

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)

Legislative Record
House of Representatives
One Hundred and Twenty-Fourth Legislature
State of Maine

Volume II

First Regular Session

May 28, 2009 – June 12, 2009

Second Regular Session

January 6, 2010 - March 23, 2010

Pages 609-1214

materialize, but Madam Speaker, Men and Women of the House, the earliest that this money could be awarded to that community would be in January, and we have no assurance, at present, that it would be awarded at that time. Even if it were, by then, the budget is in motion, there are only a few months left until next year at this time, and so the delay would only serve to be buy a few months of marginal, at best, transition funding. That \$5 million in the meantime sits there, does nothing for our schools, it does nothing for our children. All it does is increase pressure on the mill rates. You know, a Republican hero of mine, Teddy Roosevelt, once said that 90 percent of wisdom is wisdom in time. I think it is time for us to give time to the schools. I'm a teacher by trade, I've been in education for 20 years, and when I give an assignment that is unclear or it has unrealistic deadlines, and that does happen, I admit, from time to time, usually I can give an extension and the children who have done the work appropriately and handed it in on time have absolutely no resentment for those who needed a little extra time to make sense of the assignment. I think that's what we're talking about, Madam Speaker. I think we should give that extension on the assignment and allow a few months to go by, that might very well go by anyway if we were not to pass this bill. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Chapman, Representative Sutherland.

Representative **SUTHERLAND**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to point out a correction for the members of this body. The Minority Report, Ought to Pass as Amended, the amendment was an emergency preamble and that was passed, it was attached to the bill and whether it was a clerical issue, I just want to point out that we are talking, discussing a bill with an emergency preamble. That is the only way we can move a bill, this piece of legislation forward, if you choose that way, otherwise it would not meet the competing measure guidelines which require a minimum of a two-thirds vote, so my apologies. I appreciate one of my colleagues pointing it out to me. It was an oversight on my part to not point that out to you sooner.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Minority Ought to Pass as Amended Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 185

YEA - Austin, Ayotte, Beaudette, Beaudoin, Beaulieu, Beck, Berry, Blodgett, Boland, Bolduc, Browne W, Burns, Butterfield, Campbell, Carey, Casavant, Cebra, Celli, Chase, Clark H, Clark T, Cleary, Cornell du Houx, Cotta, Crafts, Crockett J, Crockett P, Curtis, Davis, Dill, Driscoll, Duchesne, Eaton, Eberle, Edgecomb, Eves, Finch, Fitts, Flemings, Fletcher, Flood, Fossel, Gifford, Gilbert, Giles, Greeley, Hamper, Hanley, Harvell, Hill, Hogan, Hunt, Innes Walsh, Johnson, Joy, Kaenrath, Kent, Knapp, Knight, Kruger, Lajoie, Langley, MacDonald, Magnan, Martin JL, Mazurek, McCabe, McFadden, McKane, McLeod, Morrison, Nass, Nutting, O'Brien, Pendleton, Peoples, Percy, Perry, Pieh, Pinkham, Pratt, Rankin, Richardson D, Richardson W, Rosen, Russell, Sarty, Saviello, Schatz, Shaw, Sirois, Stevens, Stuckey, Sutherland, Sykes, Tardy, Theriault, Thibodeau, Thomas, Tilton, Trinward, Tuttle, Wagner J, Wagner R, Watson, Weaver, Welsh, Wheeler, Willette, Wright, Madam Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Briggs, Bryant, Cain, Cohen, Connor, Dostie, Flaherty, Goode, Harlow, Haskell, Hayes, Hinck, Legg, Lovejoy, Martin JR, Miller, Millett, Nelson, Peterson, Pilon, Plummer, Priest, Robinson, Rotundo, Sanborn, Smith, Strang Burgess, Treat, Valentino, Van Wie, Webster.

ABSENT - Bickford, Blanchard, Cray, Cushing, Jones, Lewin, Piotti, Prescott.

Yes, 111; No, 32; Absent, 8; Excused, 0.

111 having voted in the affirmative and 32 voted in the negative, with 8 being absent, and accordingly the Minority **Ought to Pass as Amended Report was ACCEPTED.**

The Bill was **READ ONCE. Committee Amendment "A" (H-352) was READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED.**

Under suspension of the rules the Bill was given its **SECOND READING WITHOUT REFERENCE** to the Committee on **Bills in the Second Reading.**

Under further suspension of the rules the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-352)** and sent for concurrence. **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH.**

HOUSE DIVIDED REPORT - Majority (8) **Ought Not to Pass** - Minority (5) **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-257)** - Committee on **EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS** on Bill "An Act To Repeal the School District Consolidation Laws"

(I.B. 4) (L.D. 977)

TABLED - May 13, 2009 (Till Later Today) by Representative SUTHERLAND of Chapman.

