

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

OF THE

One Hundred And Seventeenth Legislature

OF THE

State Of Maine

VOLUME III

FIRST REGULAR SESSION

Senate

December 7, 1994 to April 27, 1995

THE PRESIDENT: The pending question before the Senate is the motion by Senator HANLEY of Oxford to ACCEPT the Report "A" - OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-88).

A Division has been requested.

Will all those in favor please rise in their places and remain standing until counted.

Will all those opposed please rise in their places and remain standing until counted.

18 Senators having voted in the affirmative and 9 Senators having voted in the negative, the motion by Senator HANLEY of Oxford to ACCEPT Report "A" - OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-88), PREVAILED.

The Bill READ ONCE.

Committee Amendment "A" (S-88) READ and ADOPTED.

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

Off Record Remarks

On motion by Senator PARADIS of Aroostook, RECESSED until the sound of the bell.

After recess

Senate called to order by the President.

Off Record Remarks

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

COMMITTEE REPORTS

House

Ought to Pass As Amended

The Committee on LABOR on Bill "An Act to Amend the Workers' Compensation Board's Annual Assessment" (Emergency)

H.P. 695 L.D. 953

Reported that the same Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-148).

Comes from the House with the Report READ and ACCEPTED and the Bill PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-148).

Which Report was READ and ACCEPTED, in concurrence.

The Bill READ ONCE.

Committee Amendment "A" (H-148) READ and ADOPTED, in concurrence.

Under suspension of the Rules, READ A SECOND TIME and PASSED TO BE ENROSSED, As Amended, in concurrence.

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

Divided Report

Eight Members of the Committee on TRANSPORTATION on Bill "An Act to Require All Persons to Use Safety Belts in Motor Vehicles"

S.P. 77 L.D. 165

Reported in Report "A" that the same Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-91).

Signed:

Senators:

STEVENS, JR. of Androscoggin
PARADIS of Aroostook

Representatives:

O'GARA of Westbrook
BOUFFARD of Lewiston
DRISCOLL of Calais
LINDAHL of Northport
CHARTRAND of Rockland
FARNUM of South Berwick

Two Members of the same Committee on the same subject reported in Report "B" that the same Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "B" (S-92).

Signed:

Representatives:

BAILEY of Township 27
HEINO of Boothbay

Three Members of the same Committee on the same subject reported in Report "C" that the same Ought Not to Pass.

Signed:

Senator:
CASSIDY of Washington

Representatives:
RICKER of Lewiston
STROUT of Corinth

Which Reports were READ.

Senator STEVENS of Androscoggin moved that the Senate ACCEPT the Report "A" - OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-91).

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oxford, Senator Hanley.

Senator HANLEY: Thank you Mr. President, Men and Women of the Senate. I would urge you to vote against the ought to pass as amended report so that we can go on to accept Report "C", ought not to pass.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Lincoln, Senator Begley.

Senator BEGLEY: Thank you Mr. President. I would concur with the gentleman who just recommended that you go with the ought not to pass report. The argument goes on and on and on. The bill before you, on the ought to pass report, simply makes a piece of legislation that forces us to do a certain thing because some people say that that is what should be done, when actually, if you wanted to have the impact on the wearing of seatbelts, you would go the route of insurance. You would go to the insurance people or to the people who say "I'm not going to wear my seatbelt" and say "Fine, then your insurance company will handle it in such a fashion." To do it otherwise is, once again, to take away from anyone who is, hopefully, mature enough to make a decision on how he wishes to live. You could quote statistics until they come out your ears. We received enough of them. We have seen all of the monetary problems because of this and I could quote you other problems in other areas that you haven't touched, but you are certainly going to somewhere along the line. "The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of government power", Woodrow Wilson. From a gentleman somewhere in the State, "Society works when the people of that society decide to limit their own freedoms with regard to their actions toward others. It is a form of overkill to extend that limit to outlaw stupidity. Taken to the limit, helmet and seatbelt laws should be coupled with laws against smoking, laws against unprotected sex, laws against going out in the summer sun without a hat or number 30 sunblock, and a law against going bird watching in the woods on any weekday in November. Will those come if we pass seatbelts? There is no way to tell. Will the next item of our freedom of choice come strictly from the point of view that we know better, or some of us know better, than you? If the premise

