

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-Second Legislature
State of Maine

Volume II

First Special Session

May 26, 2005 – June 17, 2005

Second Special Session

July 29, 2005

Second Regular Session

January 4, 2006 - April 6, 2006

Pages 737-1487

thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 125 voted in favor of the same and 0 against, and accordingly the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Emergency Measure

Resolve, Directing the State Board of Property Tax Review To Accept and Review the Appeal Filed by the Town of Palermo (S.P. 768) (L.D. 1989) (C. "A" S-464)

Reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 124 voted in favor of the same and 0 against, and accordingly the Resolve was **FINALLY PASSED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate. **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH.**

Acts

An Act To Exempt Trail-grooming Equipment from the Personal Property Tax (S.P. 716) (L.D. 1799) (C. "A" S-452)

An Act To Establish the Securities Investor Education and Training Fund (H.P. 1295) (L.D. 1855) (C. "A" H-753)

Reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed, **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Resolves

Resolve, Authorizing the State Tax Assessor To Convey the Interest of the State in Certain Real Estate in the Unorganized Territory (H.P. 1217) (L.D. 1710) (C. "A" H-756)

Resolve, To Direct the Department of Audit To Establish a Working Group To Develop a Model Chart of Accounts for All Levels of Government (H.P. 1220) (L.D. 1713) (C. "A" H-752)

Reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed, **FINALLY PASSED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

The House recessed until the Sound of the Bell.

(After Recess)

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The following items were taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The following matter, in the consideration of which the House was engaged at the time of adjournment Thursday, March 2, 2006, had preference in the Orders of the Day and continued with

such preference until disposed of as provided by House Rule 502.

SENATE DIVIDED REPORT - Majority (10) Ought Not to Pass - Minority (3) Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-436) - Committee on EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS on Bill "An Act Regarding Standardized Testing in Maine" (EMERGENCY)

(S.P. 715) (L.D. 1798)

- In Senate, Majority **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED.**

TABLED - February 9, 2006 (Till Later Today) by Representative NORTON of Bangor.

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

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Rockport, Representative Bowen.

Representative **BOWEN**: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. We haven't had a policy discussion about this in this institution about whether using the SATs is the right decision to make and so now is the time that we are going to have that discussion I guess.

I have three reasons why making this switch from the MEAs to the SATs is a bad decision. The first has to do with the test itself. I don't know how many of you are familiar with the history of the SAT. The history of that exam is actually relatively fascinating. The SAT was developed by a group of university professors in the early part of the 20th Century. Enlightened university professors, in some of the best universities in this country realized that in the 20s and 40s their universities were not filling up with the best and the brightest people in this country. They were filling up with the sons of the privileged class and not the best and smartest kids in the country. So they began thinking about some way to reach those kids who had the aptitude and the ability to do well in a university setting, but who they were not getting any access to, because they were poor kids and they were on farms in the south, they were in big cities and they were someplace, sometimes trapped in education settings that were not particularly good. So, they had to figure out a way to reach those kids who were not in good schools, who had not been in good schools, but who, if they could be pulled out of those settings and brought to a Harvard or a Yale or a Princeton or someplace where they were able to bring them along, they could be turned into great students. So, the SAT was designed specifically to negate the effects that your education had had on you, because they knew that the kids of privilege had gone to private schools and had all kinds of stuff. They were looking for the other kids who hadn't had the advantage of a strong school. They needed some way to measure how much innate talent a kid had, so that if they brought that kid out of that terrible school they were in and brought them to a Harvard or a Princeton that kid could succeed.

You will probably hear a lot today about how this is the new SAT and it doesn't do that anymore and that we have made changes to it, but the fact of the matter is that down in the DNA of the SAT - in the marrow of it's bones - this test was designed to be predictive, not a test of what a child had attained in school. It was specifically designed not to measure that because it was assumed that those kids hadn't one to very good schools and hadn't had much academic achievement. So it was designed specifically to find those kids who had some type of nugget of skill, of aptitude, which is what the test used to be called, so that they could be brought to an institution of higher learning and turned into a great student and a great contributor to society. It is to their credit that these very enlightened university presidents decided to do this and so the test was launched in the fifties.