PENDING - Motion of same Representative to **ACCEPT** the Majority **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Chapman, Representative Sutherland.

Representative **SUTHERLAND**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We have before us a piece of legislation that is a citizen's initiative, and I previously moved the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report and I like to speak to that a little bit.

One of my first reasons for doing that is you've seen the list of the small towns we just addressed previously. Not a whole lot of people, lots of towns. Those people worked very, very hard to collect over 55,000 signatures in order to put their citizen's initiative forward. I suspect that there were very few, if any, paid signature gathers, maybe there were, but they worked very hard in order to gather that number of signatures. Personally, I think they deserve to have this put before the people of the state, which is what they wish to do.

Secondly, I have concerns about the legal ramifications if we repeal this piece of legislation. There would be a whole host of currently legally existing school units that would disappear, because the entire law, this eliminates, repeals all of the law, not just provisions of it. If I use MSAD 43, Rumford, as an example, and they are part of RSU 10 now that includes MSAD 21, Dixfield; MSAD 39, which is Buckfield, Hanover and the Rumford SAD. They have formed an RSU tent. Let's just talk about one community. MSAD 43 in Rumford would have no legal identity, not a new identity, not an old identity, because the old identity was put away when the new one was begun. There would be no elected school board, no superintendent under contract, no school unit budget, no line of credit established, whole lots of other things I don't need to go into. You know, you've all heard all of this. It would create a legal quagmire for our school units around the state. Certainly could work their way out of it, certainly this Legislature could help, or not, in moving some things forward, but it really would create a situation of a morass, if you will, of what do we do now, and it can be done but there would be those months when it would be very difficult, very challenging, and again, whatever issues we adults in this state have around how we're going to run our schools, we must put

number one, at the top of our list, the best possible education that we can provide for the kids in our public schools and as much stability as we can provide for those kids in our public schools. So I would encourage you to support the Majority Report of the committee and move this citizen's initiative the next step forward, which is what they requested when they worked very hard in order to get all of those signatures and put it on a ballot for statewide vote. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Sullivan, Representative Eaton.

Representative **EATON**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. School administrative consolidation is necessary. Flexibility in creating a good, fair law is also necessary. Since passing the budget and this attached consolidation in 2007, our Education Committee and the previous Legislature, in good faith, attempted to modify the legislation, Madam Speaker, to make it more fair, more reasonable for our towns and our small communities. Our legislative efforts to create a more cooperative and less punitive environment have been rejected at virtually every turn. I had been assured by the Department of Education that it would be capable of providing accurate and timely information to the citizens charged with this huge overhaul of their school system and format. Hours of emails, phone calls, sit down discussions with RPC members, superintendents, and facilitators validated my concerns that this law was too broad and too overreaching. We may have saved the state considerable funds, but we did so on the backs of many small communities, and the list is long. In my opinion, this is not real savings when our communities, including many who have complied with the law, are thumped by increased property taxes to support their new RSU. Ask the citizens in my district of Lamoine about school consolidation, but sit down, Madam Speaker, because they're going to give you an earful. Madam Speaker, we're ultimately responsible for this mess. I would rather repeal this measure today and have the elected members of this, the 124th Legislature, involved from the beginning in a new, more respectful effort to consolidate the administration of our schools.

It's been stated there will be no structure; it could create a nightmare, a quagmire. I disagree. We have hundreds of new informed and battle tested people to help us with this process, those folks from the RPCs that worked so diligently at trying to work through this effort. These citizens will help us get to the next step of where we need to go. As a citizen of this state, who has witnessed the commitment and dedication of this legislative body, I believe, with the assistance of those citizens and stakeholders, we can overcome the structural issues before they become a problem, and we can craft new legislation. Madam Speaker, on the evening of April 9th, only 14 short months ago, the 123rd Legislature, this body in the people's House, voted to repeal school consolidation. We voted last April 9th to repeal school consolidation. Madam Speaker, we did it because we knew it wasn't working then, and now it's *deja vu* all over again. For too many of our communities, both conforming and not conforming, it's not working now. It's time for us to stand up and be counted, Madam Speaker. We can do better. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Greenville, Representative Johnson.

Representative **JOHNSON**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Those who know my position know that I concur with Representative Eaton and my purpose in rising now is just to ask for a vote by the yeas and nays.

Representative JOHNSON of Greenville **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Easton, Representative Clark.

