

# 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

Representatives:

NASS of Acton  
BEAULIEU of Auburn  
FOSTER of Augusta  
MALONEY of Augusta  
MOULTON of York  
PRIEST of Brunswick  
ROCHELO of Biddeford  
SARTY of Denmark  
WATERHOUSE of Bridgton

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject reported that the same **Ought To Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-309)**.

Signed:

Representative:

DILL of Cape Elizabeth

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

Reports **READ**.

On motion by Senator **HASTINGS** of Oxford, the Majority **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report **ACCEPTED**, in concurrence.

---

**Divided Report**

The Majority of the Committee on **MARINE RESOURCES** on Bill "An Act Regarding the Saltwater Recreational Fishing Registry" (EMERGENCY)

H.P. 250 L.D. 308

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

Signed:

Senator:

SULLIVAN of York

Representatives:

WEAVER of York  
BELIVEAU of Kittery  
CHAPMAN of Brooksville  
KNAPP of Gorham  
KRUGER of Thomaston  
KUMIEGA of Deer Isle  
MacDONALD of Boothbay  
OLSEN of Phippsburg

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject reported that the same **Ought To Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-181)**.

Signed:

Senators:

SNOWE-MELLO of Androscoggin  
LANGLEY of Hancock

Representatives:

PARRY of Arundel  
TILTON of Harrington

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

Reports **READ**.

On motion by Senator **SNOWE-MELLO** of Androscoggin, the Majority **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report **ACCEPTED**, in concurrence.

---

**Divided Report**

The Majority of the Committee on **STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT** on RESOLUTION, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of Maine To Reduce the Size of the House of Representatives

H.P. 33 L.D. 40

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

Signed:

Senators:

THOMAS of Somerset  
COLLINS of York  
SULLIVAN of York

Representatives:

COTTA of China  
BOLAND of Sanford  
CASAVANT of Biddeford  
GRAHAM of North Yarmouth  
MOULTON of York  
TURNER of Burlington

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject reported that the same **Ought To Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-198)**.

Signed:

Representatives:

BOLDUC of Auburn  
HARVELL of Farmington  
KAENRATH of South Portland

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

Reports **READ**.

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

Senator **KATZ** of Kennebec requested a Roll Call.

---

Senator **RAYE** of Washington was granted unanimous consent to address the Senate off the Record.

---

On motion by Senator **KATZ** of Kennebec, 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 Kennebec, Senator Katz.

Senator **KATZ:** Thank you Madame President. Men and women of the Senate, the premise behind this bill is that it's not a bad idea to take a fresh look at something every 170 years or so. The size of the Maine House was set back in 1841. Abraham Lincoln, whose portrait hangs there, was a lawyer at the time. He wasn't even President yet. It's a time when people got around in their districts by horse and buggy and it might take someone a day or more just to get across their House District. We didn't have telephones. We certainly didn't have automobiles. It's so long ago that baseball hadn't even been invented yet. How things have changed now and how we communicate and stay in touch with our constituents has changed. I'll bet there are many members of this Body who have communicated with people back in their home district this morning by e-mail or text, whether you live in Aroostook County or you live in Augusta, as I do. Yet, as those things have changed and as our ability to stay in touch with our constituents has changed, our House of Representatives remains large. We have the sixth largest House in the entire country. The sixth largest in the entire country despite the fact that we have the thirty-ninth largest population and the fortyish largest land mass. We have larger legislatures than states like ours in terms of population like Wyoming or Idaho. We also have a larger legislature than very large states like Illinois or California. Why is that? Why is it in this day when instantaneous communication and all sorts of way our constituents can stay in touch with us and we can stay in touch with our constituents that we insist on holding to the sixth largest legislature in the entire United States? Why is it that within the last fifteen years eleven states have voted to reduce the size of their legislatures that we won't even let this go out to the voters?

I think it's an idea whose time has come for another reason. We really need in the legislature, I would suggest, to lead by example. We're saying to our towns and our cities, through our decreased revenue sharing and in many other ways, that they need to do more with less. We're saying to our schools, our K-12 school, through a reduction in our funding, that even with the GPA we're going to give them they are going to have to do more with less. What are we doing ourselves to tighten our own budgets? I'm honored to serve on the Appropriations Committee and time and time again that's the message we have to tell people. To the people who are waiting on waiting lists for disability services for longer and longer, we have to tell them to tighten their belts. To the people that we may be cutting off from MaineCare because we simply can't afford to do all that we have been doing, we're asking them to tighten their belts. To all of our constituents who

have to ride over some of the worse roads in the country, we're certainly asking them to tighten their belts. What are we doing ourselves to do that?