A guy that was named James Conant, who was President of Harvard, helped develop it and it has served that function largely ever since. So the test is not the right test. And, the policy discussion that we should be having is of what the right test should be. If the MEA isn't it then what is it; maybe it is the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, and maybe it is the Stanfords? There is a whole series of nationally recognized assessment tests that we could use, but I haven't heard a convincing argument yet of why the SAT needs to be one of them.

My second reason for opposing this is the very fact that we haven't had this discussion. This is a major policy change and it has not come before this body until today, with the SAT only weeks away. Now, I don't serve on the Education Committee; I am a teacher, but I don't serve on the committee. My understanding is that Commissioner Gendron came to the committee last year and said, "Well, we are thinking about the SAT. We want to do something with MEAs and we know that they take way too long and we have to take a look at it." The committee said, "Ok, go ahead." My understanding is that when the committee met last fall the Commissioner came in and said that it was done. We are going to SATs, it's done and all taken care of and we are not even going to write an MEA for 11th grade. It is a done deal. My understanding, and I am perfectly willing to let anybody from the Education Committee correct me, is that the Education Committee never really discussed this policy and that this policy was a done deal when we came into session now and we are hearing that if we don't pass it it's too late and there is no MEA written for 11th grade and the kids are not going to get tested. Those issues certainly need to be dealt with. So the removal of the Legislature from this policy decision concerns me a great deal and I think that it should concern anybody in this room. We are the policy making arm of this government and this decision should have been made by the Legislature and it was not. For that reason alone we shouldn't support this change. But that is not even the best reason.

The best reason has something to do with kids. Now, we all know kids that are hopefully going to take the SATs and go to college. Not every kid does, a lot of kids do, more so in Maine than in other places. My concern is not for those kids that are going to go to college, or even for those kids who probably aren't going to college, my concern is those borderline kids – those kids who may be the first one in their generation and in their family to go to college and they are not really sure. They haven't had a great time in school. They haven't been particularly successful. They don't come from a family that has an education background. They don't know. They know they probably ought to get some secondary education, but they don't really know if they should and so what we are going to do is lay this test on them. All of you in here that have taken it can remember the stress. You all remember, I am sure, getting up on Saturday morning, which is bad enough in itself, driving to some other school, because the test is only given here and there and not everywhere. Usually it was the school that was your hated rival in basketball and you had to drive over and take the test in their cafeteria, with all of their stuff hanging on the walls and their trophies.

I have given the SAT as a teacher. I see these kids come in clutching their number 2 pencils with pale fingers. Kids make themselves sick over this thing. I have seen it. They come in and they sit and they shake and they have got their ID and want to make sure. It is a very stressful situation. What is even more stressful though is when you get that score. How many of you can remember that. You get the little forms. One of those where you tear across the top and you tear down the sides and you open it up. Think about those borderline kids who haven't had a lot of success in school. They don't really know if this is the thing

for them and they are holding in their hand an assessment of them from someone completely outside their circle. Not an assessment from their teachers or parents, but this sort of written-in-stone number inside that little envelope that tells them whether their future is this way or that way. For a kid who doesn't really know which way they want to go, this really isn't the best way to get them there. We have lots of great programs to get kids from high school into college, but sitting them down in a stressful situation, making them take this test, giving them that envelope after a few weeks and having them open it up and see that they didn't do as well is just closing doors. It is throwing up stop signs for them. I don't think that this test is good for kids and I don't think that it is good for schools. I know that this test wasn't designed to do what we think it will do and I am especially bothered by the way that this decision is made. The SATs are on a fast track; they are going to happen regardless of what happens with this bill.

I think that this is an opportunity for this institution to make a statement; that a decision like this needs to have more time. We need to look at it more. We need to study it more. It should have come into this institution and been debated fully and so I am asking you to oppose this Ought Not to Pass motion and send a signal that this is a big decision that this state is making and it needs more time. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

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

Representative CAIN: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What an exciting opportunity to discuss this today. Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House, I am urging you to support the Majority Ought Not To Pass today and I would like to tell you why.