Representative **CLARK**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just wanted to say that I was one of the people who collected signatures, the 55,000, and I've talked to so many people that did. When we collected, we didn't care how it passed, and we wouldn't mind if we went ahead and took care of this right now, in fact they'd be more than happy.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Brewer, Representative Celli.

Representative **CELLI**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The people that got these signatures together, if we were to hand them a victory today and vote this down, they would be doing cartwheels, jumping up and down for joy. They did their hard work, and I don't think we need to send it out to all the communities, which would cost hundreds of thousands of dollars in a ballot, in order to have them repeal that. This Legislature started this fiasco; this Legislature should finish this fiasco. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Blue Hill, Representative Schatz.

Representative **SCHATZ**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I'm not one to push envelopes, I'm a happy person right now; however, I do think that, as the good Representative from wherever he is, my good friend Representative Eaton from Sullivan, I knew that, has indicated, this is an item that's been before us a number of times, well once in particular, but it's been the topic of conversation for basically three years now. I think that we should look at this as a vote of confidence, or lack of it if nothing else, and it's an opportunity to so that. Should we be able to overturn it, I think that to repeal consolidation, I think it would at least start the wheels moving for the kind of difficult chore that we might be faced with to undo some of the legal relationships, but I think that it will all be done with the focus on the education of our children. As we often point out, these conversations seem to lack that as a topic. I think the sooner we dispose of this, then the sooner we can talk about the quality of education and what's the best learning environment and how we get there, and so I would support the repeal at this point in time again. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Dennysville, Representative McFadden.

Representative **McFADDEN**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We need to look at repeal very carefully. As reorganization stands today, we still have that 143 nonconforming units. We have 24 reorganized units in 53 districts that were exempt from the law in the first place. Nothing happens to the 53 districts exempt from the law. The 24 reorganized districts, if they are saving money and happy of their efforts, which I know some are not, they would be back to square one, but they would use the same format and not be threatened if they saw they'd really save money in wanting to reorganize. It would not be, you reorganize or it will cost you. We all know what the cost is. The 144 noncompliant units would be the same as they are today. GPA was reduced by \$36.5 million, which was enacted in the last Biennial Budget, and districts needed to find the best way to adjust to the loss of state funding. Taxes had to be increased and layoffs followed. Administration was cut by 50 percent, lost Special Ed, transportation, and maintenance was cut by 5 percent. There is nothing in the law that creates a savings; it is merely a shift in

spending from the state to local taxes. The Sinclair Act in 1957 awarded a 10 percent bonus to form a new SAD. There is nothing in the law that penalized any unit. This was a democratic process. Our new undemocratic law, mandated from the top down, is very detrimental to our democratic process. Let's vote to repeal LD 977 and begin at the local level for proper citizen input and figure out the best way to consolidate and save real money statewide. I recommend you vote against the pending motion. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Boothbay, Representative MacDonald.

Representative **MacDONALD**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to the Ought Not to Pass motion. This school consolidation process has been bad and confusing public policy from the beginning that was supposed to be about the consolidation of administrative functions, and it swept into it everything from school committees to teacher contracts, and I believe it had the effect and has the effect of taking away from local people their involvement in local, civil life, which often centers around local schools and local school politics, and took away from those local communities, removing that emphasis and that activity to a more remote level. That was primarily why I was against this bill from the beginning, because I didn't think that we should be doing anything that would remove, from our small towns and their citizens, that ability to be a part of local, public life, which this I think diminished and still will diminish if it continues on. I think the best route for us is to repeal this law and to move back and then take another look at how we could make administrative savings without diminishing the local involvement, the local ownership, the local involvement in the life of the public schools. I think that if we do repeal it, Madam Speaker, you yourself have pointed out in our own caucus that, if we do repeal it, we won't create a quagmire; we'll create a situation in which you will then have further work to do. Our Constitution, as you pointed out, says that if any change we make has a fiscal impact that we then have the period of time, after we make that change to come back in, and make the necessary changes to adjust. So we can do that if we repeal. We will have the proper time to adjust, come back, fix the situation and move forward with a totally different time of approach towards consolidating public education in our state. I don't think we'll create any more of quagmire than we created when we did this in the beginning. I urge you to reject the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report and repeal school consolidation. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from New Gloucester, Representative Van Wie.

