

Journal of the House

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

At ten o'clock in the forenoon the Speaker called the House to order.

Devotional Exercises

Devotional exercises were conducted by Matthew Romei, VT Capitol Police Chief, Williamstown, VT.

House Resolution Adopted

H.R. 9

House resolution, entitled

House resolution expressing support for the welcoming and settling of refugees in the United States

Offered by: Representatives Colburn of Burlington, Anthony of Barre City, Austin of Colchester, Bartholomew of Hartland, Bates of Bennington, Beck of St. Johnsbury, Birong of Vergennes, Bock of Chester, Briglin of Thetford, Browning of Arlington, Brumsted of Shelburne, Burditt of West Rutland, Burke of Brattleboro, Campbell of St. Johnsbury, Carroll of Bennington, Chesnut-Tangerman of Middletown Springs, Christensen of Weathersfield, Christie of Hartford, Cina of Burlington, Coffey of Guilford, Conquest of Newbury, Copeland-Hanzas of Bradford, Cordes of Lincoln, Demrow of Corinth, Dolan of Waitsfield, Donahue of Northfield, Donovan of Burlington, Durfee of Shaftsbury, Elder of Starksboro, Fagan of Rutland City, Fegard of Berkshire, Feltus of Lyndon, Giambatista of Essex, Grad of Moretown, Haas of Rochester, Harrison of Chittenden, Hashim of Dummerston, Hooper of Montpelier, Hooper of Randolph, Hooper of Burlington, Houghton of Essex, Howard of Rutland City, James of Manchester, Jessup of Middlesex, Jickling of Randolph, Killacky of South Burlington, Kimbell of Woodstock, Kornheiser of Brattleboro, Krowinski of Burlington, LaLonde of South Burlington, Lanpher of Vergennes, Lippert of Hinesburg, Macaig of Williston, Masland of Thetford, McCarthy of St. Albans City, McCormack of Burlington, McCullough of Williston, Mrowicki of Putney, Murphy of Fairfax, Notte of Rutland City, Noyes of Wolcott, O'Brien of Tunbridge, Ode of Burlington, O'Sullivan of Burlington, Pajala of Londonderry, Patt of Worcester, Pugh of South Burlington, Rachelson of Burlington, Ralph of Hartland, Redmond of Essex, Rogers of Waterville, Scheu of Middlebury, Seymour of Sutton, Sibia of Dover, Squirrell of Underhill, Stevens of Waterbury, Sullivan of Dorset, Sullivan of Burlington, Toleno of Brattleboro, Townsend of South Burlington,

Trieber of Rockingham, Troiano of Stannard, Walz of Barre City, Webb of Shelburne, White of Hartford, Wood of Waterbury, Yacovone of Morristown, Yantachka of Charlotte, and Young of Greensboro

Whereas, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) was established in December 1950 “to lead and coordinate international action to protect refugees and resolve refugee problems worldwide,” and

Whereas, the UNHCR reports that there are more refugees in the world today than at any time since World War II, and many of the world’s refugees are children, and

Whereas, the UNHCR has determined that 1.19 million refugees are in need of immediate resettlement, and

Whereas, refugees are fleeing armed conflicts and human rights abuses in Africa, Central America, the Middle East, and Southeast Asia, and

Whereas, these refugees who need to be resettled include torture survivors, people with severe medical conditions, LGBTI individuals, children travelling alone, and women and children at risk—none of whom can return home nor stay in their current host country due to their extreme vulnerability, and

Whereas, only 10 nations host one-half of the world’s refugees, including countries that do not have adequate resources to feed, house, or keep these refugees safe, and

Whereas, refugees in need of resettlement represent only a tiny fraction of the world’s population, and

Whereas, every single refugee admitted into the United States must undergo a strict and lengthy security check, involving multiple law enforcement and intelligence agencies, and

Whereas, the U.S. Committee for Refugees and Immigrants’ Vermont Refugee Resettlement Program (VRRP) and numerous other Vermont community and religious organizations have declared their support for resettling refugees in Vermont, and since 1980, VRRP has resettled more than 7,000 refugees from many nations, and

Whereas, in the interest of affordability and sustainable economic development, Vermont is working hard to build its workforce, to be a supportive place for children and families, and to welcome people as new residents to the State, and

Whereas, the United Nations World Refugee Day will be celebrated on June 20, 2019 to honor the strength and courage of refugees and to encourage public awareness and support of refugees, now therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives:

That this legislative body applauds the historic tradition of the United States welcoming refugees in keeping with our national values and respect for human rights, and be it further

Resolved: That this legislative body declares its support for the resettlement of refugees in the United States, including Vermont, regardless of religion, race, nationality, or country of origin and calls upon other states to support a national effort to resettle the most vulnerable refugees, and be it further

Resolved: That the Clerk of the House be directed to send a copy of this resolution to the Vermont Refugee Resettlement Program, the President of the United States, the Governor, the Vermont Congressional Delegation, and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

Which was read and adopted.

House Resolution Referred to Committee

H.R. 10

House resolution, entitled

House resolution reaffirming the position of the House related to 2019's House Bill 39

Offered by: Representatives Scheuermann of Stowe, Browning of Arlington, Burditt of West Rutland, Burke of Brattleboro, Cina of Burlington, Gamache of Swanton, Gregoire of Fairfield, Higley of Lowell, Leffler of Enosburgh, Morrissey of Bennington, Mrowicki of Putney, Page of Newport City, Partridge of Windham, Patt of Worcester, Rogers of Waterville, Rosenquist of Georgia, Savage of Swanton, Smith of Derby, Strong of Albany, Yacovone of Morristown, and Young of Greensboro

Whereas, House Bill 39, "An act relating to the extension of the deadline of school district mergers required by the State Board of Education" is bipartisan legislation intended to address transitional issues impacting the school district merger process, and

Whereas, the rapidity of the merger process required of certain districts, especially those that the State Board of Education ordered to be established and that were not part of a merger study committee, poses problems for a

smooth and successful transition for teachers, administrators, support staff, students, and parents, and

Whereas, on February 7, 2019, the House approved a Committee on Education strike-all amendment, on a vote of 134–10, and that amendment reflects the text of the bill as adopted in the House, and

Whereas, the bill proceeded to the Senate, where the measure was altered significantly prior to passage, and

Whereas, the subsequently appointed conferees have deadlocked, and on April 30, 2019, the Senate reaffirmed its position on House Bill 39 and requested the appointment of new conferees, and

Whereas, the enactment of an acceptable version of House Bill 39 is of great importance for the orderly opening of the 2019–2020 public school year, now therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives:

That this legislative body reaffirms its position on 2019’s House Bill 39, and be it further

Resolved: That this legislative body requests that new conferees be appointed in order to reach a successful conclusion to the deliberations on House Bill 39.

Which was read and referred to the committee on Education pursuant to Rule 52.

Second Reading; Consideration Interrupted

S. 23

Rep. Troiano of Stannard, for the committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs, to which had been referred Senate bill, entitled

An act relating to increasing the minimum wage

Reported in favor of its passage in concurrence with proposal of amendment by striking all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 1. 21 V.S.A. § 384 is amended to read:

§ 384. EMPLOYMENT; WAGES

(a)(1) An employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$9.15. ~~Beginning on January 1, 2016, an employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$9.60. Beginning on January 1, 2017, an employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$10.00.~~

Beginning on January 1, 2018, an employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$10.50, and beginning \$10.78. Beginning on January 1, 2019 2020, an employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$11.50. Beginning on January 1, 2021, an employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$12.25. Beginning on January 1, 2022, an employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$13.10. Beginning on January 1, 2023, an employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$14.05. Beginning on January 1, 2024, an employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$15.00, and on each subsequent January 1, the minimum wage rate shall be increased by five percent or the percentage increase of the Consumer Price Index, CPI-U, U.S. city average, not seasonally adjusted, or successor index, as calculated by the U.S. Department of Labor or successor agency for the 12 months preceding the previous September 1, whichever is smaller, but in no event shall the minimum wage be decreased. The minimum wage shall be rounded off to the nearest \$0.01.

(2) An employer in the hotel, motel, tourist place, and restaurant industry shall not employ a service or tipped employee at a basic wage rate less than one-half the minimum wage. As used in this subsection, “a service or tipped employee” means an employee of a hotel, motel, tourist place, or restaurant who customarily and regularly receives more than \$120.00 per month in tips for direct and personal customer service.

(3) If the minimum wage rate established by the U.S. government is greater than the rate established for Vermont for any year, the minimum wage rate for that year shall be the rate established by the U.S. government.

* * *

(e)(1) A tip shall be the sole property of the employee or employees to whom it was paid, given, or left. An employer that permits patrons to pay tips by credit card shall pay an employee the full amount of the tip that the customer indicated, without any deductions for credit card processing fees or costs that may be charged to the employer by the credit card company.

(2) An employer shall not collect, deduct, or receive any portion of a tip left for an employee or credit any portion of a tip left for an employee against the wages due to the employee pursuant to subsection (a) of this section.

(3) This subsection shall not be construed to prohibit the pooling of tips among:

(A) service or tipped employees as defined pursuant to subsection (a) of this section; or

(B) service or tipped employees who are paid at least the federal minimum wage established pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 206(a)(1) and non-supervisory employees who do not customarily and regularly receive more than \$120.00 per month in tips for direct and personal customer service.

Sec. 2. 21 V.S.A. § 383 is amended to read:

§ 383. DEFINITIONS

~~Terms used in this subchapter have the following meanings~~ As used in this subchapter, unless a different meaning is clearly apparent from the language or context:

(1) “Commissioner,” means the Commissioner of Labor or designee.

(2) “Employee,” means any individual employed or permitted to work by an employer except:

* * *

(G) ~~taxi-cab~~ taxicab drivers;

(H) outside salespersons; and

(I) secondary school students under 18 years of age working during all or any part of the school year or regular vacation periods. As used in this subdivision (2)(I), “regular vacation periods” does not include the period between two successive academic years.

(3) “Occupation,” means an industry, trade, or business or branch thereof, or a class of work in which workers are gainfully employed.

(4) “Tip” means a sum of money gratuitously and voluntarily left by a customer for service, or indicated on a bill or charge statement, to be paid to a service or tipped employee for directly and personally serving the customer in a hotel, motel, tourist place, or restaurant. An employer-mandated service charge shall not be considered a tip.

Sec. 3. CHILD CARE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

(a) It is the intent of the General Assembly that investments and initiatives set forth in this section and Sec. 4 of this act are meant to complement the anticipated redesign of the Child Care Financial Assistance Program, which shall be monitored by the General Assembly.