This is not a party issue and I would suggest it's not even a rural/urban issue. Everyone would continue to represent the same proportionate number of people. I, personally, think this bill, which reduces the size of the House to 131, doesn't go nearly far enough. I think it should be much lower but it is the only bill that is before us. Again, it's not the legislature changing the size of the House but the legislature simply allowing this matter to go out to referendum. Again, maybe once every 170 years it's not such a bad thing to do. Thank you, Madame President.

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

Senator **SCHNEIDER:** Thank you Madame President. Men and women of the Senate, I just wanted to stand to point out a few things. I think I waiver on this because I do hear from people about reducing the size of the legislature, but when you come from a district that has both sort of more populated towns and then some really rural areas you understand better the challenges that occur in serving those towns by getting to meetings and school board meetings. I serve 23 communities in my Senate District. I happen to know from one of my Representatives, Representative Turner, that it is a very expansive district. It's a lot easier when you come from a very compact area to speak in favor of this kind of legislation. Yes, you can serve but a lot of that is going to be telephone and e-mail because, in the rural areas, it's harder and harder to travel the distances. I'm really not certain about the way I want to support this because I know that there are going to be other pieces of legislation that include reducing the size of the Senate. If we're going to reduce the size of the House perhaps we should reduce the size of both. If we're going to lead by example than perhaps that's the way to go and not on this one.

I also wanted to say that I don't think that we have ever called, at least I haven't heard it, for school boards to be reduced. The governing boards, I don't think we have suggested that those governing boards be reduced at all. I've never seen it. I've never heard of that. In fact, when we talk about tightening our belts we're talking about things like administrative costs. Even though I understand there is this call, I think we represent our Senate Districts and the other Body represents their House Districts and we have a large geographic location. I would suggest that perhaps some of the people who live in the more compact areas should come along with me and see where I go in my Senate District and how far I travel to get places so people can actually see me in my Senate District and know that I really care about them and believe that they should have direct contact with their representatives. It will be awfully difficult to do that as we get smaller. I feel both ways on this issue. It's a very, very difficult issue to decide on. Do we need the size of this Body to be this big? I'm not sure we've really done a thorough examination of this issue. I would be willing to send something out to the people if it was more carefully examined to see if this particular number is the appropriate number. I haven't gotten any data to suggest that this particular number is the appropriate number. I just wanted to put that out there because I think sometimes when people come from more compact areas they think about how easy this would be and then when they come to other areas in the state that are much more expansive in the geographic area to meet the

population that we need to serve as a Senate District it is a lot more difficult than when you serve one city council and one school board or maybe one or two. It's a different ballgame altogether. I guess that would be my challenge to you before we go ahead on this particular bill and say to House members to expand their districts. Take a ride around Representative Turner's district and see what that is like. Thank you.

---

Off Record Remarks

---

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

Senator **THOMAS:** Thank you Madame President. Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, I promised my seatmate that I wouldn't read the 59 towns and townships in my Senate District because we'd be here all day. I realize that this is a bill affecting the other Body and not ours, but it will come to our Body if we pass this. There will be calls to reduce the size of this Body. Serving on the committee of State and Local Government is a member of the other Body that also has 59 towns and townships. We like to represent our constituents as well as every other member. It's a long way from Palmyra to Patten I'll guarantee you. Some day you ought to come up and ride with me. One hundred and seventy years ago, as my seatmate mentioned, government didn't interfere with our daily lives like it does today. Today you can't turn around but there is some bureaucrat telling you that you can't do this or you shouldn't do that so constituents didn't need to contact their legislator. Today they need to contact their legislator. I just can't believe that it's the right thing to do to make these districts bigger. Thank you.

