

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-Third Legislature

State of Maine

Daily Edition

First Regular Session
December 6, 2006 to June 21, 2007

Pages 1 - 1266

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Unfinished Business

The following matters in the consideration of which the Senate was engaged at the time of Adjournment had preference in the Orders of the Day and continued with such preference until disposed of as provided by Senate Rule 516.

The Chair laid before the Senate the following Tabled and Later (3/6/07) Assigned matter:

Bill "An Act To Promote County-based Economic Development Efforts"

S.P. 324 L.D. 1007

Tabled - March 6, 2007, by Senator **SCHNEIDER** of Penobscot

Pending - motion by same Senator to **REFER** to the Committee on **STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT**

(Committee on **BUSINESS, RESEARCH AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT** suggested and ordered printed.)

(In Senate, March 6, 2007, on motion by Senator **SCHNEIDER** of Penobscot, **REFERRED** to the Committee on **STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT**. Subsequently, **RECONSIDERED**.)

Senator **SCHNEIDER** of Penobscot requested and received leave of the Senate to withdraw her motion to **REFER** to the Committee on **STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT**.

On further motion by same Senator, **REFERRED** to the Committees on **STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT** and **BUSINESS, RESEARCH AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**.

Sent down for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the Senate the following Tabled and Later (3/13/07) Assigned matter:

Bill "An Act To Assist Maine Pharmacies"

S.P. 450 L.D. 1287

Tabled - March 13, 2007, by Senator **SCHNEIDER** of Penobscot

Pending - **REFERENCE**

(Committee on **BUSINESS, RESEARCH AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT** suggested and ordered printed.)

On motion by Senator **SCHNEIDER** of Penobscot, **REFERRED** to the Committee on **HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**.

Sent down for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the Senate the following Tabled and Later (3/13/07) Assigned matter:

Bill "An Act To Protect against Discrimination in Housing"
S.P. 454 L.D. 1306

Tabled - March 13, 2007, by Senator **MARRACHÉ** of Kennebec

Pending - **REFERENCE**

(Committee on **LEGAL AND VETERANS AFFAIRS** suggested and ordered printed.)

On motion by Senator **MARRACHÉ** of Kennebec, **REFERRED** to the Committee on **LEGAL AND VETERANS AFFAIRS** and ordered printed.

Sent down for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the Senate the following Tabled and Later (3/13/07) Assigned matter:

SENATE REPORTS - from the Committee on **TRANSPORTATION** on Bill "An Act To Make Failure To Wear a Seat Belt a Primary Offense"

S.P. 22 L.D. 24

Majority - **Ought to Pass** (10 members)

Minority - **Ought Not to Pass** (3 members)

Tabled - March 13, 2007, by Senator **MARTIN** of Aroostook

Pending - motion by Senator **DAMON** of Hancock to **ACCEPT** the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS** Report (Roll Call Ordered)

(In Senate, March 13, 2007, Reports **READ**.)

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Knox, Senator Savage.

Senator **SAVAGE:** Thank you, Madame President, women and men of the Senate. I just want to say to you seat belts save lives. Remember that. Here are some statistics for you to think about. In the Bureau of Highway Safety survey over 300,000 Mainers are not buckling up. Maine seat belt usage is the third lowest in the nation. Wearing a safety belt reduces the chances of being killed or seriously injured by approximately 50%. This is the motor vehicle law that is not a primary offense. Currently drivers can be stopped for having a tail light out. They can be stopped for littering. Protecting lives with safety belts, you can't be stopped. If Maine were to enact a primary safety belt law we could expect to save approximately ten lives, 155 serious injuries, and \$33 million in costs each year. In 2006 150 people died on Maine highways while in motor vehicles. That's a lot of lives. Of these 150, 55 died from not wearing their safety belts. In 2006 only 13 of 46 young Mainers, 15 to 24 years old, that died in motor vehicle crashes were reported as wearing their safety belts, just 13 of the 46 crashes. I ask you to read in your daily newspaper the reports of accidents and see how many people, fatalities and serious injuries, were not buckled up. We need to do more to save these lives. Twenty-five states, the District of

Columbia, and Puerto Rico have primary enforcement laws. Twenty-four states have secondary laws; six of them, in addition to Maine, are considering primary seat belt legislation as of January 2007.