(b) In fiscal year 2020, of the funds appropriated from the General Fund to the Department for Children and Families’ Child Development Division, \$1,250,000.00 shall be used to restore the base for the Child Care Financial Assistance Program (CCFAP) and \$6,900,000.00 shall be used to adjust the sliding fee scale and reimbursement rates in CCFAP as follows:

(1) adjust the sliding fee scale of CCFAP to ensure that families whose gross income is up to 100 percent of the current federal poverty guidelines receive 100 percent of the available benefit and that families whose gross income is between 100 and 300 percent of the current federal poverty guidelines receive between 99 and 10 percent of the available financial assistance benefit, scaling between set eligibility levels as follows:

(A) 95 percent of the available financial assistance benefit for families at 125 percent of the current federal poverty guidelines;

(B) 75 percent of the available financial assistance benefit for families at 150 percent of the current federal poverty guidelines;

(C) 50 percent of the available financial assistance benefit for families at 200 percent of the current federal poverty guidelines; and

(D) 10 percent of the available financial assistance benefit for families at 300 percent of the current federal poverty guidelines; and

(2) align rates of reimbursement for preschool and school age children participating in CCFAP in fiscal year 2020 with the market rates reported on the 2015 Vermont Market Rate Survey and maintain rates of reimbursement for infants and toddlers participating in CCFAP in fiscal year 2020 with the market rates reported on the 2017 Vermont Market Rate Survey.

Sec. 4. 33 V.S.A. § 3512(a)(4) is added to read:

(4) Beginning on January 1, 2025 and each subsequent year the minimum wage is increased thereafter, the Commissioner for Children and Families shall amend the Department for Children and Families' Child Care Financial Assistance Program to:

(A) adjust the sliding fee scale to correspond with each minimum wage increase required pursuant to 21 V.S.A. § 384(a)(1) in order to ensure that the benefit percentage at each new minimum wage level is not lower than the percentage applied under the former minimum wage; and

(B) adjust the rate of reimbursement paid to providers on behalf of families participating in the Child Care Financial Assistance Program in a manner that offsets the estimated increased cost of child care in Vermont resulting from an increase in the minimum wage required pursuant to 21 V.S.A. § 384(a)(1).

Sec. 5. INCREASES FOR EMPLOYEES OF CERTAIN MEDICAID-PARTICIPATING PROVIDERS; APPROPRIATION

(a) In order to increase Medicaid reimbursement rates to home health agencies, nursing homes, residential care homes, assisted living residences,

and adult day agencies by \$3,305,646.00 in fiscal year 2020 to facilitate the payment of wages to their employees who are providing health care services pursuant to the State Medicaid Program that are equal to at least the minimum wage set forth in 21 V.S.A. § 384 and to mitigate wage compression for employees of those service providers who are in occupations with a starting wage rate within \$1.00 of the minimum wage:

(1) \$874,894.00 is appropriated in fiscal year 2020 from the General Fund to the Department of Vermont Health Access;

(2) \$1,021,691.00 is appropriated in fiscal year 2020 from federal funds to the Department of Vermont Health Access; and

(3) the Secretary of Human Services shall redirect to the Medicaid programs identified in this subsection an estimated \$650,000.00 of State funds and any related federal matching funds from savings experienced by programs within the Agency of Human Services as a result of the increase in the minimum wage on January 1, 2020.

(b) On or before November 15, 2019, the Department of Vermont Health Access shall submit a written report to the Joint Fiscal Committee regarding the adequacy of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, and any additional appropriation that may be necessary during fiscal year 2020.

Sec. 6. INCREASES FOR EMPLOYEES OF CERTAIN MEDICAID-PARTICIPATING PROVIDERS; PROJECTIONS; REPORT

On or before December 1, 2019, the Secretary of Human Services, in consultation with the Joint Fiscal Office and relevant service providers, shall submit a written report to the House Committees on Appropriations, on General, Housing, and Military Affairs, on Health Care, and on Human Services and the Senate Committees on Appropriations, on Economic Development, Housing and General Affairs, and on Health and Welfare regarding the projected costs for fiscal years 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024 of increasing Medicaid reimbursement rates to all Medicaid participating providers, including designated agencies, specialized service agencies, home health agencies, nursing homes, residential care homes, assisted living residences, and adult day agencies, by an amount necessary to facilitate the payment of wages to their employees who are providing services pursuant to the State Medicaid Program that are equal to at least the minimum wage set forth in 21 V.S.A. § 384 and to mitigate wage compression for employees providing services pursuant to the State Medicaid Program who are in occupations with a starting wage rate within \$1.00 of the minimum wage.

Sec. 7. MINIMUM WAGE; ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION; REPORT

On or before January 15, 2023, the Office of Legislative Council and the Joint Fiscal Office shall submit a written report to the House Committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs and the Senate Committee on Economic Development, Housing and General Affairs regarding potential mechanisms for indexing the minimum wage established pursuant to 21 V.S.A. § 384 to inflation after 2024. In particular, the report shall:

(1) identify and examine mechanisms that other jurisdictions use to index their minimum wages to inflation and the potential benefits and disadvantages of each mechanism; and

(2) identify and examine any alternative mechanisms to index the minimum wage to inflation, including alternative measures of inflation, and the potential benefits and disadvantages of each mechanism.

Sec. 8. TIPPED AND STUDENT MINIMUM WAGE STUDY
COMMITTEE; REPORT

(a) Creation. There is created the tipped and student minimum wage study committee to examine the effects of altering or eliminating the basic wage rate for tipped employees in Vermont and of eliminating the subminimum wage for secondary school students during the school year.

(b) Membership. The Committee shall be composed of the following members:

(1) one member of the House appointed by the Speaker of the House;

(2) one member of the Senate appointed by the Committee on Committees;

(3) the Commissioner of Labor or designee;

(4) the Commissioner for Children and Families or designee;

(5) one member representing employers in the food service or hospitality industry, appointed by the Speaker of the House; and

(6) one member representing tipped workers in the food service or hospitality industry, appointed by the Committee on Committees.

(c) Powers and duties. The Committee shall study the effects of altering or eliminating the basic wage rate for tipped employees and of eliminating the subminimum wage for secondary school students during the school year, including the following issues:

(1) the impact in states that have eliminated their tipped wage on:

(A) jobs, prices, and the state economy; and

(B) the welfare of tipped workers, women, and working families with children;

(2) the impact in states that have increased their tipped wage during the last 10 years on:

(A) jobs, prices, and the state economy; and

(B) the welfare of tipped workers, women, and working families with children;

(3) the impact in states that have decoupled their tipped wage from the standard minimum wage during the last 10 years on:

(A) jobs, prices, and the state economy; and

(B) the welfare of tipped workers, women, and working families with children;

(4) the projected impact in Vermont of altering or eliminating the basic wage rate for tipped employees on:

(A) jobs, prices, and the State economy; and

(B) the welfare of tipped workers, women, and working families with children; and

(5) the projected impact in Vermont of eliminating the subminimum wage for secondary school students on jobs, prices, the State economy, and the welfare of individuals under 22 years of age.

(d) Assistance. The Committee shall have the administrative, technical, and legal assistance of the Office of Legislative Council and the Joint Fiscal Office.

(e) Report. On or before December 15, 2019, the Committee shall submit a written report to the House Committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs and the Senate Committee on Economic Development, Housing and General Affairs with its findings and recommendations, if any, for legislative action related to Vermont's basic wage for tipped employees and subminimum wage for secondary school students.

(f) Meetings.

(1) The Commissioner of Labor shall call the first meeting of the Committee to occur on or before September 15, 2019.

(2) The Committee shall select a chair from among its members at the first meeting.

(3) A majority of the membership shall constitute a quorum.

(4) The Committee shall cease to exist on January 30, 2020.

(g) Compensation and reimbursement.

(1) For attendance at meetings during adjournment of the General Assembly, a legislative member of the Committee serving in his or her capacity as a legislator shall be entitled to per diem compensation and reimbursement of expenses pursuant to 2 V.S.A. § 406 for not more than six meetings. These payments shall be made from monies appropriated to the General Assembly.

(2) Members of the Committee who are not employees of the State of Vermont and who are not otherwise compensated or reimbursed for their attendance shall be entitled to per diem compensation and reimbursement of expenses as permitted under 32 V.S.A. § 1010 for not more than six meetings. These payments shall be made from monies appropriated to the General Assembly.

Sec. 9. MINIMUM WAGE FOR AGRICULTURAL WORKERS;

WORKING GROUP; REPORT

(a) Creation. There is created the Agricultural Minimum Wage Working Group to examine the wage and hour laws for agricultural workers.

(b) Membership. The Working Group shall be composed of the following members:

(1) one member of the House appointed by the Speaker of the House;

(2) one member of the Senate appointed by the Committee on Committees;

(3) The Secretary of Agriculture or designee; and

(4) The Commissioner of Labor or designee.

(c) Powers and duties. The Working Group shall study the wage and hour laws for agricultural workers, including the following issues:

(1) the overlapping legal requirements of the federal Fair Labor Standards Act and Vermont's wage and hour laws with respect to agricultural employees and employers;

(2) particular issues and challenges related to federal and State wage and hour laws that Vermont's agricultural employees and employers face; and

(3) how other states have addressed similar issues and challenges in their wage and hour laws.

(d) Assistance. The Working Group shall have the administrative, technical, and legal assistance of the Office of Legislative Council.

(e) Report. On or before December 15, 2019, the Working Group shall submit a written report to the House Committees on Agriculture and on General, Housing, and Military Affairs and the Senate Committees on Agriculture and on Economic Development, Housing and General Affairs with its findings and any recommendations for legislative action.

(f) Meetings.

(1) The member from the House shall call the first meeting of the Working Group to occur on or before September 15, 2019.

(2) The Committee shall select a chair from among its members at the first meeting.

(3) A majority of the membership shall constitute a quorum.

(4) The Working Group shall cease to exist on January 30, 2020.

(g) Compensation and reimbursement. For attendance at meetings during adjournment of the General Assembly, a legislative member of the Working Group serving in his or her capacity as a legislator shall be entitled to per diem compensation and reimbursement of expenses pursuant to 2 V.S.A. § 406 for not more than four meetings. These payments shall be made from monies appropriated to the General Assembly.

Sec. 10. LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL; DRAFT LEGISLATION

On or before January 15, 2020, the Office of Legislative Council shall prepare and submit a draft bill to the House Committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs and the Senate Committee on Economic Development, Housing and General Affairs that makes statutory amendments of a technical nature to modernize the statutory language of 21 V.S.A. chapter 5, subchapter 3. The draft bill shall also identify provisions of 21 V.S.A. chapter 5, subchapter 3 that may require amendment in order to eliminate out-of-date and obsolete provisions. The Office of Legislative Council shall consult with the Commissioner of Labor to identify language requiring modernization and provisions that are out-of-date or obsolete.

Sec. 11. EFFECTIVE DATES

(a) In Sec. 2, 21 V.S.A. § 383, the amendments to subdivisions (2)(G) and (I) shall take effect on January 1, 2020. The remaining provisions of Sec. 2 shall take effect on July 1, 2019.

(b) The remaining sections of this act shall take effect on July 1, 2019.