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

Senator **SULLIVAN:** Thank you Madame President. Men and women of the Senate, first I would very much like to ride with the Senator from Somerset, Senator Thomas, from Palmyra to Patten. I think that would be exciting, to say the least. Seriously, I'm also on this Ought Not to Pass and there are several reasons, one of them being, as the good Chair pointed out, that this is truly the story of the two Maines. One Maine where you can stay in a city. There are some cities, my city, that happens to have three Representatives. That's how large we are. It wouldn't bother us at all. As we mentioned, Representative Turner, from the other Body, has just been elected and she has tons of towns. Sometimes when people introduce themselves and they try to list off all of their different townships, I have to add something like the Vatican something just to feel important because I only have four little places. I will tell you that three of those four places have separate town meetings. If you try to make the town meetings, if you try to keep in touch with a city council, and you try all those things, there is not enough time to be able to service your people.

I think we tend to over-inflate our importance. If you put something out to the people they would vote to do away with all of Augusta people, you and me included, for many of the reasons that the Senator from Somerset, Senator Thomas, just talked about. It seems like every time you turn around you hear, "I'm

here from government and I really want to help." That's one of the three big lies. That's how they look at it. If we're going to do this let's not just be willy-nilly about it and so that we've picked this number and we're going to use this number. It costs money to put something out to the people. Trust me. I think at this point of time and this area of crisis where we are trying to redefine government we ought to at least have a well thought out plan. I think that since we've waited 170 years I'm okay with waiting 175 years. I think that's okay. There is a reason why there are three Senators on this Ought Not to Pass. There is a reason why there are seven of the ten House members on the Ought Not to Pass. We've sat through the committee hearings and listened to several bills. If the committee process works and we've taken the time, we being the whole committee which is aptly and very competently run by the Senate Chair, unless there is a compelling reason, I really think you ought to honor a bi-partisan report and the fact that three Senators are on this. Thank you.

**THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM:** The Chair recognizes the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Sherman.

Senator **SHERMAN:** Thank you Madame President. Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, five points, if I can make these without being too lengthy. I would note that in the Civil War times and after that they only met every other year for a short period of time. In my lifetime, and yours too, they used to have the Executive Council, I believe, the Governor's Executive Council, that handled this short session. We've morphed into something else. I believe firmly that there are things we could do. One of them is to limit the number of bills. There are states that do that. Three thousand bills becomes a mess. There is a gentleman who is moving to Florida now to work down there with the initials of TB and I asked him what Florida was like. If you go on-line, 60 days, in and out. They move to Tallahassee and do their business. The trick is that the committees themselves, the committee Chairs, look at the bills and then they decide what they are going to have for bills that are of significance. You have a screening process that I think we could go through. I know what people think, but I am not sure whoopie pies would be on one of my bills, frankly. Sorry to the other Body. There are other things that need to be done. It seems to me that if we really wanted to become efficient that we could have a process by which we wouldn't deal with 3,000 bills and that we would deal with bills of substance that people have, in effect, in some way negotiated over before they show up. I won't go into the other states that have looked at this, but there are other states that have something similar to that. I've talked to a member of the other Body, who shall remain nameless. In some states the committees, if you want to bring a bill out, you have to have at least two people bring it out. We'll bring it out with one and I've done that too. It seems to me that if we wanted to do any changes in this Body that there are ways to do it without running around the countryside and asking if you want to vote or not vote on something. By the way, to talk about how far Aroostook is, I can go on Interstate 95 at 75 miles per hour and beat Ron Collins to Augusta fairly easily, so I thank you for that, passing that bill.

**THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM:** The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington, Senator Raye.

Senator **RAYE:** Thank you Madame President. I rise as a rural legislator. I have 62 towns and townships, separate voting

precincts, in my district which covers parts of three counties. It runs from Franklin to Danforth. To the Senator from York, Senator Sullivan, you'd be welcome to come with me as well on that trip. My constituents, rural constituents, frequently ask me why Maine has such a large legislature. Neither geography nor population, if you look at legislatures across this country, warrant Maine having such a large legislature. I would point out that the Maine Constitution already allows the size of this Body to be reduced to 33 or even to 31 and at various points throughout history we have had a 33 or a 31 member Senate. I believe that this is a reasonable bill. It is not an anti-rural bill because we who live in rural Maine will still have one person and one vote. It will still be proportionate. I just wanted to rise and somewhat respond to the good Senator from Penobscot, Senator Schneider, who said that it may be a matter of people who have nice little compact districts like a neighborhood in Portland or a few towns. I rise as someone who, for the past seven years, has represented 62 towns and townships covering the entirety of Washington County and portions of Hancock and Penobscot. I can tell you that it is doable. It is doable and I believe that this is a cost effective, commonsense, reform that the people all across Maine, whether they be urban or rural, would embrace. I think we should at least give them the opportunity to do so.