Representative **VAN WIE**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Again, I rise torn. I think we're actually in a situation where we are going to be jumping out of the quicksand into the quagmire either way. As I mentioned before, I'd like to get on with the business of consolidation and I'd like to do it right, and if I vote in favor of the motion, we put it on to November, I fear that it can be perceived that I'm disrespecting the hard work that my RSU folks have done, and I certainly don't want to do that. I believe that they have done everything that was asked of them. Obviously, there are many agendas out there, but it is important that we try to do this right, and no matter what we do, there are 24 districts that are going to need immediate legal attention. We're going to have to allow them to write new law to allow them to exist, or to allow them to dissolve, because there's nothing in the current law that allows them to dissolve, which I find kind of an amazing situation. So as I've mentioned before, as my head spins as I look at this issue, I could keep coming back to a let's just get it

right, and that strategy is repeal and repair. I would vote against the current motion so that we can get on with the business of repairing this law and allowing our students to be educated. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Bethel, Representative Crockett.

Representative **CROCKETT**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition of the pending motion. I'll tell you why: I represent School Union 37, SAD 58 and SAD 44. Many of you heard the plight of SAD 58 from the good Representative from Wilton, Representative Saviello, so I won't elaborate on that. But I'll give you the example of SAD 44.

SAD 44, two years ago, was told to consolidate with Mountain Valley, which is Rumford, Mexico, Dixfield and Buckfield, it's all RSU 10 now. But at the time, at the outset, they were told to pursue consolidation, so they started. They were rejected by those schools. I have them here. So they went back to the Department of Education and they were told by the Department of Education go to Rangeley, a school a mere 70 miles away, and you could co-locate your superintendent or your major service center, perhaps in Errol, New Hampshire, which is the midway point between the two of them. So anyway, that was a little facetious, yes, so they pursued this, they went through, they found absolutely no savings except for the penalty being imposed. That's a false penalty. So naturally, the people of Rangeley didn't like it, they voted it down. SAD 44 voted in favor of it so, according to the current budget, they won't face a penalty. But now, after I approached the Department of Education last week, I was again told by Department of Education, they want me to go back to Rumford-Mexico, an RSU that's already been formed. We will have no say in the formation of it. We'll go back to the very people that rejected us, and I'm holding these letters right here. Now tonight I have a budget meeting in Bethel, seven o'clock, and I have to go back to these people and tell them that two years of hard work and they're back to the very beginning and they have no choice. They did everything they were supposed to do. Earlier it was implied that these people hadn't done what they were supposed to do, they're supposed to bear the brunt of their penalty. These people did everything. They looked for savings, they found none except what the state imposed, and now we're going to push them back to the beginning. Pardon my emotion to it, I guess it's the short sleeve shirt; I'm looking like Paul Davis now. It's terrible, I rise in opposition of the current motion, and I'm not under the illusion that this is going to go and we'll be able to do anything and what happens on the second floor after, if we defeat the pending motion, that may or may not work out. In November, regardless of what happens there, we're still in a situation where we're going to have to remedy this. We're not avoiding. So if by some overwhelming chance we get two-thirds today, it helps alleviate any issues we have with the second floor, we may be able to do something. But that's just an outside thought and food for thought. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Lewiston, Representative Wagner.

Representative **WAGNER**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Majority Ought Not to Pass motion. We should not repeal consolidation at this point. We were rushed in to the consolidation; let's not rush out of it in a way that doesn't allow us to try to make some necessary changes so that this flawed system can work. One of the things that concerns me, and I hope this does not insult too many school districts and small towns, one of the things that concerns me is savings, efficiencies

and so on were not being implemented effectively statewide prior to the consolidation. If we repeal, where is the pressure going to be and we do need that pressure in many parts of the state, where is the pressure going to be to make the changes that are necessary to save the money so that our budget doesn't continue to go up and up and up in terms of educational costs? So I will be voting against the motion to repeal.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Chapman, Representative Sutherland.

Representative **SUTHERLAND**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I just want to reiterate and make it clear at the request of a couple of colleagues. Voting on this motion to support the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report makes the piece of legislation, the initiative go forward to be put on the budget. I just wanted to make that perfectly clear that a support of the motion before us moves the citizen's initiative to the next step, which is on the next ballot that will be before us statewide. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Caribou, Representative Edgecomb.

Representative **EDGECOMB**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Representative from Sullivan aptly pointed out that this consolidation bill was repealed by this Legislature, and one of the main reasons why that happened was that, when consolidation was considered, it was removed from the Education Committee. The very committee that should have handled this and passed this legislation and made a proposal to this Legislature was removed from that decision. Therefore, I think we need to do the right thing and put Maine back the way life should be in our state. It was a flawed legislation that really needs to be repealed. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Portland, Representative Russell.