for this is medical costs saved, then the logical extension of this thinking, leads to consequences freedom cannot afford. Will all bicycles become tricycles? Because bicycles tip over. Will you be forced to take on any number of things? Will those who like to skate with the new skates be forced to use crutches on the side so they won't fall? Because they are ending up in hospitals. Skiers look out, you may have all kinds of marvelous cages that you can come down a slope in that is no steeper than five degrees. You could go on and on. A manufacturer of couches, because you who are couch potatoes, may find that that manufacturer, in some future legislature, will say that you will have an automatic ejection seat after thirty minutes, and you will have to come up into an upright position." Now that is absurd, absolutely. From my standpoint, I wear seatbelts, my family does, and I believe strongly in the point of view that I should make that choice myself. You can give me all of the statistics you want, my point is that I am mature, at least I think so, and therefore I should be given the right, and I would like to give the right to anybody else. Put it back in the insurance company. Put it back where it is going to make a difference to the person who decides not to, and let him decide. If you listen closely enough, Ladies and Gentlemen, the echo in this room has said, on any number of occasions, pro-choice, give me the right to choose. People will tell you that is a different issue. Choice is choice. My recommendation is to accept the ought not to pass report.

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

Senator PENDEXTER: Thank you Mr. President, Men and Women of the Senate. Yes, we do go on and on and on about seat belt legislation. This is my third debate on the issue, and you know the personal freedom, getting government out of my life, is basically the age-old argument that we keep hearing over and over and over. That is the only thing that opponents of this legislation can say, this is my personal freedom, keep government out of my life. We have been having states enact seat belt laws since 1978 in this country. We have all kinds of experiences we can look at. It all boils down to me, it is very easy, being a health professional, it is all about highway safety, it is all about saving lives, it is all about preventing serious life-altering injuries. You know, people feel their motor vehicles are their castles. You buy your car and it is yours and what you do in there should be your own business. I agree with that as long as it is on your private property. I don't care what you do in your motor vehicle, but the minute you put that vehicle on a public highway it becomes a public act. I feel state government is certainly within its purview to legislate safety on the highway. It certainly is within government's role to mandate that you use a piece of safety equipment in your motor vehicle. Driving is not a right, it is a privilege that is granted to you by the Secretary of State. We ask all kinds of behavioral things of you on the highway. We ask that you be licensed, we ask that you only travel certain speeds in certain areas, we ask that you don't drink and drive, we ask that you safely inspect, you have to have a sticker and you have to register your vehicle. We go on and on and

on. This is nothing new, passing a piece of legislation so that our highways are safer. So mandating seatbelt usage is really a safety issue. We are just asking people to use a piece of equipment that is in their motor vehicle that they have bought, and is sitting there. We are just asking you to use it. What is so awful about that? If you ride on the waters we ask you to wear a lifejacket. If you are out in the woods we ask you to wear blaze orange. So, if you are on the highway we ask you to put on your seatbelt. As we are getting newer and newer models on our highways, the issue of airbags comes up, which makes the use of seatbelts even more important, because if you have an airbag deploy, and you are not sitting where you are supposed to be sitting, which is safely and securely in your seat, you can sustain very serious injuries from your airbag deploying. I don't know if you have ever had the experience of that happening to you, but it comes at you with a very, very powerful force, and at a high velocity. If you are not where you are supposed to be, which is what your seatbelt will do for you, you will sustain, probably, some very serious injuries. So, I think that is one other issue for you to think about as we are all purchasing vehicles now that have airbags. It is very important that you wear your seatbelt with your airbag.