On the day of our public hearing Tom Judge, who is the Executive Director of LifeFlight, was waiting to testify on the bill when one of his critical care teams was called out and struggled in a vain effort to save the life of a young adult ejected from a motor vehicle crash near Jackman.

There were over 20 people representing many organizations, including an emergency room doctor and a trauma physician. I'm not even going to begin to read the testimony that we heard from these people. I'd like you to hear some of the remarks made by Dr. Mills and Lt. Chris Grotten. I'll read to you what Dr. Mills said. I quote, 'First, I agree with my colleagues that seat belt usage is a public safety and medical issue as they testified. However, it is also a public health issue. In 2005 more Mainers died from car crashes than HIV, meningitis, hepatitis, tuberculosis, skin cancer, cervical cancer, homicide, and snowmobile crashes combined. Car crashes are the leading cause of death amongst all causes of death among Maine's young people ages 15 to 35. Indeed, for those of us who are parents of children in this age group, our biggest fear is the phone ringing, giving us dreaded and tragic news of a car crash involving a child. Today, in Maine, we can expect 94 car crashes on our roads. Today, in Maine, we can expect three people to be rushed to the hospital after a crash and be seriously injured, to require hospitalization. Today or tomorrow we can expect one Mainer to die on our roads. That was on data from 2005 statistics. No person or community in Maine has escaped the emotional, physical, or financial toll these crashes extracted. The good news is most of this toll is preventable. The bill before you will save lives; 12 lives, 179 serious injuries, and save \$38 million.' I'd like to quote from Lt. Chris Grotten. He says, 'We tend to be injured and maimed and all too often knock on the darkened door of their loved ones late at night to deliver the news that will change their lives forever. While this is never easy, it is exponentially more frustrating when those injuries or deaths could have been prevented by simply using seat belts. The impact of this oversight is not limited to the victim, but includes family members, friends, and co-workers who are permanently impacted emotionally and financially in many ways by the consequences of not buckling up.'

I ask you to please save those people that could be injured or killed and vote for this bill. Thank you.

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

Senator **SCHNEIDER:** Thank you, Madame President, men and women of the Senate. I know that the Transportation Committee has heard very compelling testimony about the horrible injuries that come from automobile accidents and not wearing a seat belt. This is not just about a safety issue. This is about choice. This is about freedoms. This is about what America is supposed to be about, to me. I stand in opposition to this motion. I am concerned about the direction in which we chose to take ourselves and the message that it sends about our safety. I had a gentleman who put cameras all up around an island that he owned. He invited me to come and have my victory celebration on that island and I said, 'George, I will not come out to that island.' He said, 'Why not?' I said, 'Because you have cameras everywhere and I'm not interested in that.' He said, 'That's all

about safety. Would you rather have somebody come up behind you and grab you from behind or would you rather have a camera watch and somebody could help you?' I said, 'Let the person come at me from behind because I don't want my rights taken away. I don't want my liberties taken away. I would rather protect myself than to have Big Brother hanging over me, telling me what I can and cannot do.' This is much bigger of an issue to me than how many accidents occur. I'm in favor of safety. I'm in favor of promoting safety. I'm in favor of letting people know about the dangers of driving without their seat belts on, but it should be their choice. We're losing our rights here. This is about a choice. We're going further and further about protecting people. Soon when you go into have a Big Mac at McDonald's we'll slap you with a fine because you are 20 pounds overweight. Is this the direction that we're taking our country? In Britain if you stop at a stop light and have a cup of water a camera is looking at you and you are slapped with a huge fine. Is this the direction that we are going to go? Cameras are watching us from everywhere and all in the name of safety. I am telling you this is all in the name of safety. Our letters are being opened in the name of safety, in the name of protecting us. What are we protecting? The things that we value most, our freedoms and our choices. I remind this Body not to be hypocritical. We have helmet laws come before us and I implore any of you who voted in favor last biennium of the Ought Not to Pass on helmet laws for motorcycles and so on that you think again about why you did that and that you consider before you make your mind up on this bill about choice. Yes, there are costs involved. There is no question about it, but there are other ways of convincing people that the best way to deal with this issue is by giving the freedom of choice but educating them. I implore you to go with the educating way rather than making this a primary offense. This is a very slippery slope we are taking ourselves in. We say we want our freedoms. We say this country is free. I submit to you that it is a slippery slope we are going in taking our country and our state in when we make these sorts of things primary offenses. I will not deny that we need to do a better job in preventing people from being injured by educating them about the issue of buckling up. This is just not right. This is not the way to do it. I ask you to not support this motion, to please vote with me against this motion. Please think about what you are doing here and think about the message that it sends. Thank you very much.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Hancock, Senator Damon.