Rep. Trieber of Rockingham, for the committee on Appropriations, recommended that the House propose to the Senate to amend the bill as recommended by the committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs and when amended as follows:

First: In Sec. 1, 21 V.S.A. § 384, by striking out subsection (a) in its entirety and inserting in lieu thereof a new subsection (a) to read as follows:

(a)(1) ~~An~~ Except as otherwise provided pursuant to subdivision (B) of this subdivision (a)(1), an employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$9.15. Beginning on January 1, 2016, an employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$9.60. Beginning on January 1, 2017, an employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$10.00. Beginning on January 1, 2018, an employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$10.50, and beginning \$10.78. Beginning on January 1, 2019 2020, the minimum wage rate shall be increased by two and one quarter times the percentage increase of the Consumer Price Index, CPI-U, U.S. city average, not seasonally adjusted, or successor index, as calculated by the U.S. Department of Labor or successor agency for the 12 months preceding the previous September 1, provided that the rate of increase shall not be more than five and one half percent, until the minimum wage is equal to or greater than \$15.00. On January 1 of the first year after the minimum wage rate reaches an amount that is equal to or greater than \$15.00 and on each subsequent January 1, the minimum wage rate shall be increased by five percent or the percentage increase of the Consumer Price Index, CPI-U, U.S. city average, not seasonally adjusted, or successor index, as calculated by the U.S. Department of Labor or successor agency for the 12 months preceding the previous September 1, whichever is smaller, but in . In no event shall the minimum wage be decreased. The minimum wage shall be rounded off to the nearest \$0.01.

(2) An employer in the hotel, motel, tourist place, and restaurant industry shall not employ a service or tipped employee at a basic wage rate less than one-half the minimum wage. As used in this subsection, “a service or tipped employee” means an employee of a hotel, motel, tourist place, or restaurant who customarily and regularly receives more than \$120.00 per month in tips for direct and personal customer service.

(3) If the minimum wage rate established by the U.S. government is greater than the rate established for Vermont pursuant to subdivision (1) of this subsection for any year, the minimum wage rate for that year shall be the rate established by the U.S. government.

Second: In Sec. 1, 21 V.S.A. § 384, after subsection (e), by inserting a subsection (f) to read:

(f)(1) Notwithstanding 2 V.S.A. § 20(d), on or before December 1, 2019, and on or before each subsequent December 1 until the minimum wage established pursuant to subdivision (a)(1)(B) of this section reaches \$15.00, the Commissioner of Taxes shall submit a written report to the Governor and the General Assembly regarding whether the inflation-adjusted revenues from the sales tax imposed pursuant to 32 V.S.A. § 9771 and the use tax imposed pursuant to 32 V.S.A. § 9773 for the 12-month period ending on September 30 of that year have decreased by two percent or more relative to the revenues from the sales tax and use tax for the 12-month period ending on September 30 of the previous year.

(2) Notwithstanding subdivision (a)(1) of this section, the minimum wage rate established pursuant to subdivision (a)(1) shall be increased by the percentage increase of the Consumer Price Index, CPI-U, U.S. city average, not seasonally adjusted, or successor index, as calculated by the U.S. Department of Labor or successor agency for the 12 months preceding the previous September 1 or by five percent, whichever is smaller, on January 1 of the next calendar year if both of the following occur:

(A) the Commissioner of Taxes' report indicates that the inflation-adjusted revenues from the sales tax imposed pursuant to 32 V.S.A. § 9771 and the use tax imposed pursuant to 32 V.S.A. § 9773 for the 12-month period ending on September 30 of that year have decreased by two percent or more relative to the revenues from the sales tax and use tax for the 12-month period ending on September 30 of the previous year; and

(B) the official State revenue estimate for the General Fund in the current or next fiscal year has been reduced by two percent or more.

Third: By striking out Secs. 5 and 6, Medicaid participating providers, and inserting in lieu thereof new Secs. 5 and 6 to read as follows:

**Sec. 5. INCREASES FOR EMPLOYEES OF CERTAIN MEDICAID-
PARTICIPATING PROVIDERS; REPORT**

(a) On or before December 15, 2019, the Secretary of Human Services, in consultation with the Joint Fiscal Office and relevant service providers, shall submit a written report to the House Committees on Appropriations, on General, Housing, and Military Affairs, on Health Care, and on Human Services and the Senate Committees on Appropriations, on Economic Development, Housing and General Affairs, and on Health and Welfare regarding the projected costs for fiscal years 2020 and 2021 of increasing Medicaid reimbursement rates to Medicaid participating providers, including designated agencies, specialized service agencies, home health agencies, nursing homes, residential care homes, assisted living residences, and adult

day agencies, by an amount necessary to facilitate the payment of wages to their employees who are providing services pursuant to the State Medicaid Program that are equal to at least the minimum wage set forth in 21 V.S.A. § 384.

(b)(1) On or before August 15, 2019, the Secretary of Human Services shall request from Medicaid participating providers with employees who are providing services pursuant to the State Medicaid Program and earn wages that are at or near the minimum wage set forth in 21 V.S.A. § 384 any documentation of wages and related costs that the Secretary determines to be necessary to develop the projections required pursuant to subsection (a) of this section.

(2) Service providers shall, on or before October 15, 2019, provide to the Secretary the documentation requested pursuant to subdivision (1) of this subsection.

(3) Any service provider that fails to provide the information requested by the Secretary pursuant to this subsection shall forfeit the right in fiscal years 2020 and 2021 to any increase in Medicaid reimbursement rates that is proposed pursuant to subsection (a) of this section.

Sec. 6. MINIMUM WAGE FOR EMPLOYERS PROVIDING BENEFITS;
STUDY COMMITTEE; REPORT

(a) Creation. There is created the Minimum Wage for Employers Providing Benefits Study Committee to examine the possibility of creating a separate minimum wage rate for employers that provide certain benefits to their employees that would increase more slowly than the standard minimum wage.

(b) Membership. The Committee shall be composed of the following members:

(1) a current member of the House of Representatives, who shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House;

(2) a current member of the Senate, who shall be appointed by the Committee on Committees;

(3) a representative of employers, who shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House;

(4) a representative of employees earning wages that are at or near the minimum wage, who shall be appointed by the Committee on Committees; and

(5) the Commissioner of Labor or designee.

(c) Powers and duties. The Committee shall study the possibility of creating a separate minimum wage rate for employers that provide certain benefits to their employees that would increase more slowly than the standard minimum wage, including the following topics:

(1) the experience of jurisdictions that have created a second minimum wage rate for employers that provide certain benefits to their employees that would increase more slowly than the standard minimum wage;

(2) the advantages and drawbacks of permitting an employer to qualify for a minimum wage rate that increases more slowly than the standard minimum wage by providing certain types of benefits, including health insurance, retirement, child care reimbursement, family and medical leave, and tuition reimbursement; and

(3) an appropriate minimum value of benefits that must be provided to qualify an employer for a second minimum wage rate that increases more slowly than the standard minimum wage.

(d) Assistance. The Committee shall have the administrative, technical, and legal assistance of the Office of Legislative Council and the Joint Fiscal Office.

(e) Report. On or before January 15, 2020, the Committee shall submit a written report to the House Committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs and the Senate Committee on Economic Development, Housing and General Affairs with its findings and any recommendations for legislative action.

(f) Meetings.

(1) The member from the House shall call the first meeting of the Committee to occur on or before September 15, 2019.

(2) The Committee shall select a chair from among its members at the first meeting.

(3) A majority of the membership shall constitute a quorum.

(4) The Committee shall cease to exist on January 31, 2020.

(g) Compensation and reimbursement.

(1) For attendance at meetings during adjournment of the General Assembly, a legislative member of the Committee serving in his or her capacity as a legislator shall be entitled to per diem compensation and reimbursement of expenses pursuant to 2 V.S.A. § 406 for not more than four meetings.

(2) Other members of the Committee who are not otherwise compensated for their attendance at meetings shall be entitled to per diem compensation and reimbursement of expenses as permitted under 32 V.S.A. § 1010 for not more than four meetings.

(3) Payments to members of the Committee authorized under this subsection shall be made from monies appropriated to the General Assembly.

The bill having appeared on the Calendar one day for Notice was taken up and read the second time.

Recess

At eleven o'clock and seven minutes in the forenoon, the Speaker declared a recess until eleven o'clock and thirty minutes in the forenoon.

At eleven o'clock and thirty-five minutes in the forenoon, the Speaker called the House to order. Thereupon, the Speaker declared a recess until twelve o'clock and forty minutes in afternoon.

Message from the Senate No. 59

A message was received from the Senate by Mr. Marshall, its Assistant Secretary, as follows:

Madam Speaker:

I am directed to inform the House that:

The Senate has considered House proposal of amendment to Senate bill of the following title:

S. 131. An act relating to insurance and securities.

And has concurred therein with an amendment in the passage of which the concurrence of the House is requested.

The Senate has considered House proposal of amendment to Senate bill of the following title:

S. 41. An act relating to regulating entities that administer health reimbursement arrangements.

And has concurred therein.

The Senate has considered House proposal of amendment to Senate proposal of amendment to House bill of the following title:

H. 133. An act relating to miscellaneous energy subjects.

And has concurred therein.

The Senate has considered bills originating in the House of the following titles:

H. 287. An act relating to small probate estates.

H. 524. An act relating to health insurance and the individual mandate.

H. 525. An act relating to miscellaneous agricultural subjects.

H. 530. An act relating to the qualifications and election of the Adjutant and Inspector General.

And has passed the same in concurrence with proposals of amendment in the adoption of which the concurrence of the House is requested.

The Governor has informed the Senate that on the fourteenth day of May, 2019 he approved and signed a bill originating in the Senate of the following title:

S. 154. An act relating to miscellaneous banking provisions.

At twelve o'clock and fifty-nine minutes in the afternoon, the Speaker called the House to order.

Consideration Resumed; Proposals of Amendment Agreed to; Third Reading Ordered

S. 23

Consideration resumed on Senate bill, entitled

An act relating to increasing the minimum wage

Thereupon, the report of the committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs was amended as recommended by the committee on Appropriations.

Pending the question, Shall the House propose to the Senate to amend the bill as recommended by the committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs, as amended? **Rep. Trieber of Rockingham** moved to amend the proposal of amendment as recommended by the committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs, as amended, as follows:

First: In Sec. 1, 21 V.S.A. § 384, in subdivision (a)(1), before the words “the minimum wage rate shall be increased by two and one quarter times” by inserting the following: “, and on each subsequent January 1,”

Second: In Sec. 1, 21 V.S.A. § 384, in subdivision (f)(1), by striking out “(a)(1)(B)” and inserting in lieu thereof the following: “(a)(1)”

Which was agreed to.

Pending the question, Shall the House propose to the Senate to amend the bill as recommended by the committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs, as amended? **Rep. Browning of Arlington** moved to amend the proposal of amendment as recommended by the committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs, as amended, as follows:

First: In Sec. 1, 21 V.S.A. § 384, by striking out subdivision (a)(1) in its entirety and inserting in lieu thereof a new subdivision (a)(1) to read as follows:

(a)(1)(A) An employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than ~~\$9.15. Beginning on January 1, 2016, an employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$9.60. Beginning on January 1, 2017, an employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$10.00. Beginning on January 1, 2018, an employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$10.50, and beginning \$10.78. Beginning on January 1, 2019~~ 2020 and on each subsequent January 1, of 2021 the minimum wage rate shall be increased by five percent or the percentage increase of the Consumer Price Index, CPI-U, U.S. city average, not seasonally adjusted, or successor index, as calculated by the U.S. Department of Labor or successor agency for the 12 months preceding the previous September 1, whichever is smaller, but in no event shall the minimum wage be decreased.

