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

Comes from the House, the Majority OUGHT NOT TO PASS Report READ and ACCEPTED, in NON-CONCURRENCE.

On motion by Senator **MARTIN** of Aroostook, the Senate **ADHERED**.

Sent down for concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Concerning Certain Flavored Cigarettes and Cigars" S.P. 475 L.D. 1361 (S "A" S-230 to C "A" S-180)

In Senate, June 7, 2007, PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-180) AS AMENDED BY SENATE AMENDMENT "A" (S-230) thereto.

Comes from the House, PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-180) AS AMENDED BY HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" (H-544) AND SENATE AMENDMENT "A" (S-230) thereto, in NON-CONCURRENCE.

Senator MILLS of Somerset moved the Senate RECEDE and CONCUR.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Somerset, Senator Mills.

Senator MILLS: Thank you, Madame President. This is a bill I suppose is in danger of being amended to the third degree. The final amendment from the House, which is on the bill at the request of the tobacco lobby, says to bring the rules about candy and other flavorings in tobacco products back to the January session of the Legislature. Bring them back early so that the Health and Human Services Committee can take a good close look at them and have the benefit of the Attorney General's advice on how to implement the policies addressed in this statute. It's a fine amendment and seems to be consistent with the will of the committee. Thank you, Madame President.

On motion by Senator **MILLS** of Somerset, the Senate **RECEDED** and **CONCURRED**.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

SENATE REPORTS - from the Committee on **JUDICIARY** on Bill "An Act Regarding the Reporting of Sexual Abuse"
S.P. 60 L.D. 178

Majority - Ought Not to Pass (9 members)

Minority - Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-204) (4 members) Tabled - June 6, 2007, by Senator HOBBINS of York

Pending - motion by same Senator to ACCEPT the Majority OUGHT NOT TO PASS Report

(In Senate, June 6, 2007, Reports READ.)

On motion by Senator **NUTTING** of Androscoggin, **TABLED** until Later in Today's Session, pending the motion by Senator **HOBBINS** of York to **ACCEPT** the Majority **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report.

Senate at Ease.

Senate called to order by the President.

The Chair laid before the Senate the following Tabled and Later Today Assigned matter:

SENATE REPORTS - from the Committee on **JUDICIARY** on Bill "An Act Regarding the Reporting of Sexual Abuse"

S.P. 60 L.D. 178

Majority - Ought Not to Pass (9 members)

Minority - Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-204) (4 members)

Tabled - June 12, 2007, by Senator NUTTING of Androscoggin

Pending - motion by Senator HOBBINS of York to ACCEPT the Majority OUGHT NOT TO PASS Report

(In Senate, June 6, 2007, Reports READ.)

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

Senator STRIMLING: Thank you, Madame President. I rise in opposition to the pending motion. I rise in opposition to this motion for a lot of reasons. I want to just tell you where this came from originally. As I was knocking on doors in my district I came upon the door of a fellow who has got a family there, has had a family there for generations, and he said to me, 'The Legislature passed a bill a number of years ago that basically took away the statute of limitations for sexual abuse against children from here going forward. You know what, the abuse that happened to me happened before that statute of limitations was lifted. Extensively, because I was abused on a Tuesday but other people were abused on a Wednesday, somehow or another I'm not able to get redress in the courts. Because I was abused on a Tuesday I can't get redress from the courts whereas somebody who was abused on a Wednesday can.' I said, 'That doesn't make any sense. Whether or not you support whether the statute of limitations should be open or not on the civil side it certainly doesn't make sense that we would determine that because it happened the day before something else that that means that you