I would challenge the Senator from Lincoln, when he is sitting in an airplane and he is told that he has to put on his seatbelt. It almost kind of amuses me because the attendants really take this very seriously. They go around and if you're not wearing your seatbelt you better put it on because it is a federal regulation. Your seatbelt in your airplane will only help you when you are taxiing on the runway or when you hit turbulence in the air. God help you if you are in an air crash, your seatbelt isn't going to do you any good. Yet, when you look at all of the effort that they put in, explaining to you how to take it on and off. I would venture to say that none of you, who are going to vote against this bill, stand up and stomp your feet and say "This is my personal right, I don't want to put this belt on and I am not going to." I bet that you have all sat there and done what you have been told to do, which is to put your belt on, because it is a safety issue. It is a safety standard that our federal government feels is important. You all do it. I would venture to say that when you travel in states that have seatbelt laws I bet some of you do put it on. You can talk about choice all you want to, you still have the choice to not wear your belt, but you are going to pay a price for it if you get caught not wearing it. That is an adult choice in this difficult world of choices. So, even though we have a law, and you are saying, "Gee, you're advocating that we break the law", well that is your decision. If you really feel strongly about not wearing your belt, you don't have to wear it, you can still have that choice. It's all about developing the habit of buckling up, and you know, only 35% of the people in our state wear seatbelts. Men and Women of the Senate, that is the worst usage rate in our nation. The average rate is around 50%. What is even worse is that 85% of our fatalities were not wearing their belts. Some of you say education, that is what it should be all about. Yes, you are right, to a point. We have to have education. However, education only gets you so far. I have been involved

in this issue since the early eighties. At that point we had a 20% usage rate, then we went up to 32%. We have been stuck at 35% forever because that is all we can get in this State with education. We might look at our neighbor, New Hampshire, who has a higher usage rate than we do, but they have been stuck at 50% for five years with education. If this is all about getting people to develop the habit of buckling up, unfortunately, human nature being what it is, we need to couple education with legislation with enforcement. If you look at one of our neighboring states in New England, Connecticut, with very aggressive, excellent seatbelt law, with good enforcement, they have an 80% usage rate. That's what it is all about. It is getting people to wear their seatbelts.

People talk about let's use the insurance issue. Well, I don't quite understand it, because if you have a car crash, your insurance company is going to have to pay you for damages. So, I don't understand where the savings are. If you have a health care need, we are not going to deny you health insurance, so I really don't understand what people mean when they say let's let the insurance company take of it and if they don't wear their belt then they won't be covered. When you really think it through I don't see any logic because, number one, you are going to suffer damages in your vehicle, and your insurance company is going to pay you for that, and nobody is going to deny you health care. So, okay we don't pay it. You don't pay in and then we all bear the cost anyway. But, where the insurance company does come in, as they evaluate their rates on an annual basis, if there obviously is less injuries and less fatalities that they have to account for, that would automatically be reflected in the rate-setting process that they go through. So, you automatically get a benefit anyway because it will happen through the Bureau of Insurance when they look at insurance companies experience rates, when looking at how much they are going to charge us. People say this is unpopular with their constituents, I can't vote for this, everybody tells me that this is very unpopular. I served on the seatbelt coalition in the mid to late eighties, and we did a telephone survey back then, and as an authentic, scientific survey which showed that 75% of the people in this state agree with seatbelt legislation. Ninety-nine of our nation lives under seatbelt laws. There are only two states left, Maine and New Hampshire. If it is such an un-American thing to do I wonder how come 99% of our population lives under such legislation. I don't see people having revolutions because they have seatbelt laws because what happens in the end is most people know they should wear their belt, and they know that they will get some benefits from it. It is just a matter of some people are waiting, if we pass this seatbelt law today and it gets enacted tomorrow, we get an automatic 20% increase in our usage rate. That's human behavior Men and Women of the Senate. You don't do things until to have to have to do them. I would say that there are 20% of the people out there waiting for us to tell them to wear their belts. That's been substantiated in all of the 48 states who have seatbelt laws.

People who argue that it is their personal right and say that it only affects me and that it is only my problem, I would ask you to look at this green

handout, which talks about the health care costs. Yes, we could throw numbers at you, and we can quote all kinds of statistics, but you cannot argue the fact that people who don't wear their belts incur higher health costs. In some cases it is seven times greater. We all pay that cost. So the argument that it only affects me and it is my decision, I don't think is valid. So, I strongly urge you to support the pending motion, in the name of highway safety. Mr. President, when the vote is taken, I request the yeas and nays.

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

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Penobscot, Senator O'Dea.