---

Off Record Remarks

---

**THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM:** The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Katz.

Senator **KATZ:** Thank you Madame President. Men and women of the Senate, again, briefly. I knocked on a lot of doors this Fall and this is one of the things I asked people about. I probably asked this question of literally thousands of people. I can't remember a single person I spoke with who didn't think it was a good idea to at least put this out to the voters once I told them we had the sixth largest House in the entire United States. I can't speak for other districts but I would suspect it would be similar there. We represent now the equivalent of about four and a half House Districts in the Senate now, each of us. I know it's a struggle for us to do a decent job to represent our constituents and it's long hours and it's weekends, but I think we're doing a pretty good job of it. That's four and a half House Districts. This bill is so modest in its reduction in the size of the House. Each House member would only have about one-seventh additional people. Given the workload we have and how we are able to do it, does anybody seriously think that members of the House won't be able to effectively serve one-seventh more people? Again, the financial savings are significant; hundreds of thousands of dollars over a biennium. Again, we should be tightening our own belts before we ask anyone else to tighten theirs. Thank you, Madame President.

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

Senator **COLLINS:** Thank you Madame President. Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, probably most of you know but for some who don't know, I served in the House for four terms. As you

recall, I was termed out. I took four years off and came back into the Senate. I was reelected to serve in this Body. In those interim four years technology has advanced considerably as far as communication. I have to tell you, and I guess I don't have to tell you because you already know, that people, with the speed of communication, contact their Representatives and Senators on a very frequent basis. During that four year span of when I was here last and when I came back I've seen a huge increase in communications between our constituency and we who serve in the Maine legislature. They demand, and rightly so, a quick response. They want to know the answer to a question. They want to know our opinion, how we're going to vote. To reduce the size of the other Body now, I think, would be a mistake. The demands on us, as legislators, have increased dramatically, in my opinion. It's an important job, a job that requires constant communication with our constituency back home. As time evolves it will get worse, if that is the correct word. It creates an environment where to reduce the size of the other Body, in my humble opinion, would be a drastic mistake. The numbers should stay the same as they are today, increasing the opportunities for communication with our constituency back home. I'll be voting in favor of the current motion and I would hope you would do the same. Thank you.

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

Senator **GOODALL:** Thank you Madame President. Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, I rise today to join with the good Senator from Kennebec, Senator Katz, and the good Senate President from Washington County to just state that it's time that we improve the process by which we operate and become more efficient. I am somewhat disappointed that we're not going further in regards to touching on many of the different aspects of how we operate, potentially when we operate as well as recognizing the changing lives of professionals in this state and how that directly relates to a citizen legislature. In addition to that, I think we also have to look at ourselves. Obviously this bill does not include the Senate. As the good Senate President said, this can be done through a separate statutory action, not requiring a Constitutional Amendment. This really is not a partisan issue. That's not why I rose. I, too, just heard over and over again from my constituents that this is an issue that they would like to see forwarded to them to allow them to vote on it. With the improvements of technology I believe that we can adequately address the concerns of our constituents on a daily basis and communicate with them whether it's electronically as well as in person. There may be more challenges but at the same time I think it's time to save money in the long run and make this a more efficient process. Thank you.

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

Senator **SAVIELLO:** Thank you Madame President. As a Senator from a rural district that literally goes from the Canadian border to Augusta, I won't stand here either and count the names I have but I will tell you that many of them do not have names. They have numbers. I am someone who represented a district that had six towns and it used to take me over an hour and a half to drive around it in the event that I drove the speed limit it took that long, if I took advantage of my blue plates it was a lot less. As I was out on the campaign trail I clearly heard that we need to

reduce the size of the legislature. I will be voting against this proposal and asking for us to reduce the size of the House. Thank you.