The history of the SAT was just displayed greatly before you and it is true that it has changed a lot and somewhere deep down inside of it there is an initial thought that said that this is only for a select few people. This is not for everyone. This is, as the Representative from Rockport, Representative Bowen said, this is a predictive test; it is not an assessment test. But, guess what, the SAT has changed. The SAT has grown and developed just like schools have. It has become more responsive. It now tests many more things than it ever did before. When you line up the MEA and the SAT, what you have are two very similar tests and there are some things that those tests will never be able to measure. They will never be able to measure whether or not a student could stand up like I am in front of you today and say, "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House," and make a statement. It can't measure those types of things. It never will be able to. But it can measure writing. It can measure math. It can measure problem solving. Both tests do that and they do it in relatively the same way.

Is it the right test? Is any test the right test? What we need to find is the best test and what I can guarantee you is that the SAT is better than the MEA. The MEA was designed for the purpose of assessing whether or not the Learning Results in our schools were working and whether or not they were doing their job. It might be doing that, except it has no benefit for kids. The students at the 11th grade level have no reason to show up and, A: take the test, or B: care how well they do on it. It has no tie to their diploma, it has no tie to their GPA, and it has no tie to their college transcript. It is a way for the schools and the state to say if the Learning Results are working. Well, great, but I am an 11th grader and I don't care because I have been working really hard and this is taking up four days of my school time.

Now, let's talk about the SAT and how that relates to solving that problem. The SAT does carry some significance for students

in Maine and for all students it is a key into college. Most colleges, and not all colleges, many colleges are moving away from it – these colleges are now looking at this test and using it and now these students are able to say, "Wow, look I got a 900. I was never going to take this test before. I never even thought that I could go to college and now I am getting mail from colleges that tell me that they want me to apply." This has benefits for students. It gives every child in Maine the opportunity to take the SAT for free, once. Every child in Maine that falls within a certain socio-economic status already gets a free SAT. Those students will now have two free SATs. That right there is an opportunity. It is an opportunity for teachers and it is an opportunity for administrators and for school board members and for superintendents to come together and say that they want to support their students in this experience. This is an opportunity for us to help kids through that stress that was discussed by the good Representative and for those borderline kids, what a great opportunity. They were taking a test anyway. This is just a different test and now we have the opportunity to show them how this can connect to their future, how this can connect to college. And, as the good Representative said, the best reason not to do it has to do with kids, and I submit that the best reason to do this has to do with kids. We had the MEA, the school boards and the superintendents all come before us to say that they support this. Sure, it happened pretty quickly; we all saw it in the newspaper in August when it showed up. I think it was August 25th. It showed up and we all went, "What's this?" Then we thought about it and asked the hard questions and the questions about how this decision had come about. We had representatives from the College Board come here and at the end of the day a vast majority of the committee said, "Wow, this is a better idea than the MEA and what a great opportunity we have to institute it this year." We are gathering the info. We are continuing to ask the hard questions. We can still go back and change it, but the Commissioner had the absolute authority to do this. We gave it to her as a committee in the last session. We said, "You change the test. You go ahead and we will support you." That is what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on for many more minutes, but I won't and I will look forward to continued debate on this test. The bottom line for me is that this is a better opportunity for kids than the MEA was and we need to be less selfish as a state and say that we can use this test in the same way and give an added benefit for children. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Falmouth, Representative Davis.

Representative DAVIS: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I agree with everything that Emily Cain said, I am a member of the Education Committee. The SAT is infinitely better than the MEA, which takes day after day after day of testing. You can prepare for the SAT. There are courses to get you ready for it and they have proven their worth. So without repeating everything that Emily said, thank you Emily and I agree with every word you said. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Cape Elizabeth, Representative Goldman.

Representative GOLDMAN: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I absolutely agree that this is a policy issue that should be discussed, however it is only a part of a larger policy issue that actually has been part of many decisions that this body has made and previous Legislatures. I am talking about Learning Results, the implementation of Learning Results, and the ability or intent to measure whether our students are achieving those standards. This particular piece of that larger picture has already been

addressed very well, but at the same time I would like to add that our committee is still discussing this, and I suspect that further discussion will continue to go on in years to come, as to exactly what the best tests are and exactly how to measure the learning results.