Senator **O'DEA:** Thank you very much Mr. President, Men and Women of the Senate. This is my fourth term in the Maine Legislature and, I think, the fourth time that I have seen this bill. Every time I speak on this bill I remind the body that from my perspective, however jaded, that seatbelts are a good idea. It is a good thing to wear a seatbelt. Seatbelts do reduce the cost of injury. I don't think there is anybody here who would dispute that. I think back to the two times that I was a passenger in a motor vehicle, that I wound up hanging from my seatbelt, upside down, once in a field and once in a ditch, and unbuckled myself and dropped to the roof, in fine condition because of the seatbelt, no doubt. I am grateful that I had the foresight to put it on. But, at the same time I look at my responsibility as a representative of the people back in my district, and I think about the campaign that we went through and I think about a lot of the rhetoric that we hear coming out of Washington about the need to get government out of our lives, and to have government get out of managing the minutia of our day-to-day lives. I guess the issue today shouldn't be whether or not we think seatbelts are a good idea, or whether or not they save money, because clearly they are a good idea, and clearly they do save health care dollars. The real issue is, at what point do we say no, that government isn't going to manage every aspect of our life and yes, you are going to have to take some responsibility for your own actions.

I listened to my friend, Senator Begley, read off a litany of things this afternoon that he could see possibly being regulated ad nauseam. Things that are risky, things that we choose to do, and things where there might be a certain economic benefit to regulating, but that we don't regulate because it is abhorrent to us. I was pleased to hear my friend, Senator Begley, say that he was pro-choice today. Then I started thinking about some of my liberal friends in this Chamber, who profess to be pro-choice on abortion, who are not pro-choice on seatbelts, who are, in fact, anti-choice on seatbelts, and I wonder what is going on there. But, I'm not going to lose much sleep over that. I want to talk about something a little more serious. I received a mailing this winter from a gentleman down in Washington, he is the Administrator of the NHTSA, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, and he sent me this nice mailing and a nice fact sheet about seatbelt laws. These are the things he was talking about. Make

seatbelt laws subject to primary enforcement. What that means is if you are driving down the road, and an officer sees you driving down the road without a seatbelt, the officer can pull you over and issue you a summons. That's not what this bill is about, in fact, if somebody wanted to challenge it, and the President might even rule me out of order for discussing this, but I'm concerned about the slippery slope that we are going down. I read this from this gentleman in Washington, and I read things like this, "In attitude surveys, officers consistently preferred primary laws and report that secondary enforcement laws", as is being proposed here, "is a major deterrent to issuing citations." I think about some of the other things here on the back, about the level of fines and how the fines in some states aren't adequate to insure a high enough level of compliance. It goes on and on and on, and I think to myself about this poor Administrator in Washington D.C. who can send me paper until the cows come home, who I will never believe that it is his business to tell my constituents to wear their seatbelts, and to encourage state legislatures across the land to raise their fines and to make violations of law subject to primary enforcement that results in our constituents being harrassed, ad nauseam, by law enforcement officers, who probably have better things to do with their time. I don't think that just because 99% of the people in this country live under laws like that, that we should necessarily subject our constituents to it.

There have been some other issues raised in this chamber today. I think the Senator from Cumberland made some good points, about airbags for instance. I had an airbag deployed against me in this chamber, and I didn't have my seatbelt on in my chair, this was in a recent debate, I survived. I guess if we wanted to be consistent we would have an amendment to this bill to require seatbelts to be worn in the Chamber. Then I thought about the aircraft reference, and what was going on on airplanes, when we are forced to wear our seatbelts. With all due respect, the reason that law is there is not to prevent me from being hurt in my chair, it is to prevent me from being a hazard to other passengers on the aircraft if the aircraft encounters turbulence or has a problem on the ground. That is the same reason why your suitcase has to be in the overhead storage bin or stored in the belly of the plane. It's not because they care about your suitcase, because that certainly is not the case, but because they don't want it bouncing around inside the cabin and going through some persons head. That's why that is there. I guess if we look around this land we can't see any revolution that was caused by seatbelt laws, but I think back to the experience that the State of Massachusetts had, when their benevolent legislature passed this law some years ago. The citizens, through a citizen's initiated referendum, repealed the law, and the legislature went back again and enacted the law, and the citizens went back again and repealed it. I wonder where it will end.