(B) Beginning on January 1, 2022 and on each subsequent January 1, the minimum wage rate shall be increased by two and one quarter times the percentage increase of the Consumer Price Index, CPI-U, U.S. city average, not seasonally adjusted, or successor index, as calculated by the U.S. Department of Labor or successor agency for the 12 months preceding the previous September 1, provided that the rate of increase shall not be more than five and one half percent, until the minimum wage is equal to or greater than \$15.00. On January 1 of the first year after the minimum wage rate reaches an amount that is equal to or greater than \$15.00 and on each subsequent January 1, the minimum wage rate shall be increased by five percent or the percentage increase of the Consumer Price Index, CPI-U, U.S. city average, not seasonally adjusted, or successor index, as calculated by the U.S. Department of Labor or successor agency for the 12 months preceding the previous September 1, whichever is smaller. In no event shall the minimum wage be decreased.

(C) The minimum wage shall be rounded off to the nearest \$0.01.

Second: In Sec. 1, 21 V.S.A. § 384, by striking out subsection (f) in its entirety and by inserting a new subsection (f) to read as follows:

(f)(1) Notwithstanding 2 V.S.A. § 20(d), on or before December 1, 2021, and on or before each subsequent December 1 until the minimum wage established pursuant to subdivision (a)(2) of this section reaches \$15.00, the Commissioner of Taxes shall submit a written report to the Governor and the General Assembly regarding whether the inflation-adjusted revenues from the sales tax imposed pursuant to 32 V.S.A. § 9771 and the use tax imposed pursuant to 32 V.S.A. § 9773 for the 12-month period ending on September 30 of that year have decreased by two percent or more relative to the revenues from the sales tax and use tax for the 12-month period ending on September 30 of the previous year.

(2) Notwithstanding subdivision (a)(2) of this section, the minimum wage rate established pursuant to subdivision (a)(2) shall be increased by the percentage increase of the Consumer Price Index, CPI-U, U.S. city average, not seasonally adjusted, or successor index, as calculated by the U.S. Department of Labor or successor agency for the 12 months preceding the previous September 1 or by five percent, whichever is smaller, on January 1 of the next calendar year if two of the following occur:

(A) The Commissioner of Taxes' report indicates that the inflation-adjusted revenues from the sales tax imposed pursuant to 32 V.S.A. § 9771 and the use tax imposed pursuant to 32 V.S.A. § 9773 for the 12-month period ending on September 30 of that year have decreased by two percent or more relative to the revenues from the sales tax and use tax for the 12-month period ending on September 30 of the previous year.

(B) The official State revenue estimate for the General Fund in the current or next fiscal year is reduced by two percent or more.

(C) The seasonally adjusted unemployment rate (U-3) for the State is equal to or greater than five percent for any single month between April 1 and September 30 of the current calendar year.

Third: In Sec. 5, report on increases for Medicaid participating providers, in the first sentence, after “On or before December 15,” by striking out “2019” and inserting in lieu thereof “2021”

Fourth: In Sec. 5, report on increases for Medicaid participating providers, in the first sentence, after “the projected costs for fiscal years” by striking out “2020 and 2021” and inserting in lieu thereof “2022 and 2023”

Sixth: In Sec. 7, report on inflation index for minimum wage rate, in the first sentence, after “On or before January 15,” by striking out “2023” and inserting in lieu thereof “2021”

Seventh: In Sec. 7, report on inflation index for minimum wage rate, in the first sentence, by striking out “after 2024”

Pending the question, Shall the report of the Committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs, as amended, be amended as offered by Rep. Browning of Arlington? **Rep. Donahue of Northfield** demanded the Yeas and Nays, which demand was sustained by the Constitutional number. The Clerk proceeded to call the roll and the question, Shall the Report of the Committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs, as amended, be amended as offered by Rep. Browning of Arlington? was decided in the negative. Yeas, 39. Nays, 105.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Bancroft of Westford	Hango of Berkshire	Page of Newport City
Batchelor of Derby	Harrison of Chittenden	Palasik of Milton
Brennan of Colchester	Helm of Fair Haven	Quimby of Concord
Browning of Arlington *	Higley of Lowell	Rosenquist of Georgia
Canfield of Fair Haven	LaClair of Barre Town	Savage of Swanton
Cupoli of Rutland City	Lefebvre of Newark	Scheuermann of Stowe
Donahue of Northfield *	Leffler of Enosburgh	Seymour of Sutton
Fagan of Rutland City	Martel of Waterford	Shaw of Pittsford
Fegard of Berkshire	McCoy of Poultney	Smith of New Haven
Gamache of Swanton	McFaun of Barre Town	Strong of Albany
Goslant of Northfield	Morgan of Milton	Sullivan of Dorset
Graham of Williamstown	Morrissey of Bennington	Terenzini of Rutland Town
Gregoire of Fairfield	Norris of Shoreham	Toof of St. Albans Town

Those who voted in the negative are:

Ancel of Calais	Feltus of Lyndon	Notte of Rutland City
Anthony of Barre City	Gardner of Richmond	Noyes of Wolcott
Austin of Colchester	Giambatista of Essex	O'Brien of Tunbridge
Bartholomew of Hartland	Grad of Moretown	Ode of Burlington
Bates of Bennington	Haas of Rochester	O'Sullivan of Burlington
Beck of St. Johnsbury	Hashim of Dummerston	Pajala of Londonderry
Birong of Vergennes	Hill of Wolcott	Partridge of Windham
Bock of Chester	Hooper of Montpelier	Patt of Worcester
Briglin of Thetford	Hooper of Randolph	Potter of Clarendon
Brownell of Pownal	Hooper of Burlington	Pugh of South Burlington
Brumsted of Shelburne	Houghton of Essex	Rachelson of Burlington
Burditt of West Rutland	Howard of Rutland City	Ralph of Hartland
Burke of Brattleboro	James of Manchester	Redmond of Essex
Campbell of St. Johnsbury	Jerome of Brandon	Rogers of Waterville
Carroll of Bennington	Jessup of Middlesex	Scheu of Middlebury
Chase of Colchester	Jickling of Randolph	Sheldon of Middlebury
Chesnut-Tangerman of Middletown Springs	Killacky of South Burlington	Smith of Derby
Christensen of Weathersfield	Kimbell of Woodstock	Squirrell of Underhill
Christie of Hartford	Kitzmiller of Montpelier	Stevens of Waterbury
Cina of Burlington	Kornheiser of Brattleboro	Sullivan of Burlington
Coffey of Guilford	Krowinski of Burlington	Szott of Barnard
Colburn of Burlington	LaLonde of South Burlington	Taylor of Colchester
		Till of Jericho

Colston of Winooski	Lanpher of Vergennes	Toleno of Brattleboro
Conlon of Cornwall	Lippert of Hinesburg	Toll of Danville
Conquest of Newbury	Long of Newfane	Townsend of South
Copeland-Hanzas of Bradford	Macaig of Williston	Burlington
Corcoran of Bennington	Marcotte of Coventry	Trieber of Rockingham
Cordes of Lincoln	Masland of Thetford	Troiano of Stannard
Demrow of Corinth	Mattos of Milton	Walz of Barre City
Dolan of Waitsfield	McCarthy of St. Albans City	Webb of Shelburne
Donovan of Burlington	McCormack of Burlington	White of Hartford
Durfee of Shaftsbury	McCullough of Williston	Wood of Waterbury
Elder of Starksboro	Mrowicki of Putney	Yacovone of Morristown
Emmons of Springfield	Murphy of Fairfax	Yantachka of Charlotte
	Myers of Essex	Young of Greensboro
	Nicoll of Ludlow	

Those members absent with leave of the House and not voting are:

Dickinson of St. Albans Town	Gannon of Wilmington Gonzalez of Winooski	Sibilia of Dover
---------------------------------	--	------------------

Rep. Browning of Arlington explained her vote as follows:

“Madam Speaker:

I vote yes for a gradual and cautious approach to further increases in the minimum wage. It is important for the labor market and businesses to have time to absorb these increases so that some of the Vermonters we are trying to help are not hurt through loss of hours or loss of jobs.”

Rep. Donahue of Northfield explained her vote as follows:

“Madam Speaker:

I would like to support an increase in our minimum wage if done cautiously, with due attention to potential negative economic impacts that actually hurt workers. This amendment does that, so I vote yes.”

Pending the question, Shall the House propose to the Senate to amend the bill as recommended by the committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs, as amended? **Rep. Wood of Waterbury** moved to amend the proposal of amendment as recommended by the committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs, as amended, as follows:

By striking out Sec. 5 in its entirety and inserting in lieu thereof a new Sec. 5 to read as follows:

Sec. 5. INCREASES FOR EMPLOYEES OF CERTAIN MEDICAID-
PARTICIPATING PROVIDERS AND INDEPENDENT DIRECT
SUPPORT PROVIDERS; REPORT

(a) On or before December 15, 2019, the Secretary of Human Services, in consultation with the Joint Fiscal Office and relevant service providers, shall submit a written report to the House Committees on Appropriations, on General, Housing, and Military Affairs, on Health Care, and on Human Services and the Senate Committees on Appropriations, on Economic Development, Housing and General Affairs, and on Health and Welfare regarding the projected costs for fiscal years 2020 and 2021 of increasing Medicaid reimbursement rates to:

(1) Medicaid participating providers, including designated agencies, specialized service agencies, home health agencies, nursing homes, residential care homes, assisted living residences, and adult day agencies, by an amount necessary to facilitate the payment of wages to their employees who are providing services pursuant to the State Medicaid Program that are equal to at least the minimum wage set forth in 21 V.S.A. § 384; and

(2) independent direct support providers who are providing home- and community-based services pursuant to the State Medicaid Program to facilitate the payment of wages to those independent direct support providers that are equal to at least the minimum wage set forth in 21 V.S.A. § 384.

(b)(1) On or before August 15, 2019, the Secretary of Human Services shall request any documentation of wages and related costs that the Secretary determines to be necessary to develop the projections required pursuant to subsection (a) of this section from:

(A) Medicaid participating providers with employees who are providing services pursuant to the State Medicaid Program and earn wages that are at or near the minimum wage set forth in 21 V.S.A. § 384; and

(B) any fiscal services agency providing payroll services in relation to independent direct support providers who are providing home- and community-based services pursuant to the State Medicaid Program.

(2) Service providers and fiscal services agencies shall, on or before October 15, 2019, provide to the Secretary the documentation requested pursuant to subdivision (1) of this subsection.

(3) Any service provider that fails to provide the information requested by the Secretary pursuant to this subsection shall forfeit the right in fiscal years 2020 and 2021 to any increase in Medicaid reimbursement rates that is proposed pursuant to subsection (a) of this section.