There are a couple issues that I would like to address. The MEA at the 11th grade has never been tied to the diploma. If we were concerned about that particular issue and if it had been a part of previous legislation, then we would have to be concerned about the fact that the MEA is a criterion reference test and, as has already been discussed, the classic SAT is a predictive test. Those differences are much less important, given the fact that, as a policy issue we have not tied the 11th grade MEA to it being an exit test for the diploma, instead, in a previous session, this body chose to adopt legislation that tied the diploma to something called the Local Assessment System. There are a few districts in this state that have made some use of the 11th grade MEA as a part of their system, but that was almost in spite of the legislation and not because of it. It was a local choice. What we are really, as a committee, now studying, and have been for the last year and a half, is exactly what is working with this Local Assessment System policy and what isn't working. In fact, we have a session on Friday where we are really digging into that issue to cap our previous efforts. With that in mind, as a policy level, the choice of a specific test such as the SAT as opposed to the MEA makes sense because so many of our students do take the SAT very seriously for good reason. We, too, share some of the concerns that have been expressed. Yes we do not want our students to feel that they have been pegged, but at the same time, since it is not going to be used as an exit test, we do not feel that that is going to be a problem. We have already, as a legislative body, in a variety of ways, discussed and shown support for increasing the number of Maine students who go on to get a post secondary education. This is certainly a piece of policy that is in step with that goal. For all of those reasons and others I, too, will be supporting the Ought Not to Pass on this bill and respectfully ask you to join me. Thank you.

Representative BOWEN of Rockport 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 Appleton, Representative Merrill.

Representative MERRILL: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I rise this morning, or afternoon actually, to oppose the pending motion and I would like to tell you why. I agree with points that have been made by the three previous speakers. The jury is still out with me as to whether the SAT is the right test to replace the MEA. I really don't think that we have all the facts at our fingertips right now to make this decision as to whether the MEA should be replaced by the SAT, but I have signed onto the Minority Report because I agree with the points made by the good Representative from Rockport that this process was not a good process. This was a process that was, I believe, put on the fast track in order to effectively prevent the Legislature from being able to stop this. The Bangor Daily News editorialized in one particular piece by Todd Benoit, that was entitled, I believe, "No Legislator Left Behind". It was a fairly amusing little title, but the point was that this was put on a fast track. I found out about how fast the fast track was after we were briefed by the Commissioner of Education in our committee last fall. We were briefed, but it was a very brief briefing and we were not entitled to a lot of opportunity to ask the hard questions. It was a day that we were

convened and worked through a number of subjects and the discussion that pertained to this particular test may have lasted a half-hour if that.

Certainly, very few of us, when we left here last year, thought that the MEA was going to be replaced with the SAT this year. The majority of our committee had given the commissioner authorization to go forth and look for alternatives to the MEA. But certainly speaking for myself and for several other members of the committee none of us had a clue that it was going to happen this fast without the Legislature really having a meaningful opportunity to discuss this.

After we were briefed last fall and after I started receiving a lot of emails and phone calls from concerned constituents of mine, as well as folks from outside of my own district, I decided to host two public forums – one in Waldo County and one in Knox County, because I have towns in Knox County. The forums were well attended and they were overwhelmingly in opposition to the replacement of the test. I heard a variety of reasons and you have heard a sampling of the arguments here today. There were substantive concerns about whether or not we should jump from the track that we have been moving down with Learning Results and the MEA and there were concerns about whether or not the SAT is the appropriate test, but I also heard, we heard, a lot of concerns from the guidance councilors and the principles and the teachers, procedural questions, process questions. They said to us, "This test is going to be administered on a Saturday, we are going to have an awful lot of students who we know darn well are not going to come in for a Saturday test. Under the rules that our schools are currently under, if a certain percentage of the students don't show up for a test the schools find themselves on the failing list. Why can't we wait and slow this down?" Even people who agreed with substituting the test said "slow it down", but I found out at the first forum that there really was probably not going to be a slowdown and everyone else at the forum heard it.