For me, this is another unconscionable step towards micromanaging every aspect of our lives. I suppose, yes, I will be truly consistent. I will be ready to vote for a seatbelt law the day that unbelted passengers in motor vehicles, flying through windows, pose a hazard to pedestrians on sidewalks

and other motorists. But until that day comes I will try to keep the government out of the inside of our cars. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Paradis.

Senator **PARADIS:** Thank you very much Mr. President, Men and Women of the Senate. I get such a kick whenever I hear, and I have to start with this and then I will go on to my other remarks, but when I hear about the involvement of government in our lives. I think it was in the early seventies when we stopped using missionaries to run our school systems in Aroostook County, and our hospitals. Our hospitals went a lot later than that. Our roads have seen very, very few government people doing something to improve them. So, if some of you really want to be free from government please, please move immediately to Aroostook County, and I can assure you that you will have to go years, possibly, without seeing any people from the government. Aroostook County has one of the highest cancer rates in the nation. It has one of the highest MS rates in the nation. We're not sure why. We have had a few research people come up and check around a little bit, but we have no money to buy the services of somebody who can tell us what is causing our people to be dying so young and so badly with multiple cancers. I just had a friend who was in his early fifties, the diagnosis came two weeks ago and he died Monday. In Frenchville we have 900 people, we lose 900 people in ten years because of people not wearing seatbelts. If we lost that many people in the community we would try to find out the reason why that was happening. We know why it is happening, and we know what is causing it. I have fifty communities in my district. I visited most of them. I did door-to-door from July to November and I can assure you that never once did somebody bring up the seatbelt or the restriction of rights. We always talked about issues, when can we get these roads fixed, very specific things, but always the greater good of the area. People are very unselfish in my district. We know that if one of us survives we all survive and we have had to do it that way. I just don't know who these people are who are always so concerned about their rights. Because of the bad roads we have a high rate of accidents and very serious accidents. I have a constituent over across the river, at Togus, right now, who met a truck head-on on the ice. Because he was belted in he just had his legs crushed and that is coming along, but he is in a federal institution and guess who is picking up the price for that little accident? My nightmare has been, and for all the years that we have been discussing this, is when we are going to be taking from the healthy people in this state to pay for the sicker people in this state, especially when we know what the cause is. That's what is happening. When I read a headline recently that one of the ways that we are going to be able to pay for the sick tax was to take it from education because that is 52% of the budget. This morning we had thirty or forty or fifty young women in the room. We had them raise their hands on what they thought of this and every one but one child lifted her hand. They want to keep their parents safe, they want to keep their grandparents, their brothers and sisters. They are so close to it, like we are close to it. We are so good about what

we do. Senator Abromson has company today, a gentleman from Portland who has been shadowing him, and he marvels at the amount of work and the tenacity that is required for us to do the job that we do. We do a good job, we stay long and late, we do our homework, we review the paperwork, and the Transportation Committee, once more, did all that. We went through an incredible amount of paperwork. All the statistics that people don't want to hear about, we forced ourselves to sit through. The most compelling was always the medical, the blood and the guts of it, and anybody in the room could not help but be touched by the overwhelming evidence of what we are doing to some of our state members. It is very little to ask. You have been very patient, you have been very attentive, and I have been appreciating that, and I urge your support for this legislation. Thank you very much.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Franklin, Senator Benoit.

Senator **BENOIT:** Thank you Mr. President. May it please the Senate. Some years ago I went off to Paris Island for Boot Camp in the Marine Corps. When I got there I soon learned that every minute of my day was planned for me. I was told when to eat, and when to sleep, when to shave, when to shower, when to do this, and yes, when to do that. I was government property. I live with that and I expect it. Then, following my stint in the service I got an honorable discharge which said I am no longer government property. I am allowed now to exercise my own decisions, the government will not be telling me what to do every minute of the day. Now, along comes a piece of legislation like this, which wants to put government in my vehicle as I drive down the road. I'm starting to feel again like a piece of government property. Now, as to the statistics on medical expenses, if you want to save some money, vote against cigarette smoking. Thank you Mr. President.