Senator **DAMON:** Thank you, Madame President, ladies and gentlemen of the Senate. I rise in support of the pending motion. I must tell you before I talk to you about this that were I to be in this same situation a few years ago I would probably have been rising in opposition to the pending motion. It has become clear to me through my involvement with the Joint Standing Committee on Transportation; through my involvement with having family members and loved ones involved in motor vehicle accidents, some resulting in their deaths; and it has become clear to me that when my health insurance premiums are increased because we feel as though our liberties and our freedoms and the impact that our actions have on society outweigh those costs, all of those occurrences have led me to this position, a position that I don't come to easily or naturally. Some of you who know me and some of you who have observed me perhaps would recognize me as being fairly independent and maybe even contrary on occasion. I

don't find either of those traits uncomplimentary. In this particular position I urge you to consider very strongly and I urge you, in fact, to support the pending motion.

I want to give you a little bit of the testimony that came before us, not the verbatim testimony but testimony from trauma room doctors and nurses, people who regularly have to deal with trying to put back together the pieces of humanity that are brought before them because somebody wanted to exercise their individual freedoms. One medical bill that was shown to us was, when laid out end-to-end, 27 feet long. Another medical bill, which was demonstrated to us, was approximately this thick. Let the record show I'm holding my hands about 7 inches apart. It amounted to some \$925,000. Both of those bills were the result of trying to save somebody who was involved in a motor vehicle accident but wanted to exercise their freedom of not wearing a seat belt. In the latter case, after over 30 days of valiant effort, that victim died. In the former case, after years of valiant effort, that victim is still alive, though I will submit to you that he is not living the same life that he lived prior to that accident. In previous testimony you heard that the director of LifeFlight had stood before our committee and announced that as he was waiting to testify he received word that one of his units was dispatched to an accident scene and was, in fact, carrying the victim to a hospital as he spoke. I later learned, as you've also learned today, that not only did that victim die, that victim who was not wearing a seat belt, but that this victim was, in fact, the granddaughter of one of my next door neighbors in Trenton. It seemed to be fairly ironic to me, yet consistent with our actions, that those kinds of results will continue if we don't have laws on the books that would remind us and direct us to look after our own safety, not only for our own sake but for your sake and my sake, for the people's sakes who are paying the bills.

It has often been said that this would take away our personal freedoms. I'll tell you that the primary enforcement of the safety belt law is no more intrusive of an individual's freedom than any other law that we work here and that we pass routinely. As with other laws, for example building and fire codes, it is the legitimate responsibility of government to provide for the protection of its citizens. Some have questioned the constitutionality of such a primary offense. I'll read just a paragraph from the United States Supreme Court, which once noted, and I quote, 'From the moment of injury, society picks up the person off the highway; delivers him to a municipal hospital and municipal doctors; provides him with unemployment compensation if after recovery he cannot replace his lost job; and, if the injury causes disability, may assume responsibility for his and his family's continued existence.'