Representative **RUSSELL**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have no dog in this fight, you can check for paraphernalia; however, I'm looking at this and, as you all know, I'm really fond of the citizen's initiative process, as some of you are well aware, and so I'm looking at this very narrowly through the process of the citizen's initiative, and I'm really struggling with this because if we pass this outright today, everyone that I keep hearing is saying we need to pass it and fix it. Well, the people who collected the signatures and put a lot of hard work into collecting those signatures didn't write this legislation to say please delay the penalty, please give us more time. They said please repeal the legislation altogether. So if we vote to repeal this, we need to vote to repeal it period, and we do not get a chance to come back and fix it, because that really does a dishonor to the people who collected the signatures. On the other hand, if we send this to the people of Maine and they come back and they say we want you to repeal this legislation, it puts us in yet another situation, because if they pass this outright at the polls, come January, when we come back next year and want to fix the piece of legislation, yet again, the people have spoken. So I really, I'm neither for nor against is how I'm testifying, but just something for consideration that a lot of work went into collecting these signatures, and regardless of what we do, we're kind of in trouble in terms of the people, unless the people speak out and say we do not want you to repeal school consolidation, we're in a real bind. Or, if you really want to repeal it outright and leave it repealed outright, that's fine. But if you want to repeal it and then fix it, we're in a bind regardless of what we do. So I just wanted to throw that out there. I know it doesn't help, but I think that we really should be weighing this very carefully in terms of what

people want, and what they have asked for is an outright repeal and not a fix. I would ask that people consider that when they consider their vote today. I think our hands are tied either way. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Orono, Representative Cain.

Representative **CAIN**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. May I pose a question to the Chair?

The SPEAKER: The Representative may pose her question.

Representative **CAIN**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. What is the motion that we're voting on since it's not being displayed on the board at this time?

The SPEAKER: The motion is the Acceptance of the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report.

ROLL CALL NO. 186

YEA - Adams, Beaudette, Beaudoin, Beaulieu, Beck, Bickford, Bolduc, Briggs, Bryant, Butterfield, Cain, Campbell, Carey, Casavant, Cohen, Dill, Dostie, Driscoll, Eberle, Eves, Flaherty, Flood, Giles, Goode, Harlow, Haskell, Hayes, Hill, Hinck, Hogan, Hunt, Kaenrath, Kent, Kruger, Lajoie, Legg, Lovejoy, Martin JR, Mazurek, McCabe, Miller, Millett, Morrison, Nelson, Pendleton, Peoples, Percy, Perry, Peterson, Pilon, Plummer, Priest, Rankin, Robinson, Rotundo, Russell, Sanborn, Sirois, Smith, Stevens, Strang Burgess, Stuckey, Sutherland, Treat, Tuttle, Valentino, Wagner J, Wagner R, Watson, Webster, Welsh, Wheeler.

NAY - Austin, Ayotte, Berry, Blodgett, Boland, Browne W, Burns, Cebra, Celli, Chase, Clark H, Clark T, Cleary, Cotta, Crafts, Crockett J, Crockett P, Curtis, Davis, Duchesne, Eaton, Edgecomb, Finch, Fitts, Flemings, Fletcher, Fossel, Gifford, Gilbert, Greeley, Hamper, Hanley, Harvell, Innes Walsh, Johnson, Joy, Knapp, Knight, Langley, MacDonald, Magnan, Martin JL, McFadden, McKane, McLeod, Nass, Nutting, O'Brien, Pieh, Pinkham, Pratt, Richardson D, Richardson W, Rosen, Sarty, Saviello, Schatz, Shaw, Sykes, Tardy, Theriault, Thibodeau, Thomas, Tilton, Trinarward, Van Wie, Weaver, Willette, Wright, Madam Speaker.

ABSENT - Blanchard, Connor, Cornell du Houx, Cray, Cushing, Jones, Lewin, Piotti, Prescott.

Yes, 72; No, 70; Absent, 9; Excused, 0.

72 having voted in the affirmative and 70 voted in the negative, with 9 being absent, and accordingly the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** and sent for concurrence. **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH.**

SENATE PAPERS

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act To Provide Greater Access to ATVs by Lowering the Minimum Operating Age"

(S.P. 104) (L.D. 340)

Majority (8) **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report of the Committee on **INLAND FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE READ** and **ACCEPTED** in the House on June 2, 2009.

Came from the Senate with that Body having **INSISTED** on its former action whereby the Minority (3) **OUGHT TO PASS** Report of the Committee on **INLAND FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE** was **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY SENATE AMENDMENT "A" (S-194)** in **NON-CONCURRENCE.**