I invited several representatives from the Department of Education and they came, did a good job and made their case, but we learned at that forum that the guidance councilors were already in the process of registering the kids who require special accommodation to take the test. So, it was fairly clear to me at that time that I knew that two pieces of legislation had been filed as legislative requests, but I didn't know at that point which were going to make it in, but it was clear to me that this was on the fast track and that this was going to happen. Look at it, now it is March. I was a little late getting in here this morning because I have one child taking the MEA, so I was driving in wondering if this was going to remain on the table until April and, Mr. Speaker, I am glad that it didn't. I am glad that we are at least discussing it in March, but this test is going to happen unless this body makes a decision to put it forward. If we decide that we are going to stop it what is going to happen? The 11th graders in the State of Maine won't take the MEA. Is the federal government going to come down and take away our No Child Left Behind money just because the Maine Legislature in the month of March said, "Wait a minute? We are not sure about this." The eight graders are still taking the MEA.

The good Representative from Orono made the comment that she could talk about this for a long time and I could as well, but I will defer. I would just like to ask all of you to think about this.

Several speakers have said that we should be thinking about the children. Of course we should be thinking about the children, but if the MEA or the SAT doesn't go forward next month, the sky is not going to fall in. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Bangor, Representative Norton.

Representative **NORTON**: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't particularly want the conversation to go on forever, but my seatmate, the good Representative from Appleton, Representative Merrill, has pointed out that that was August and this is March and in that period of time an awful lot of the people who had some original problems with using the SAT in place of the MEA have changed their mind. I thought that you might like to know. I am usually a woman of fewer words, but people who are also on the Ought Not to Pass side are Maine School Management, Maine Principals' Association, Maine Education Association and we had several superintendents come and talk to us; I have written down only Superintendent Gallaudet's name.

Many of the people who started out wondering about whether this was a good idea or not actually faded into the background because they became more convinced that the decision had to be made in order to have a test this year too. So, I just wanted you to know who was also on the Ought Not to Pass side. Thank you.

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

Representative **BISHOP**: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Last year this body adopted LD 1, a radically different approach to school funding. As the peoples' Representatives we have been made, and certainly I have been made, and probably many have you have been made quite aware by our constituents of the many, many problems, inefficiencies and inequalities in funding for school transportation, teacher compensation and even per-school payments. We have not gotten it right.

The Department of Education has not gotten it right, not yet anyway. Maybe the Department of Education should be spending its available time, energy and money on these ongoing and omnipresent problems, rather than working overtime to create a whole new set of problems to solve by changing tests in midstream. Please vote against this pending motion.

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.

ROLL CALL NO. 372

YEA - Adams, Ash, Babbidge, Barstow, Beaudette, Blanchard, Blanchette, Bliss, Brannigan, Brautigam, Bryant, Burns, Cain, Canavan, Clark, Craven, Cummings, Davis G, Driscoll, Duchesne, Dugay, Dunn, Duplessie, Eberle, Eder, Edgcomb, Faircloth, Farrington, Finch, Fisher, Flood, Goldman, Hanley S, Harlow, Hogan, Hutton, Jackson, Jennings, Koffman, Lerman, Lundeen, Makas, Marley, Marraché, Mazurek, McKenney, Miller, Mills, Moody, Muse, Norton, O'Brien, Paradis, Patrick, Perry, Pilon, Pineau, Pingree, Piotti, Rines, Sampson, Saviello, Simpson, Smith N, Thompson, Tuttle, Valentino, Walcott, Watson, Webster, Wheeler, Woodbury, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Annis, Austin, Berube, Bishop, Bowen, Bowles, Brown R, Browne W, Bryant-Deschenes, Campbell, Carr, Cebra, Churchill, Clough, Collins, Cressey, Crosby, Crosthwaite, Curley, Curtis, Daigle, Davis K, Dudley, Duprey, Fischer, Fitts, Fletcher, Glynn, Greeley, Hall, Hamper, Hanley B, Jacobsen, Jodrey, Joy, Kaelin, Lansley, Lewin, Lindell, Marean, McCormick, McFadden, McKane, McLeod, Merrill, Millett, Moulton, Nass, Ott, Pinkham, Plummer, Rector, Richardson D, Richardson E, Richardson M, Richardson W, Robinson, Rosen, Schatz, Seavey, Sherman, Shields, Sykes, Tardy, Thomas, Trahan, Twomey, Vaughan.