Finally I'll end by saying that there was testimony in opposition to this bill. I will cite two of those testimonies, if you will permit. One said that seat belts don't make a difference. In fact, you are required, we are required, to have seat belts on in airplanes on take-off and landing, yet when those planes crash not everybody lives. Secondly, a testimony provided to us said that if seat belts were so important and were maintaining a person's position inside of an automobile during a crash, which sometimes if they are not belted in they can be ejected from the automobile. This has been noted in our NASCAR circuit and the solution to that problem of ejection from the automobile was that we welded the doors shut and we perhaps ought to consider that instead of primary seat belt laws. Well, I hope that you don't look at welding your doors shut, but I do hope that you look at this bill for the purpose for which it was designed, to provide safety for

you and me and the rest of the citizens of Maine, and that it is not overly obtrusive to our well-being. I urge your support of the pending motion. Thank you, Madame President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from York, Senator Courtney.

Senator **COURTNEY:** Thank you, Madame President, men and women of the Senate. I just want to make a couple of observations and a couple of concerns if this bill is to pass. I don't think any of us will argue the importance of wearing your seat belt. I think the area that we don't agree on, apparently, is the State stepping in and requiring it and making it a primary reason to be able to stop someone. It's a personal liberty issue for myself and many of my constituents. I could see us driving up to Augusta one day and coming up to the tollbooth and getting ready to throw a quarter in the little bucket, sorry it's sixty cents, and there's a Trooper standing there and he's looking for the strap across your shoulder. Down the road a little ways there is a whole troop of Troopers that are pulling people over, similar to a speed trap. I'm concerned that there is more of an issue about, as we see sometimes here as we raised the fines a couple of years ago, raising money for the State coffers as opposed to a real safety issue. I'm not convinced, and with your permission, Madame President, I'd ask a question through the Chair. Is there any data that would indicate that seat belt usage would be increased by making failure to wear a seat belt a primary offense?

THE PRESIDENT: The Senator from York, Senator Courtney poses a question through the Chair to anyone who may wish to answer. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Brannigan.

Senator **BRANNIGAN:** Thank you, Madame President. I would answer that there is evidence that people would wear seat belts if there was a primary law. Can I continue, Madame President? I speak only because I spent many years here getting the progression of seat belt wearing into the law. We had to begin with little children, 4 year olds and 12 year olds, all those people who don't have a vote. We got to the 18 years old. Finally, after many years, we got to the seat belt law that we have today. The Senate would go for it and the other Body wouldn't. The other Body would go for it and the Senate wouldn't. We finally got them all together and the Governor vetoed it. Eventually it was done.

I want to square away something that has been said here, that there is a choice. There is no choice now. It is against the law to not buckle up. If you don't buckle up you have broken the law. The only thing we hear then, unless you want to repeal this law, with the Senator from York, Senator Courtney, and others is impugning the police departments. If you have got a problem with the police, if you have a problem with the Turnpike Authority, let's deal with that. It is against the law not to be buckled up. If we pull people over for all the reasons like a tail light out or this or that, it is much more important that you wear your seat belt. You kids, you know you have to wear your seat belts. Most of these people know they have to wear their seat belts. Because I was such a promoter of the seat belts I won't move without a seat belt because I don't want my obituary to say that the sponsor of the seat belt law died without his seat belt on. Thank you, Madame President.

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

Senator **BRYANT:** Thank you, Madame President, men and women of the Senate. I won't go to the emotional side of this, but I think when I was in the other Body we made an agreement and we crafted what I believed to be the best of both worlds. We crafted a secondary offense so that the kids would be wearing a seat belt and over time we would adjust to that. The other piece to that, the primary offense, is that now you are going to burden, and you can use different words, the local police. They are going to have to enforce that. They are going to be using their time enforcing seat belt laws when they should be using their time to protect the children and the communities, making sure that domestic violence isn't happening in the community, and we're going to use a lot of resources for this bill. When we looked at this before, it went to a secondary offense but we mandated that those under 18 would wear their seat belts and that goes with you for the rest of your life. I would say that there is nothing wrong with the current law. The current law works well. I think if you went out there in the community and ask someone if they should wear their seat belt they would say yes. Probably 90% of them would think that the law is already there. It was designed that way so that we had a compromise. Now what we hear later on is that we were just fooling then and now that we agreed to go down this road so we can improve the safety of our communities we're going to take it anyways. I would ask my colleagues to vote against the pending motion.