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

Senator **PENDEXTER:** Thank you Mr. President, Men and Women of the Senate. I rise just to correct two very incorrect statements that the Senator from Penobscot, Senator O'Dea, made. First of all, this legislation is primary enforcement because all it does is, we already have seatbelt legislation for children up to eighteen, all this does is change the age. We presently have a primary enforcement law. Secondly, yes, Massachusetts passed and repealed and enacted, but in their November referendum they did pass their seatbelt legislation. As a matter of fact there were five states who had referendums on seatbelts this last November, and all five prevailed, which now leaves only two states, Maine and New Hampshire. I just wanted to correct that. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: The pending question before the Senate is the motion by Senator STEVENS of Androscoggin to ACCEPT Report "A" - OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-91).

A vote of Yes will be in favor of acceptance.

A vote of No will be opposed.

Is the Senate ready for the question?

The Doorkeepers will secure the Chamber.

The Secretary will call the Roll.

ROLL CALL

YEAS: Senators: ABROMSON, AMERO, BUSTIN, CAREY, CIANCHETTE, CLEVELAND, ESTY, FAIRCLOTH, HARRIMAN, LAWRENCE, LONGLEY, McCORMICK, MILLS, PARADIS, PENDEXTER, PINGREE, RAND, RUHLIN, STEVENS

NAYS: Senators: BEGLEY, BENOIT, CARPENTER, CASSIDY, FERGUSON, HALL, HANLEY, HATHAWAY, KIEFFER, LORD, MICHAUD, O'DEA, SMALL, and the PRESIDENT, Senator BUTLAND

EXCUSED: Senators: BERUBE, GOLDTHWAIT

19 Senators having voted in the affirmative and 14 Senators having voted in the negative, with 2 Senators having been excused, the motion by Senator STEVENS of Androscoggin to ACCEPT Report "A" - OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-91), PREVAILED.

The Bill READ ONCE.

Committee Amendment "A" (S-91) READ and ADOPTED.

The Bill, as Amended, TOMORROW ASSIGNED FOR SECOND READING.

Senate at Ease

Senate called to order by the President.

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

PAPERS FROM THE HOUSE

House Papers

Bill "An Act to Make Additional Appropriations and Allocations for the Expenditures of State Government for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1995" (Emergency) (GOVERNOR'S BILL)

H.P. 1001 L.D. 1412

Reference to the Committee on APPROPRIATIONS AND FINANCIAL AFFAIRS suggested and ORDERED PRINTED.

Comes from the House, under suspension of the Rules, PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED, without reference to a Committee.

Which was, under suspension of the Rules, READ TWICE.

On motion by Senator CAREY of Kennebec, Senate Amendment "A" (S-93) READ.

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

Senator CAREY: Thank you Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This amendment does three things. It gives us a two-week period in which we can receive material, so that we will know what we are going to be voting on when we get into this three calendar day period. It also asks that the Senate President appoint two Senators, one from each political party, so that there will be no shutting out of either party, and that the task force, when it presents its report, doesn't only report to the State and Local Government Committee and to the Appropriations Committee, but that each and every member of the Legislature will get a copy of that monthly report so we, in fact, will be in better touch with what is happening. I would hope that this would receive the approval of the body.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oxford, Senator Hanley.

Senator HANLEY: Thank you Mr. President, Men and Women of the Senate. I will be voting against the amendment that is presented by the good Senator from Kennebec and would urge the rest of the members of the Senate to follow, as well. While I can appreciate the issues that the good Senator wants to address, I believe that most of them have already been addressed. It is my understanding that the presiding officers of both bodies have agreed to have representation from members of both this Chamber and the other Chamber. As far as the reports, it is also my understanding that the Governor has agreed to make those reports available to the entirety of the Legislature. As far as the final two weeks, it was a compromise of the Appropriations Committee, in a unanimous vote of the Appropriations Committee, to go with the language as drafted by the Democrats on the Committee. We were in agreement with that. We have made it a point to pass this without amendment, and I realize we may have further discussions on the length of time to enact, and I will save that for another time, but at this point in time I would urge this chamber to vote against the pending motion to accept the amendment.

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

Senator CAREY: In effect, what this does, it puts into the bill what the Governor has said that he would do, so that we would be insured that what he said he would do will be done.

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