ABSENT - Bierman, Emery, Gerzofsky, Grose, Hotham, Moore G, Nutting, Percy, Smith W, Stedman.

Yes, 73; No, 68; Absent, 10; Excused, 0.

73 having voted in the affirmative and 68 voted in the negative, with 10 being absent, and accordingly the Majority **Ought Not to Pass Report** was **ACCEPTED** in concurrence.

SENATE PAPERS

Bill "An Act To Strengthen Maine's Craft Brewers"

(S.P. 792) (L.D. 2048)

Came from the Senate, **REFERRED** to the Committee on **TAXATION** and ordered printed.

REFERRED to the Committee on **TAXATION** in concurrence.

CONSENT CALENDAR

First Day

In accordance with House Rule 519, the following items appeared on the Consent Calendar for the First Day:

(S.P. 756) (L.D. 1966) Bill "An Act To Make Allocations from the Maine Turnpike Authority Funds for the Maine Turnpike Authority for the Calendar Year Ending December 31, 2007" Committee on **TRANSPORTATION** reporting **Ought to Pass**

(S.P. 524) (L.D. 1508) Bill "An Act To Regulate Fire Alarm Contractors" Committee on **BUSINESS, RESEARCH AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-468)**

(S.P. 684) (L.D. 1767) Bill "An Act To Clarify the Charitable Solicitations Act" Committee on **BUSINESS, RESEARCH AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-469)**

(S.P. 757) (L.D. 1967) Bill "An Act To Support Fishing Derbies" (EMERGENCY) Committee on **INLAND FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-463)**

There being no objections, the above items were ordered to appear on the Consent Calendar tomorrow under the listing of Second Day.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on **MARINE RESOURCES** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-467)** on Bill "An Act To Amend the Statutes Governing the Commercial Fishing Safety Council"

(S.P. 681) (L.D. 1764)

Signed:

Senators:

DAMON of Hancock

SULLIVAN of York

ANDREWS of York

Representatives:

PERCY of Phippsburg

FLETCHER of Winslow

EMERY of Cutler

DUGAY of Cherryfield

ASH of Belfast

EDER of Portland

KAELIN of Winterport

ADAMS of Portland

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on same Bill.

Signed:

Representative:

CRESSEY of Cornish

Came from the Senate with the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED Report READ and ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-467).**

READ.

On motion of Representative PERCY of Phippsburg, the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended Report** was **ACCEPTED.**

The Bill was **READ ONCE. Committee Amendment "A" (S-467)** was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED.** The Bill was assigned for **SECOND READING** Thursday, March 9, 2006.

Ought to Pass Pursuant to Resolve

Report of the **Joint Standing Committee on Natural Resources** on Resolve, Regarding Source Water Protection Recommendations

(S.P. 785) (L.D. 2037)

Reporting **Ought to Pass** pursuant to Resolve 2005, chapter 29.

Came from the Senate with the Report **READ and ACCEPTED** and the Resolve **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED.**

Report was **READ and ACCEPTED.** The Resolve was **READ ONCE** and assigned for **SECOND READING** Thursday, March 9, 2006.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on **AGRICULTURE, CONSERVATION AND FORESTRY** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-798)** on Bill "An Act To Provide Forest Certification Cost-share Incentives to Forest Landowners and Licensed Foresters"

(H.P. 1312) (L.D. 1872)

Signed:

Senators:

NUTTING of Androscoggin

BRYANT of Oxford

RAYE of Washington

Representatives:

PIOTTI of Unity

CARR of Lincoln

JODREY of Bethel

JENNINGS of Leeds

MAREAN of Hollis

LUNDEEN of Mars Hill

FLOOD of Winthrop

SHERMAN of Hodgdon

EDGEComb of Caribou

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "B" (H-799)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Representative:

TWOMEY of Biddeford

READ.

On motion of Representative PIOTTI of Unity, the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended Report** was **ACCEPTED.**

The Bill was **READ ONCE. Committee Amendment "A" (H-798)** was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED.** The Bill was assigned for **SECOND READING** Thursday, March 9, 2006.