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

Senator **RAYE:** Thank you, Madame President, men and women of the Senate. I have enormous respect for the Senators on the Transportation Committee and the Representatives on the Transportation Committee. I have no quarrel with the use of seat belts. I do believe they save lives. I don't think we can really argue that point. I speak as somebody for whom this issue means something personally. The date of June 22, 1979, is etched in my mind and in my heart for as long as I shall live. On that day my grandparents had a terrible accident from which my step-grandfather never recovered. He passed away after being in a coma for seven months. My grandmother's life was cut short. She recovered but never fully and died a couple of years later. I do understand, on a very personal level, the horror and the pain of automobile accidents. Nonetheless, I am opposed to this motion. Current Maine law already serves to remind us, to guide us, to direct us. If that is the goal of this motion, it's already a crime, as the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Brannigan, has pointed out. It is not a crime for which people are going to be pulled over. I supported the law as a voter when we passed it in Referendum in 1995.

I agree it's good to increase public awareness and encourage seat belt use, but I'm concerned that this is overreach on the part of government. Where does it stop? If we are to apply the same logic and the same arguments, where does it stop? We know, beyond any debate, it saves lives not to smoke. Are we going to make it a primary offense to smoke? We know beyond the shadow of a doubt it saves lives to avoid fat and cholesterol in your diet. Are we going to make over-indulgence a primary offense? Sometimes in our quest to promote things that

are good I believe it is possible for us as lawmakers to go too far. I submit that this is such a case.

I do believe this would be an intrusive law and I cannot support a bill that will result in people being stopped by the police, which many people find a horrifying thought. For people who go through life doing the right thing the thought of being pulled over by the police is horrifying, embarrassing, and disturbing. Imagine for a moment, an 80-year-old woman who discovers at 4:45 as she's fixing her supper that she's out of tea bags. She thinks, 'Oh my goodness, if I leave right now I can run down to the store and get tea bags before they close at 5:00.' In her haste she forgets to put her seat belt on. Before she gets to the store, for the first time in her life, she is pulled over by the police and fined for not wearing a seat belt. I just can't imagine that this is what we, as a State, want to do.

As for welding car doors shut, we currently have laws on the books that will prohibit us from traveling at the speeds of Bobby Labonte or Mark Martin or Jimmie Johnson. I'm not sure that is really a fair comparison.

In closing I just want to say that I understand fully the value of seat belts. Everybody in my family does. We learned that painful lesson on June 22, 1979. As a Senator, involved with the responsibility to make decisions to govern Maine people, I cannot support this, however well intentioned, pending motion. Thank you.

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

Senator **TURNER:** Thank you, Madame President, ladies and gentlemen of the Senate. I worry about the camel. He's been sliding and slipping downhill all morning trying to get his nose under the tent.

I hope that all of us, individually and collectively, do not have to have a fatality in our family in order to get religion about wearing seat belts. Some famous politician, whose name I can't recall, said that you can't legislate commonsense. I don't know whether that is true or not, but in this case I think we should try. I would urge your support of the pending motion. Thank you, Madame President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from York, Senator Courtney.

Senator **COURTNEY:** Thank you, Madame President, men and women of the Senate. I guess I'm not quite done yet. Could I propose a series of questions through the Chair?

THE PRESIDENT: The Senator may pose his questions.

Senator **COURTNEY:** Thank you, Madame President. With regards to the comments from the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Brannigan, I'm kind of curious about the source of the data that he says exists. With that data, what type of increase in seat belt usage would be able to expect with this law? I have one other one when that is answered.

THE PRESIDENT: I think you should ask all of them at once.

Senator **COURTNEY:** Thank you, Madame President. The other question is, is there additional, and this goes to the issue about

the money part of it, federal funds available if we make seat belt usage a primary offense? Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: The Senator from York, Senator Courtney poses several questions through the Chair to anyone who may wish to answer. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Knox, Senator Savage.