Pending the question, Shall the Report of the Committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs, as amended, be amended as offered by Rep. Wood of Waterbury? **Rep. McCoy of Poultney** demanded the Yeas and Nays, which demand was sustained by the Constitutional number. The Clerk

proceeded to call the roll and the question, Shall the Report of the Committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs, as amended, be amended as offered by Rep. Wood of Waterbury? was decided in the affirmative. Yeas, 144. Nays, 0.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Ancel of Calais	Goslant of Northfield	Notte of Rutland City
Anthony of Barre City	Grad of Moretown	Noyes of Wolcott
Austin of Colchester	Graham of Williamstown	O'Brien of Tunbridge
Bancroft of Westford	Gregoire of Fairfield	Ode of Burlington
Bartholomew of Hartland	Haas of Rochester	O'Sullivan of Burlington
Batchelor of Derby	Hango of Berkshire	Page of Newport City
Bates of Bennington	Harrison of Chittenden	Pajala of Londonderry
Beck of St. Johnsbury	Hashim of Dummerston	Palasik of Milton
Birong of Vergennes	Helm of Fair Haven	Partridge of Windham
Bock of Chester	Higley of Lowell	Patt of Worcester
Brennan of Colchester	Hill of Wolcott	Potter of Clarendon
Briglin of Thetford	Hooper of Montpelier	Pugh of South Burlington
Brownell of Pownal	Hooper of Randolph	Quimby of Concord
Browning of Arlington	Hooper of Burlington	Rachelson of Burlington
Brumsted of Shelburne	Houghton of Essex	Ralph of Hartland
Burditt of West Rutland	Howard of Rutland City	Redmond of Essex
Burke of Brattleboro	James of Manchester	Rogers of Waterville
Campbell of St. Johnsbury	Jerome of Brandon	Rosenquist of Georgia
Canfield of Fair Haven	Jessup of Middlesex	Savage of Swanton
Carroll of Bennington	Jickling of Randolph	Scheu of Middlebury
Chase of Colchester	Killacky of South Burlington	Scheuermann of Stowe
Chesnut-Tangerman of Middletown Springs	Kimbell of Woodstock	Seymour of Sutton
Christensen of Weathersfield	Kitzmiller of Montpelier	Shaw of Pittsford
Christie of Hartford	Kornheiser of Brattleboro	Sheldon of Middlebury
Cina of Burlington	Krowinski of Burlington	Smith of Derby
Coffey of Guilford	LaClair of Barre Town	Smith of New Haven
Colburn of Burlington	LaLonde of South Burlington	Squirrell of Underhill
Colston of Winooski	Lanpher of Vergennes	Stevens of Waterbury
Conlon of Cornwall	Lefebvre of Newark	Strong of Albany
Conquest of Newbury	Leffler of Enosburgh	Sullivan of Dorset
Copeland-Hanzas of Bradford	Lippert of Hinesburg	Sullivan of Burlington
Corcoran of Bennington	Long of Newfane	Szott of Barnard
Cordes of Lincoln	Macaig of Williston	Taylor of Colchester
Cupoli of Rutland City	Marcotte of Coventry	Terenzini of Rutland Town
Demrow of Corinth	Martel of Waterford	Till of Jericho
Dolan of Waitsfield	Masland of Thetford	Toleno of Brattleboro
Donahue of Northfield	Mattos of Milton	Toll of Danville
Donovan of Burlington	McCarthy of St. Albans City	Toof of St. Albans Town
Durfee of Shaftsbury	McCormack of Burlington	Townsend of South Burlington
Elder of Starksboro	McCoy of Poultney	Trieber of Rockingham
Emmons of Springfield	McCullough of Williston	Troiano of Stannard
Fagan of Rutland City	McFaun of Barre Town	Walz of Barre City
	Morgan of Milton	Webb of Shelburne

Fegard of Berkshire	Morrissey of Bennington	White of Hartford
Feltus of Lyndon	Mrowicki of Putney	Wood of Waterbury
Gamache of Swanton	Murphy of Fairfax	Yacovone of Morristown
Gardner of Richmond	Myers of Essex	Yantachka of Charlotte
Giambatista of Essex	Nicoll of Ludlow	Young of Greensboro
	Norris of Shoreham	

Those who voted in the negative are: none

Those members absent with leave of the House and not voting are:

Dickinson of St. Albans Town	Gannon of Wilmington Gonzalez of Winooski	Sibilia of Dover
---------------------------------	--	------------------

Pending the question, Shall the House propose to the Senate to amend the bill as recommended by the committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs, as amended? **Rep. Chesnut-Tangerman of Middletown Springs** moved to amend the proposal of amendment as recommended by the committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs, as amended, as follows:

First: In Sec. 1, 21 V.S.A. § 384, by striking out subdivision (a)(1) in its entirety and inserting in lieu thereof a new subdivision (a)(1) to read as follows:

(a)(1) An employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$9.15. ~~Beginning on January 1, 2016, an employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$9.60. Beginning on January 1, 2017, an employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$10.00. Beginning on January 1, 2018, an employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$10.50, and beginning \$10.78. Beginning on January 1, 2019 2020, an employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$11.50. Beginning on January 1, 2021, an employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$12.25. Beginning on January 1, 2022, an employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$13.10. Beginning on January 1, 2023, an employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$14.05. Beginning on January 1, 2024, an employer shall not employ any employee at a rate of less than \$15.00,~~ and on each subsequent January 1, the minimum wage rate shall be increased by five percent or the percentage increase of the Consumer Price Index, CPI-U, U.S. city average, not seasonally adjusted, or successor index, as calculated by the U.S. Department of Labor or successor agency for the 12 months preceding the previous September 1, whichever is smaller, but in no event shall the minimum wage be decreased. The minimum wage shall be rounded off to the nearest \$0.01.

Second: By striking out Sec. 5 in its entirety and inserting in lieu thereof Secs. 5 and 5a to read as follows:

Sec. 5. INCREASES FOR EMPLOYEES OF CERTAIN MEDICAID-
PARTICIPATING PROVIDERS; APPROPRIATION

(a) In order to increase Medicaid reimbursement rates to home health agencies, nursing homes, residential care homes, assisted living residences, and adult day agencies by \$3,305,646.00 in fiscal year 2020 to facilitate the payment of wages to their employees who are providing health care services pursuant to the State Medicaid Program that are equal to at least the minimum wage set forth in 21 V.S.A. § 384 and to mitigate wage compression for employees of those service providers who are in occupations with a starting wage rate within \$1.00 of the minimum wage:

(1) \$874,894.00 is appropriated in fiscal year 2020 from the General Fund to the Department of Vermont Health Access;

(2) \$1,021,691.00 is appropriated in fiscal year 2020 from federal funds to the Department of Vermont Health Access; and

(3) the Secretary of Human Services shall redirect to the Medicaid programs identified in this subsection an estimated \$650,000.00 of State funds and any related federal matching funds from savings experienced by programs within the Agency of Human Services as a result of the increase in the minimum wage on January 1, 2020.

(b) On or before November 15, 2019, the Department of Vermont Health Access shall submit a written report to the Joint Fiscal Committee regarding the adequacy of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, and any additional appropriation that may be necessary during fiscal year 2020.

Sec. 5a. INCREASES FOR EMPLOYEES OF CERTAIN MEDICAID-
PARTICIPATING PROVIDERS; PROJECTIONS; REPORT

On or before December 1, 2019, the Secretary of Human Services, in consultation with the Joint Fiscal Office and relevant service providers, shall submit a written report to the House Committees on Appropriations, on General, Housing, and Military Affairs, on Health Care, and on Human Services and the Senate Committees on Appropriations, on Economic Development, Housing and General Affairs, and on Health and Welfare regarding the projected costs for fiscal years 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024 of increasing Medicaid reimbursement rates to all Medicaid participating providers, including designated agencies, specialized service agencies, home health agencies, nursing homes, residential care homes, assisted living residences, and adult day agencies, by an amount necessary to facilitate the payment of wages to their employees who are providing services pursuant to

the State Medicaid Program that are equal to at least the minimum wage set forth in 21 V.S.A. § 384 and to mitigate wage compression for employees providing services pursuant to the State Medicaid Program who are in occupations with a starting wage rate within \$1.00 of the minimum wage.

Thereupon, **Rep. Cina of Burlington** asked that the question be divided and that the first instance of amendment be taken first and the second instance of amendment be taken second..

Pending the question, Shall the Report of the Committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs, as amended, be amended as offered by Rep. Chesnut-Tangerman of Middletown Springs in the first instance of amendment? **Rep. Cina of Burlington** demanded the Yeas and Nays, which demand was sustained by the Constitutional number. The Clerk proceeded to call the roll and the question, Shall the report of the Committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs, as amended, be amended as offered by Rep. Chesnut-Tangerman of Middletown Springs in the first instance of amendment? was decided in the negative. Yeas, 21. Nays, 121.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Anthony of Barre City	Donovan of Burlington	Rachelson of Burlington
Brownell of Pownal	Haas of Rochester	Ralph of Hartland
Burke of Brattleboro	Hashim of Dummerston	Sullivan of Burlington
Chesnut-Tangerman of Middletown Springs	Hooper of Burlington *	Szott of Barnard
Cina of Burlington	Macaig of Williston	Till of Jericho
Colburn of Burlington	Mrowicki of Putney	Yacovone of Morristown
Cordes of Lincoln *	Nicoll of Ludlow	
	O'Sullivan of Burlington	

Those who voted in the negative are:

Ancel of Calais	Grad of Moretown	Notte of Rutland City
Austin of Colchester	Graham of Williamstown	Noyes of Wolcott
Bancroft of Westford	Gregoire of Fairfield	O'Brien of Tunbridge
Bartholomew of Hartland	Hango of Berkshire	Ode of Burlington
Batchelor of Derby	Harrison of Chittenden	Page of Newport City
Bates of Bennington	Helm of Fair Haven	Pajala of Londonderry
Beck of St. Johnsbury	Higley of Lowell	Palasik of Milton
Birong of Vergennes	Hill of Wolcott	Partridge of Windham
Bock of Chester	Hooper of Montpelier	Patt of Worcester
Brennan of Colchester	Hooper of Randolph	Potter of Clarendon
Briglin of Thetford	Houghton of Essex	Pugh of South Burlington
Browning of Arlington	Howard of Rutland City	Quimby of Concord
Brumsted of Shelburne	James of Manchester	Redmond of Essex
Burditt of West Rutland	Jerome of Brandon	Rogers of Waterville
Campbell of St. Johnsbury	Jessup of Middlesex	Rosenquist of Georgia
Canfield of Fair Haven	Jickling of Randolph	Savage of Swanton
Carroll of Bennington	Killacky of South Burlington	Scheu of Middlebury
Chase of Colchester	Kimbell of Woodstock	Scheuermann of Stowe

Christensen of Weathersfield	Kitzmiller of Montpelier	Seymour of Sutton
Christie of Hartford	Kornheiser of Brattleboro	Shaw of Pittsford
Coffey of Guilford	Krowinski of Burlington	Sheldon of Middlebury
Colston of Winooski	LaClair of Barre Town	Smith of Derby
Conlon of Cornwall	LaLonde of South	Smith of New Haven
Conquest of Newbury	Burlington	Squirrell of Underhill
Copeland-Hanzas of Bradford	Lanpher of Vergennes	Stevens of Waterbury
Corcoran of Bennington	Lefebvre of Newark	Strong of Albany
Cupoli of Rutland City	Leffler of Enosburgh	Sullivan of Dorset
Demrow of Corinth	Lippert of Hinesburg	Taylor of Colchester
Dolan of Waitsfield	Long of Newfane	Terenzini of Rutland Town
Donahue of Northfield	Martel of Waterford	Toleno of Brattleboro
Durfee of Shaftsbury	Masland of Thetford	Toof of St. Albans Town
Elder of Starksboro	Mattos of Milton	Townsend of South Burlington
Emmons of Springfield	McCarthy of St. Albans City	Trieber of Rockingham
Fagan of Rutland City	McCormack of Burlington	Troiano of Stannard
Fegard of Berkshire	McCoy of Poultney	Walz of Barre City
Feltus of Lyndon	McCullough of Williston	Webb of Shelburne
Gamache of Swanton	McFaun of Barre Town	White of Hartford
Gardner of Richmond	Morgan of Milton	Wood of Waterbury
Giambatista of Essex	Morrissey of Bennington	Yantachka of Charlotte *
Goslant of Northfield	Murphy of Fairfax	Young of Greensboro
	Myers of Essex	
	Norris of Shoreham	

Those members absent with leave of the House and not voting are:

Dickinson of St. Albans Town	Gonzalez of Winooski	Toll of Danville
Gannon of Wilmington	Marcotte of Coventry	
	Sibilia of Dover	

Rep. Cordes of Lincoln explained her vote as follows:

“Madam Speaker:

Minimum wage is a women’s issue. The majority of Medicaid service caregivers are women who are still struggling with pay inequity. ‘It’ll be the year 3888 before [women] make a buck.’ (Laurie Anderson - ‘Beautiful Red Dress’)

Minimum wage is a dignity issue. Many of our friends, including those in our own State House who serve us food, need food stamps to make ends meet.