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

Senator **DILL:** Thank you Madame President. Men and women of the Senate, for those of you who are afflicted with New Hampshire envy, I would just point out that New Hampshire has 424 legislators, 24 of them being Senators. It's been that way for 216 years. I am going to be voting to accept the Majority Ought Not to Pass report because I believe that if we are going to do something we should do something that pertains to both the House and the Senate. I respect the committee process with respect to this issue. Thank you.

---

Off Record Remarks

---

**THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM:** The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator McCormick.

Senator **McCORMICK:** Thank you Madame President. Men and women of the Senate, I rise today in opposition to the pending motion for some of the very reasons we've heard from other Senators today. Clearly the people communicate to me that they would like to see us reduce the size and so putting it out for them to validate is certainly worthwhile. Means of communication is certainly another factor and we all hear from many people every day. I know that. I would like to offer a comment on the other good Senator from Kennebec, Senator Katz's remarks when he was referring to the 1840's. While he is correct, the size of the legislature has remained static, the population has not. We currently, each legislator, represent about three times as many people as those legislators in the 1840's. Thank you, Madame President.

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

Senator **DIAMOND:** Thank you Madame President. Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, the time has come to reduce the size of the House. The time has come to reduce the size of the Senate. When I was honored to be the Chief Election Official of the State I had the opportunity to travel around from top to bottom and from east to west and have seen all of the various large and small electoral districts and the units, the select-people, the counselors, and all those units and how well they work together. I think that is the base of who we represent. It's the base of our contacts. As people have said, the technology and the communication we have today is really unbelievable. I've been Skyped, I've been Facebooked, I've been Twittered, and I even got a letter yesterday in the mail. All from constituents who have, and will continue, communicated their concerns to me. I think the time has come. I think we should take this seriously. As has been mentioned by the President, this Body can change without a Constitutional Amendment. We can change this down to 31 if we'd like. We can do that at the reapportionment time, which is

coming right up, or maybe even next year. Everything is coming together. We can reduce the House, we can reduce the Senate. Ladies and gentlemen, it's time to do that. Thank you very much.

**THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM:** The Chair recognizes the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Jackson.

Senator **JACKSON:** Thank you Madame President. Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, I have been waiting a while to speak and I'm glad I had a chance to go after my good friend, the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Diamond. I know that the good Senator knows how far my house is, how far my district is, because he visited me this past Summer. He knows how long it is and how rural it is. I also know that he knows that his cell phone didn't work while he was there. You are not Skyping very well there. I never actually knew how many towns I represented. I knew I represented a lot and I actually counted them. I'm a little bit ashamed to say I only represent 39. I have, like the good Senator from Franklin, Senator Saviello, a lot of places that are numbers. Township 17 and things like that. It is an expansive district. To get from one end of it to another I have to use three different highways. I have to go down one, up another one, and then back down another one. I tell you, picking up signs after the election takes a long time because you just can't get from one end to the other on one highway. All the comments about people saying that we needed to reduce the legislature, I'm sure there are people in my district that feel that way but I can't think of very many. I did hear a lot of people that said, on both sides, that we are making \$170,000 a year like the U.S. Senate. When you explain to them what we are actually getting they are quite shocked. I have people that say that we should be making more or whatever. I'm actually happy with whatever it is. I think that there are a lot of things that we could do that would save money. I'd rather sit down with this type of thing and maybe put this out, but besides that put out maybe to see if the voters would like us to go to four year terms. That would save a lot more money than this proposal does. I think it saves a couple of million dollars. One thing I do hear a lot from people in my district is that they feel like we are campaigning all the time. That would cut a couple of elections out. People are always complaining about the mailings, the advertisements, and things like that. I think there are a lot of different things that we could do that would save money and help us become more efficient than this actual bill would. I would defer to the senior Senator from Aroostook, Senator Sherman, but I think our two districts, when we compare other states to Maine, it's not apples and oranges. I think Connecticut and Rhode Island both fit into our two districts. You've got to take into account how big a state Maine is. It just doesn't compare in a lot of regards to some of those other states. I actually get more people that are asking me things. They have become more and more accessible. It's very, very hard. I got a call on the way down. I got here around midnight Sunday night. On the way down I got a call from a school board member that wanted to know if I could be in St. Francis on Wednesday night. I had to tell him there was just no way I could do that. There are rural districts and then there are really rural districts. I think that for some of those House members it's going to hurt the constituents in those districts and I see that come to the Senate eventually. I just don't think, for the most part, it's good for the voters and the people in this state.