Senator **SAVAGE:** Thank you, Madame President. I will try to answer some of what the Senator from York, Senator Courtney, asked. Yes, there is a one time \$3.7 million available through Safety Belt Performance Grants program. I've got things that it can be used for. Eligible uses of grant funds for any safety purposes under Title 23, U.S. Code, including behavioral and infrastructure safety programs or for any project that corrects or improves a hazardous roadway location or feature or proactively addresses highway safety problems including, and it lists probably 15 or 20 ways that this money could be used. At least \$1 million of the funds has to be for behavioral safety activities. That's not why I put this bill in, for everyone in the Senate. Believe me, I firmly believe seat belts save lives.

To answer the good Senator from York, Senator Courtney, I think that if we have State Police lined up at the tollbooths acting as safety belt enforcers then their supervisors need to take a good look at their work schedule and make sure they are doing their job that they are hired for.

As far as the fines go, the fines do not change on this bill. The current law, as the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Brannigan, said is on the books now. We are required to use safety belts and the fines are \$50 for the first offense, \$125 for the second, and \$250 for the third and subsequent offenses. I would say that if you get caught three times then you deserved to be fined \$250. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arostook, Senator Martin.

Senator **MARTIN:** Thank you, Madame President. I request that the vote be taken by the yeas and nays.

THE PRESIDENT: A roll call has been ordered. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Nutting.

Senator **NUTTING:** Thank you, Madame President, ladies and gentlemen of the Senate. I rise briefly in support of the pending motion. I'm looking at a map that shows which states in the United States already have this statute is already a primary enforcement and which states are secondary enforcement. I firmly believe that if we collectively voted on what area of the United States would be the most conservative, the states of Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South and North Carolina, Tennessee, and Kentucky I think everyone here would agree, for a host of reasons, would be the most conservative area in our country. What all those states have in common is that every one of them today already has seat belt usage as a primary enforcement statute. I urge support of the pending motion. To me this is not an issue of being for individual rights or being conservative and not going to vote for this statute. Look at this whole area of the country, that I think is a good healthy conservative area of our country, and everyone of those states already has this as the law. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Hancock, Senator Damon.

Senator **DAMON:** Thank you, Madame President, ladies and gentlemen of the Senate. I'm rising in an effort to address posed earlier by the good Senator from York, Senator Courtney. With regards to data supplied by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, that federal agency that is tasked with keeping track of safety issues, states with primary seat belt laws have use rates at about 9.1% higher than states with secondary enforcement laws, meaning that the number of people using the seat belts increase in the states where it is a primary law. If Maine were to enact a primary law we would save approximately 10 lives and 155 serious injuries every year. A primary law would also save about \$33 million in associated costs each year. These costs and savings are based on an estimated 9.1% increase in the use. This is according to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Also seat belts reduce the risk of death to front seat passenger car occupants by 45% and the risk of moderate to critical injury by 50%. For light truck occupants seat belts reduce the risk of death by 60% and moderate to critical injury by 65%. Of passenger vehicle occupants who died in Maine 49% were not wearing seat belts. Thank you, Madame President.

THE PRESIDENT: The pending question before the Senate is the motion by the Senator from Hancock, Senator Damon to Accept the Majority Ought 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 (#29)

YEAS: Senators: BARTLETT, BOWMAN, BRANNIGAN, DAMON, DIAMOND, DOW, MARRACHE, MARTIN, MILLS, MITCHELL, NUTTING, PERRY, ROSEN, ROTUNDO, SAVAGE, STRIMLING, SULLIVAN, TURNER, WESTON, THE PRESIDENT - BETH G. EDMONDS

NAYS: Senators: BENOIT, BRYANT, COURTNEY, GOOLEY, HASTINGS, HOBBS, MCCORMICK, NASS, PLOWMAN, RAYE, SCHNEIDER, SHERMAN, SMITH, SNOWE-MELLO

ABSENT: Senator: BROMLEY

20 Senators having voted in the affirmative and 14 Senators having voted in the negative, with 1 Senator being absent, the motion by Senator **DAMON** of Hancock to **ACCEPT** the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS** Report, **PREVAILED**.

READ ONCE.

ASSIGNED FOR SECOND READING NEXT LEGISLATIVE DAY.