Raising the minimum wage as soon as possible is just one imperative step we must take to lift up the vulnerable, improve our economy, and reverse the ever-widening income and wealth gap.”

Rep. Hooper of Burlington explained his vote as follows:

“Madam Speaker:

I support putting money in Vermonters pockets. Clearly trickle down does not work. The largest employer in the state has a \$15 hiring rate in 2020. This will be an economic boost for Chittenden County businesses large and small. It will happen next year so to my mind this body delaying full implementation so much longer is ill advised.”

Rep. Yantachka of Charlotte explained his vote as follows:

“Madam Speaker:

Every Vermonter who works 40 hours per week deserves to be paid enough to pay the rent, heat their home, feed and clothe their family, and get to and from work. They deserve a livable wage today, not by 2024 or 2026. I support what this amendment is trying to do. However, we live within the reality of this building, and, based on what we're hearing from the Governor, adopting this amendment will likely prevent any increase in the minimum wage from becoming law. So, as much as I would like to vote YES on this amendment, I have to vote NO to improve our chances to get more money into the pockets of those at the bottom of the pay scale sooner than later.”

Pending the question, Shall the report of the Committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs, as amended, be amended as offered by Rep. Chesnut-Tangerman of Middletown Springs in the second instance? **Rep. Colburn of Burlington** demanded the Yeas and Nays, which demand was sustained by the Constitutional number. The Clerk proceeded to call the roll and the question, Shall the Report of the Committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs, as amended, be amended as offered by Rep. Chesnut-Tangerman of Middletown Springs in the second instance? was decided in the negative. Yeas, 20. Nays, 122.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Anthony of Barre City	Colburn of Burlington	Pajala of Londonderry
Brownell of Pownal	Cordes of Lincoln	Rachelson of Burlington
Burke of Brattleboro	Donovan of Burlington	Ralph of Hartland
Chesnut-Tangerman of Middletown Springs *	Haas of Rochester	Szott of Barnard
Christensen of Weathersfield	Jickling of Randolph	Till of Jericho
Cina of Burlington	Noyes of Wolcott	Wood of Waterbury
	Page of Newport City	Yacovone of Morristown

Those who voted in the negative are:

Ancel of Calais	Gregoire of Fairfield	Notte of Rutland City
Austin of Colchester	Hango of Berkshire	O'Brien of Tunbridge
Bancroft of Westford	Harrison of Chittenden	Ode of Burlington
Bartholomew of Hartland	Hashim of Dummerston	O'Sullivan of Burlington
Batchelor of Derby	Helm of Fair Haven	Palasik of Milton
Bates of Bennington	Hill of Wolcott	Partridge of Windham
Beck of St. Johnsbury	Hooper of Montpelier	Patt of Worcester

Birong of Vergennes	Hooper of Randolph	Potter of Clarendon
Bock of Chester	Hooper of Burlington	Pugh of South Burlington
Brennan of Colchester	Houghton of Essex	Quimby of Concord
Briglin of Thetford	Howard of Rutland City	Redmond of Essex
Browning of Arlington	James of Manchester	Rogers of Waterville
Brumsted of Shelburne	Jerome of Brandon	Rosenquist of Georgia
Burditt of West Rutland	Jessup of Middlesex	Savage of Swanton
Campbell of St. Johnsbury	Killacky of South Burlington	Scheu of Middlebury
Canfield of Fair Haven	Kitzmiller of Montpelier	Scheuermann of Stowe
Carroll of Bennington	Kornheiser of Brattleboro	Seymour of Sutton
Chase of Colchester	Krowinski of Burlington	Shaw of Pittsford
Christie of Hartford	LaClair of Barre Town	Sheldon of Middlebury
Coffey of Guilford	LaLonde of South Burlington	Smith of Derby
Colston of Winooski	Lanpher of Vergennes	Smith of New Haven
Conlon of Cornwall	Lefebvre of Newark	Squirrell of Underhill
Conquest of Newbury	Leffler of Enosburgh	Stevens of Waterbury
Copeland-Hanzas of Bradford	Lippert of Hinesburg	Strong of Albany
Corcoran of Bennington	Long of Newfane	Sullivan of Dorset
Cupoli of Rutland City	Macaig of Williston	Sullivan of Burlington
Demrow of Corinth	Marcotte of Coventry	Taylor of Colchester
Dolan of Waitsfield	Martel of Waterford	Terenzini of Rutland Town
Donahue of Northfield	Masland of Thetford	Toleno of Brattleboro
Durfee of Shaftsbury	Mattos of Milton	Toll of Danville
Elder of Starksboro	McCarthy of St. Albans City	Toof of St. Albans Town
Emmons of Springfield	McCormack of Burlington	Townsend of South Burlington
Fagan of Rutland City	McCoy of Poultney	Trieber of Rockingham
Fegard of Berkshire	McCullough of Williston	Troiano of Stannard
Feltus of Lyndon	McFaun of Barre Town	Walz of Barre City
Gamache of Swanton	Morgan of Milton	Webb of Shelburne
Gardner of Richmond	Morrissey of Bennington	White of Hartford
Giambatista of Essex	Mrowicki of Putney	Yantachka of Charlotte
Goslant of Northfield	Murphy of Fairfax	Young of Greensboro
Grad of Moretown	Myers of Essex	
Graham of Williamstown	Nicoll of Ludlow	
	Norris of Shoreham	

Those members absent with leave of the House and not voting are:

Dickinson of St. Albans Town	Gonzalez of Winooski	Sibilia of Dover
Gannon of Wilmington	Higley of Lowell	
	Kimbell of Woodstock	

Rep. Chesnut-Tangerman of Middletown Springs explained his vote as follows:

“Madam Speaker:

I want to thank the body for this debate. This is critical and will be ongoing. It is important that we continue to push for a more livable state and a livable wage. Thank you all.”

Thereupon, the proposal of amendment as recommended by the committee on General, Housing, and Military Affairs, as amended, was agreed to.

Pending the question, Shall the bill be read a third time? **Rep. McCoy of Poultney** demanded the Yeas and Nays, which demand was sustained by the Constitutional number. The Clerk proceeded to call the roll and the question, Shall the bill be read a third time? was decided in the affirmative. Yeas, 90. Nays, 53.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Ancel of Calais	Durfee of Shaftsbury	Mrowicki of Putney
Anthony of Barre City	Elder of Starksboro	Nicoll of Ludlow
Austin of Colchester	Emmons of Springfield	O'Brien of Tunbridge
Bartholomew of Hartland	Gardner of Richmond	Ode of Burlington *
Bates of Bennington	Giambatista of Essex	O'Sullivan of Burlington
Birong of Vergennes	Grad of Moretown	Partridge of Windham
Bock of Chester	Haas of Rochester	Patt of Worcester
Briglin of Thetford	Hashim of Dummerston	Potter of Clarendon
Brownell of Pownal	Hill of Wolcott	Pugh of South Burlington
Brumsted of Shelburne	Hooper of Montpelier	Rachelson of Burlington
Burke of Brattleboro	Hooper of Randolph	Redmond of Essex
Campbell of St. Johnsbury	Hooper of Burlington	Scheu of Middlebury
Carroll of Bennington	Houghton of Essex	Sheldon of Middlebury
Chase of Colchester	Howard of Rutland City	Squirrell of Underhill
Chesnut-Tangerman of Middletown Springs	James of Manchester	Stevens of Waterbury
Christensen of Weathersfield	Jerome of Brandon	Sullivan of Dorset *
Christie of Hartford	Jessup of Middlesex	Sullivan of Burlington
Cina of Burlington	Jickling of Randolph	Szott of Barnard
Coffey of Guilford	Killacky of South Burlington	Taylor of Colchester
Colburn of Burlington *	Kitzmiller of Montpelier	Till of Jericho
Colston of Winooski	Kornheiser of Brattleboro	Toleno of Brattleboro
Conlon of Cornwall	Krowinski of Burlington *	Toll of Danville
Conquest of Newbury	LaLonde of South Burlington	Townsend of South Burlington
Copeland-Hanzas of Bradford	Lanpher of Vergennes	Trieber of Rockingham
Corcoran of Bennington	Lippert of Hinesburg	Troiano of Stannard
Cordes of Lincoln	Long of Newfane	Walz of Barre City
Demrow of Corinth	Macaig of Williston	Webb of Shelburne
Dolan of Waitsfield	Masland of Thetford	White of Hartford *
Donovan of Burlington	McCarthy of St. Albans City	Yacovone of Morristown
	McCormack of Burlington	Yantachka of Charlotte
	McCullough of Williston	

Those who voted in the negative are:

Bancroft of Westford	Helm of Fair Haven	Pajala of Londonderry
Batchelor of Derby	Higley of Lowell	Palasik of Milton
Beck of St. Johnsbury	LaClair of Barre Town	Quimby of Concord
Brennan of Colchester	Lefebvre of Newark	Ralph of Hartland *

Browning of Arlington	Leffler of Enosburgh *	Rogers of Waterville
Burditt of West Rutland	Marcotte of Coventry	Rosenquist of Georgia
Canfield of Fair Haven	Martel of Waterford	Savage of Swanton
Cupoli of Rutland City	Mattos of Milton	Scheuermann of Stowe
Donahue of Northfield	McCoy of Poultney	Seymour of Sutton
Fagan of Rutland City	McFaun of Barre Town	Shaw of Pittsford
Fegard of Berkshire	Morgan of Milton	Smith of Derby
Feltus of Lyndon	Morrissey of Bennington	Smith of New Haven
Gamache of Swanton	Murphy of Fairfax	Strong of Albany
Goslant of Northfield	Myers of Essex	Terenzini of Rutland Town
Graham of Williamstown	Norris of Shoreham	Toof of St. Albans Town
Gregoire of Fairfield	Notte of Rutland City	Wood of Waterbury *
Hango of Berkshire	Noyes of Wolcott	Young of Greensboro
Harrison of Chittenden	Page of Newport City	

Those members absent with leave of the House and not voting are:

Dickinson of St. Albans Town	Gannon of Wilmington	Kimbell of Woodstock
	Gonzalez of Winooski	Sibilia of Dover

Rep. Colburn of Burlington explained her vote as follows:

“Madam Speaker:

I voted against amendments to dilute a minimum wage increase and for amendments to get us to a livable wage sooner. At the end of the day, I can’t oppose a wage increase that is an improvement on current law. That said, we can and should do better than this for working Vermonters. This work is not over.”