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

Senator **SCHNEIDER**: Thank you Madame President. Men and women of the Senate, I wonder how many times you have gone around your Senate District and people have said to you, "How's Congress?" or "Say such and such when you go back to D.C." and "Gee, I wish you would stop giving yourselves raises from \$140,000 up every year." There are a lot of people who make a lot of statements about the work that we do just because they don't know what we do here. There are plenty of people who have mentioned this issue. As I've said I'm neither here nor there on this particular issue since basically we're talking to ourselves about this issue, which is nice. It sounds good. We want to be efficient and we want to cut costs even though it failed in the other Body. What I'm saying is it sounds awfully good. I'm just wondering what we've really done if we're really serious about becoming more efficient and if we're really serious about cutting costs and tightening our belts? Why are we using a little sort of dart board and shooting at it and saying this is the way to reduce the House by X number of seats? We haven't really done a thorough examination of this issue. I can bet if we went to a four year term and if we made it so you could only put bills in on the first, or let's say the second, year for example, and emergency bills only the first and third and forth years, and in addition we could only have one budget that we would have supplementals for, and we actually be able to learn the budget the first year so we would really know what we're doing and we could figure out this bureaucracy better, I bet we could save some money. If we are looking for efficiencies why are we shooting in the dark and deciding this is what we should send out to the people? I'm not in opposition to this so much, but it just seems to me this is not the most thoughtful approach. If we're really serious about this, rather than putting something on the record that sounds good because we're tightening our belt and becoming more efficient or that's what we're supporting, maybe we should really put some effort behind this and really look at this more carefully, at all the different things we could do. We talk about being business friendly. One of the biggest complaints I have from businesses is that we keep changing the laws and that they can deal with the laws that we have if they just stayed the same. If we're really serious about becoming a efficient legislature and an efficient government let's look at that. Anyways, I just think that there are a lot of misunderstandings about what we do here and about maybe the best way that we can get to make our government a better government. I think we should look at this and really be serious about it. Thank you very much.

**THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM**: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Craven.

Senator **Craven**: Thank you Madame President. Men and women of the Senate, I come from the tiniest Senate District in the entire state of Maine. I represent one town. I wouldn't dare go back to my one town and say that I voted against reducing the legislature. When we talk about efficiency, democracy was not designed to be efficient. It never will be efficient if it's a real democracy. At the same time I am going to vote to reduce the legislature, not because it's a good idea, and I do sympathize with people who represent rural districts, but because my district would never forgive me if I didn't. Thank you, Madame President.

The Chair noted the absence of the Senator from York, Senator **HOBBS** and further excused the same Senator from this Roll Call vote.

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

The Doorkeepers secured the Chamber.

The Secretary opened the vote.

**ROLL CALL (#97)**

**YEAS:** Senators: BRANNIGAN, COLLINS, DILL, GERZOFKY, HILL, JACKSON, MASON, ROSEN, SCHNEIDER, SHERMAN, SULLIVAN, THOMAS, WHITTEMORE

**NAYS:** Senators: ALFOND, BARTLETT, COURTNEY, CRAVEN, DIAMOND, FARNHAM, GOODALL, HASTINGS, KATZ, LANGLEY, MARTIN, MCCORMICK, PATRICK, RAYE, RECTOR, SAVIELLO, SNOWE-MELLO, THIBODEAU, TRAHAN, WOODBURY, THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM - DEBRA D. PLOWMAN

**EXCUSED:** Senator: HOBBS

13 Senators having voted in the affirmative and 21 Senators having voted in the negative, with 1 Senator being excused, the motion by Senator **THOMAS** of Somerset to **ACCEPT** the Majority **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report, in concurrence, **FAILED**.

The Minority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report **ACCEPTED**, in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

**READ ONCE.**

Committee Amendment "A" (H-198) **READ** and **ADOPTED**.

**ASSIGNED FOR SECOND READING NEXT LEGISLATIVE DAY.**

**Divided Report**

The Majority of the Committee on **STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT** on **RESOLUTION**, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of Maine To Require a Two-thirds Vote To Approve the Issuance of a Bond or Security by the Maine Governmental Facilities Authority

H.P. 728 L.D. 984

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