Rep. Krowinski of Burlington explained her vote as follows:

“Madam Speaker:

I vote yes. When Vermonters have more money in their pockets, working families have more to invest back into our local economy, growing jobs and creating economic opportunity in all of Vermont’s 14 counties. Raising the minimum wage will help us grow an economy that works for everyone, not just a select few.”

Rep. Leffler of Enosburgh explained her vote as follows:

“Madam Speaker:

I voted against this bill because I refuse to ignore the harm implicit in this bill to our small towns and small businesses and most importantly Vermonters.

If, as previously mentioned today, it is the will of this body to have money in Vermonters’ pockets, I seriously suggest we start by leaving the money already there alone.”

Rep. Ode of Burlington explained her vote as follows:

“Madam Speaker:

Raising the minimum wage will help lift tens of thousands of working Vermonters out of poverty.

It will result in increased income tax revenue for the State of Vermont and it will reduce dependency on state programs that support low income families.

Raising the minimum wage is good for Vermont’s workers, Vermont’s families, Vermont’s businesses (helping to prevent expensive employee turnover), and Vermont’s economy.”

Rep. Ralph of Hartland explained his vote as follows:

“Madam Speaker:

I support minimum wage and am willing to take the risks associated with a wage hike on our economy and businesses because I strongly support all efforts to bring Vermonters out of poverty and to provide an adequate income. However I cannot support this bill because with it brings all the risks but doesn’t actually mandate a livable wage in a timely fashion that could help Vermonters. As a result I am afraid this bill as is will hurt Vermonters and the Vermont economy. I’m frustrated that we would let political victories supersede the best interests of our state.”

Rep. Sullivan of Dorset explained her vote as follows:

“Madam Speaker:

Some of the biggest beneficiaries of minimum wage increases are children. Higher wages ease the grind of poverty, freeing up people’s capacity to quit. While a higher minimum wage is powerful medicine, raising the minimum wage might only be a temporary fix, so I would like to see the future discussions go to focusing on minimum income instead.”

Rep. White of Hartford explained her vote as follows:

“Madam Speaker:

More women than men are working minimum wage jobs – nationally women make up two-thirds of all minimum wage earners. Raising women’s wages would have positive impacts on Vermont’s economy and move us towards closing the wage gap which would reduce the poverty rate. I vote yes because it is the pragmatic and moral choice.”

Rep. Wood of Waterbury explained her vote as follows:

“Madam Speaker:

I am supportive of a minimum wage increase, but not at the expense of older Vermonters and people with disabilities. We must keep the promise to address the Medicaid rates.”

Action on Bill Postponed

H. 16

House bill, entitled

An act relating to boards and commissions

Was taken up and pending consideration of the Senate proposal of amendment, on motion of **Rep. Copeland-Hanzas of Bradford**, action on the bill was postponed until May 17, 2019.

Action on Bill Postponed

H. 543

House bill, entitled

An act relating to capital construction and State bonding

Was taken up and pending consideration of the Senate proposal of amendment, on motion of **Rep. Emmons of Springfield**, action on the bill was postponed until May 16, 2019.

Message from the Senate No. 60

A message was received from the Senate by Mr. Marshall, its Assistant Secretary, as follows:

Madam Speaker:

I am directed to inform the House that:

The Senate has considered House proposal of amendment to Senate bill of the following title:

S. 107. An act relating to elections corrections.

And has concurred therein with an amendment in the passage of which the concurrence of the House is requested.

The Senate has considered House proposal of amendment to the following Senate bill and has refused to concur therein and asks for a Committee of Conference upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to which the President announced the appointment as members of such Committee on the part of the Senate:

S. 110. An act relating to data privacy and consumer protection.

Senator Hooker
Senator Baruth
Senator Sirotkin

Pursuant to the request of the House for a Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on House bill entitled:

H. 536. An act relating to education finance.

The President announced the appointment as members of such Committee on the part of the Senate:

Senator Cummings
Senator MacDonald
Senator Campion

The Senate has considered House proposal of amendment to Senate proposal of amendment to House bill of the following title:

H. 518. An act relating to fair and impartial policing.

And has concurred therein with an amendment in the passage of which the concurrence of the House is requested.

**Favorable Report; Second Reading;
Third Reading Ordered**

S. 169

Rep. LaLonde of South Burlington, for the committee on Judiciary, to which had been referred Senate bill, entitled

An act relating to firearms procedures

Reported in favor of its passage in concurrence

The bill, having appeared on the Calendar one day for Notice, was taken up and read the second time.

Pending the question, Shall the bill be read a third time? **Rep. Savage of Swanton** moved that the House propose to the Senate to amend the bill as follows:

By adding a Sec. 1a to read as follows:

Sec. 1a. 13 V.S.A. § 4017 is amended to read:

§ 4017. PERSONS PROHIBITED FROM POSSESSING FIREARMS;
CONVICTION OF VIOLENT CRIME

(a) A person shall not possess a firearm if the person has been convicted of a violent crime.

* * *

(d) As used in this section:

* * *

(3) “Violent crime” means:

(A)(i) A listed crime as defined in subdivision 5301(7) of this title other than:

* * *

(V) leaving the scene of an accident resulting in serious bodily injury or death as defined in 23 V.S.A. § 1128(b) or (c); or

(VI) a violation of section 1030 of this title (violation of abuse prevention order) committed before July 1, 2015; or

(VII) a misdemeanor violation of chapter 28 of this title, relating to abuse, neglect, and exploitation of vulnerable adults; or

* * *

Thereupon, **Rep Savage of Swanton** asked and was granted leave of the House to withdraw the amendment.

Pending the question, Shall the bill be read a third time? **Reps. Brennan of Colchester and Higley of Lowell** moved that the House propose to the Senate to amend the bill as follows:

In Sec. 3, 13 V.S.A. § 4019a, by adding a new subsection (d) to read as follows:

(d)(1) This section shall not apply if the proposed seller is a licensed firearms dealer under 18 U.S.C. § 923, and:

(A) the proposed seller has a written record indicating that the proposed purchaser has previously purchased a firearm from the proposed seller; or

(B) the proposed seller contacts another person in Vermont who is a licensed firearms dealer under 18 U.S.C. § 923, and that person tells the proposed seller that he or she has a written record indicating that the proposed purchaser has previously purchased a firearm from him or her.

(2) A person shall not knowingly make a false statement or provide false information to a licensed dealer with the intent to deceive the dealer regarding the person’s previous firearms purchases. A person who violates this subdivision shall be punished under subsection (b) of this section.

Which was disagreed to.

Pending the question, Shall the bill be read a third time? **Reps. McFaun of Barre Town, Anthony of Barre City and LaClair of Barre Town** moved that the House propose to the Senate to amend the bill as follows:

In Sec. 3, 13 V.S.A. § 4019a, by adding a new subsection (d) to read as follows:

(d)(1) This section shall not apply to a firearm transferred:

(A) at a gun show; or

(B) by a raffle conducted at a banquet sponsored by an organization or club.

(2) As used in this subsection, “gun show” means an event at which:

(A) 25 or more firearms are offered or exhibited for sale, transfer, or exchange to the public; and

(B) two or more persons are exhibiting one or more firearms for sale, transfer, or exchange to the public.

Pending the question, Shall the House propose to the Senate to amend the bill as offered by Rep. McFaun of Barre Town? **Rep. McFaun of Barre Town** demanded the Yeas and Nays, which demand was sustained by the Constitutional number. The Clerk proceeded to call the roll and the question, Shall the House propose to the Senate to amend the bill as offered by Rep. McFaun of Barre Town? was decided in the negative. Yeas, 56. Nays, 81.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Anthony of Barre City
Bancroft of Westford
Batchelor of Derby
Bates of Bennington
Beck of St. Johnsbury
Bock of Chester
Brennan of Colchester
Brownell of Pownal
Browning of Arlington
Canfield of Fair Haven
Chase of Colchester
Conquest of Newbury
Cupoli of Rutland City
Demrow of Corinth
Donahue of Northfield
Fagan of Rutland City
Fegard of Berkshire
Gamache of Swanton
Goslant of Northfield

Graham of Williamstown
Hango of Berkshire
Harrison of Chittenden
Helm of Fair Haven
Higley of Lowell
Hooper of Randolph
Jickling of Randolph
LaClair of Barre Town
Lefebvre of Newark
Leffler of Enosburgh
Marcotte of Coventry
Martel of Waterford
Mattos of Milton
McCoy of Poultney
McFaun of Barre Town
Morgan of Milton
Morrisey of Bennington
Murphy of Fairfax
Myers of Essex

Norris of Shoreham
Page of Newport City
Pajala of Londonderry
Palasik of Milton
Potter of Clarendon
Quimby of Concord
Rogers of Waterville
Rosenquist of Georgia
Savage of Swanton
Scheuermann of Stowe
Seymour of Sutton
Shaw of Pittsford
Smith of Derby
Smith of New Haven
Strong of Albany
Terenzini of Rutland Town
Toof of St. Albans Town
Yacovone of Morristown

Those who voted in the negative are:

Ancel of Calais	Gardner of Richmond	O'Brien of Tunbridge
Austin of Colchester	Giambatista of Essex	Ode of Burlington
Bartholomew of Hartland	Grad of Moretown	O'Sullivan of Burlington
Birong of Vergennes	Haas of Rochester	Partridge of Windham
Briglin of Thetford	Hashim of Dummerston	Patt of Worcester
Brumsted of Shelburne	Hill of Wolcott	Pugh of South Burlington
Burditt of West Rutland	Hooper of Montpelier	Rachelson of Burlington
Burke of Brattleboro	Hooper of Burlington	Ralph of Hartland
Campbell of St. Johnsbury	Houghton of Essex	Redmond of Essex
Carroll of Bennington	Howard of Rutland City	Scheu of Middlebury
Chesnut-Tangerman of Middletown Springs	Jerome of Brandon	Sheldon of Middlebury
Christensen of Weathersfield	Jessup of Middlesex	Squirrell of Underhill
Christie of Hartford	Killacky of South Burlington	Stevens of Waterbury
Coffey of Guilford	Kitzmiller of Montpelier	Sullivan of Dorset
Colburn of Burlington	Kornheiser of Brattleboro	Sullivan of Burlington
Colston of Winooski	Krowinski of Burlington	Szott of Barnard
Conlon of Cornwall	LaLonde of South Burlington	Taylor of Colchester
Copeland-Hanzas of Bradford	Lanpher of Vergennes	Till of Jericho
Corcoran of Bennington	Lippert of Hinesburg	Toleno of Brattleboro
Cordes of Lincoln	Long of Newfane	Toll of Danville
Dolan of Waitsfield	Macaig of Williston	Townsend of South Burlington
Donovan of Burlington	Masland of Thetford	Troiano of Stannard
Durfee of Shaftsbury	McCarthy of St. Albans City	Walz of Barre City
Elder of Starksboro	McCormack of Burlington	White of Hartford
Emmons of Springfield	McCullough of Williston	Wood of Waterbury
Feltus of Lyndon	Mrowicki of Putney	Yantachka of Charlotte
	Nicoll of Ludlow	Young of Greensboro
	Notte of Rutland City	

Those members absent with leave of the House and not voting are:

Cina of Burlington	Gonzalez of Winooski	Noyes of Wolcott
Dickinson of St. Albans Town	Gregoire of Fairfield	Sibilia of Dover
Gannon of Wilmington	James of Manchester	Trieber of Rockingham
	Kimbell of Woodstock	Webb of Shelburne

Pending the question, Shall the bill be read a third time? **Rep. Bancroft of Westford** moved that the House propose to the Senate to amend to amend the bill as follows:

In Sec. 3, 13 V.S.A. § 4019a, by adding a new subsection (d) to read as follows:

(d) This section shall not apply if the firearm is ordered by telephone or over the Internet by a person in Vermont, or if the firearm is purchased by a Vermont resident in another state for delivery to Vermont, and it takes more

than 24 hours for the firearm to be delivered to a firearms dealer in Vermont who is licensed under 18 U.S.C. § 923.

Pending the question, Shall the House propose to the Senate to amend the bill as offered by Rep. Bancroft of Westford? **Rep. Bancroft of Westford** demanded the Yeas and Nays, which demand was sustained by the Constitutional number. The Clerk proceeded to call the roll and the question, Shall the House propose to the Senate to amend the bill as offered by Rep. Bancroft of Westford? was decided in the negative. Yeas, 50. Nays, 89.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Bancroft of Westford	Graham of Williamstown	Myers of Essex
Batchelor of Derby	Gregoire of Fairfield	Norris of Shoreham
Beck of St. Johnsbury	Hango of Berkshire	Page of Newport City
Bock of Chester	Harrison of Chittenden	Palasik of Milton
Brennan of Colchester	Helm of Fair Haven	Potter of Clarendon
Brownell of Pownal	Higley of Lowell	Quimby of Concord
Canfield of Fair Haven	Hill of Wolcott	Rosenquist of Georgia
Carroll of Bennington	LaClair of Barre Town	Savage of Swanton
Chase of Colchester	Lefebvre of Newark	Scheuermann of Stowe
Conquest of Newbury	Leffler of Enosburgh	Seymour of Sutton
Cupoli of Rutland City	Marcotte of Coventry	Shaw of Pittsford
Donahue of Northfield	Martel of Waterford	Smith of Derby
Fagan of Rutland City	Mattos of Milton	Smith of New Haven
Fegard of Berkshire	McCoy of Poultney	Strong of Albany
Feltus of Lyndon	McFaun of Barre Town	Terenzini of Rutland Town
Gamache of Swanton	Morgan of Milton	Toof of St. Albans Town
Goslant of Northfield	Morrissey of Bennington	

Those who voted in the negative are:

Ancel of Calais	Giambatista of Essex	Ode of Burlington
Anthony of Barre City	Grad of Moretown	O'Sullivan of Burlington
Austin of Colchester	Haas of Rochester	Pajala of Londonderry
Bartholomew of Hartland	Hashim of Dummerston	Partridge of Windham
Bates of Bennington	Hooper of Montpelier	Pugh of South Burlington
Birong of Vergennes	Hooper of Randolph	Rachelson of Burlington
Briglin of Thetford	Hooper of Burlington	Ralph of Hartland
Browning of Arlington	Houghton of Essex	Redmond of Essex
Brumsted of Shelburne	Howard of Rutland City	Rogers of Waterville
Burditt of West Rutland	James of Manchester	Scheu of Middlebury
Burke of Brattleboro	Jerome of Brandon	Sheldon of Middlebury
Campbell of St. Johnsbury	Jessup of Middlesex	Squirrell of Underhill
Chesnut-Tangerman of Middletown Springs	Jickling of Randolph	Stevens of Waterbury
Christensen of Weathersfield	Killacky of South Burlington	Sullivan of Dorset
Christie of Hartford	Kitzmiller of Montpelier	Sullivan of Burlington
Coffey of Guilford	Kornheiser of Brattleboro	Szott of Barnard
Colburn of Burlington	Krowinski of Burlington	Taylor of Colchester
Colston of Winooski	LaLonde of South Burlington	Till of Jericho
		Toleno of Brattleboro

Conlon of Cornwall	Lanpher of Vergennes	Toll of Danville
Copeland-Hanzas of Bradford	Lippert of Hinesburg	Townsend of South Burlington
Corcoran of Bennington	Long of Newfane	Troiano of Stannard
Cordes of Lincoln	Macaig of Williston	Walz of Barre City
Demrow of Corinth	Masland of Thetford	Webb of Shelburne
Dolan of Waitsfield	McCarthy of St. Albans City	White of Hartford
Donovan of Burlington	McCormack of Burlington	Wood of Waterbury
Durfee of Shaftsbury	McCullough of Williston	Yacovone of Morristown
Elder of Starksboro	Mrowicki of Putney	Yantachka of Charlotte
Emmons of Springfield	Murphy of Fairfax	Young of Greensboro
Gardner of Richmond	Nicoll of Ludlow	
	Notte of Rutland City	
	O'Brien of Tunbridge	

Those members absent with leave of the House and not voting are:

Cina of Burlington	Gonzalez of Winooski	Sibilia of Dover
Dickinson of St. Albans Town	Kimbell of Woodstock	Trieber of Rockingham
Gannon of Wilmington	Noyes of Wolcott	
	Patt of Worcester	

Pending the question, Shall the bill be read a third time? **Rep. Brennan of Colchester** moved that the House propose to the Senate to amend the bill as follows:

In Sec. 3, 13 V.S.A. § 4019a, by adding a new subsection (d) to read as follows:

(d) This section shall not apply if the proposed seller is a licensed firearms dealer under 18 U.S.C. § 923 and the proposed purchaser presents the proposed seller with:

(1) a currently effective abuse prevention order issued under 15 V.S.A. chapter 21 or 33 V.S.A. chapter 69, or a currently effective order against stalking or sexual assault issued under 12 V.S.A. chapter 178; or

(2) a written statement signed by a municipality's chief law enforcement officer attesting that there is an immediate risk of harm to the proposed purchaser that under the circumstances outweighs the benefits of waiting 24 hours before purchasing a firearm.

Pending the question, Shall the House propose to the Senate to amend the bill as offered by Rep. Brennan of Colchester? **Rep. Cupoli of Rutland City** demanded the Yeas and Nays, which demand was sustained by the Constitutional number. The Clerk proceeded to call the roll and the question, Shall the House propose to the Senate to amend the bill as offered by Rep. Brennan of Colchester? was decided in the negative. Yeas, 49. Nays, 93.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Bancroft of Westford	Graham of Williamstown	Norris of Shoreham
Batchelor of Derby	Gregoire of Fairfield	Page of Newport City
Beck of St. Johnsbury	Hango of Berkshire	Palasik of Milton
Bock of Chester	Harrison of Chittenden	Potter of Clarendon
Brennan of Colchester	Helm of Fair Haven	Quimby of Concord
Browning of Arlington	Higley of Lowell	Rosenquist of Georgia
Canfield of Fair Haven	LaClair of Barre Town	Savage of Swanton
Carroll of Bennington	Lefebvre of Newark	Scheuermann of Stowe
Chase of Colchester	Leffler of Enosburgh	Seymour of Sutton *
Corcoran of Bennington	Marcotte of Coventry	Shaw of Pittsford
Cupoli of Rutland City	Martel of Waterford	Smith of Derby
Donahue of Northfield	Mattos of Milton	Smith of New Haven
Fagan of Rutland City	McCoy of Poultney	Strong of Albany
Fegard of Berkshire	McFaun of Barre Town	Terenzini of Rutland Town
Feltus of Lyndon	Morgan of Milton	Toof of St. Albans Town
Gamache of Swanton	Morrissey of Bennington	
Goslant of Northfield	Myers of Essex	

Those who voted in the negative are:

Ancel of Calais	Gonzalez of Winooski	O'Brien of Tunbridge
Anthony of Barre City	Grad of Moretown	Ode of Burlington
Austin of Colchester	Haas of Rochester	O'Sullivan of Burlington
Bartholomew of Hartland	Hashim of Dummerston	Pajala of Londonderry
Bates of Bennington	Hill of Wolcott	Partridge of Windham
Birong of Vergennes	Hooper of Montpelier	Patt of Worcester
Briglin of Thetford	Hooper of Randolph	Pugh of South Burlington
Brownell of Pownal	Hooper of Burlington	Rachelson of Burlington
Brumsted of Shelburne	Houghton of Essex	Ralph of Hartland
Burditt of West Rutland	Howard of Rutland City	Redmond of Essex
Burke of Brattleboro	James of Manchester	Rogers of Waterville
Campbell of St. Johnsbury	Jerome of Brandon	Scheu of Middlebury
Chesnut-Tangerman of Middletown Springs	Jessup of Middlesex	Sheldon of Middlebury
Christensen of Weathersfield	Jickling of Randolph	Squirrell of Underhill
Christie of Hartford	Killacky of South Burlington	Stevens of Waterbury
Coffey of Guilford	Kitzmiller of Montpelier	Sullivan of Dorset
Colburn of Burlington	Kornheiser of Brattleboro	Sullivan of Burlington
Colston of Winooski	Krowinski of Burlington	Szott of Barnard
Conlon of Cornwall	LaLonde of South Burlington	Taylor of Colchester
Conquest of Newbury	Lanpher of Vergennes	Till of Jericho
Copeland-Hanzas of Bradford	Lippert of Hinesburg	Toleno of Brattleboro
Cordes of Lincoln	Long of Newfane	Toll of Danville
Demrow of Corinth	Macaig of Williston	Townsend of South Burlington
Dolan of Waitsfield	Masland of Thetford	Troiano of Stannard
Donovan of Burlington	McCarthy of St. Albans City	Walz of Barre City
Durfee of Shaftsbury	McCormack of Burlington	Webb of Shelburne
Elder of Starksboro	McCullough of Williston	White of Hartford
Emmons of Springfield	Mrowicki of Putney	Wood of Waterbury
Gardner of Richmond	Murphy of Fairfax	Yacovone of Morristown
	Nicoll of Ludlow	Yantachka of Charlotte

Giambatista of Essex	Notte of Rutland City	Young of Greensboro
	Noyes of Wolcott	

Those members absent with leave of the House and not voting are:

Cina of Burlington	Gannon of Wilmington	Trieber of Rockingham
Dickinson of St. Albans Town	Kimbell of Woodstock	
	Sibilia of Dover	

Rep. Seymour of Sutton explained his vote as follows:

“Madam Speaker:

I am disappointed that this amendment was not supported by more members of the House. I truly felt this was an opportunity to make this bill better for all Vermonters. Let us not forget that gun rights are women's rights as well.”

Pending the question, Shall the bill be read a third time? **Rep. Donahue of Northfield** moved that the bill be committed to the committee on Health Care.

Pending the question, Shall the bill be committed to the Committee on Health Care? **Rep. LaClair of Barre Town** demanded the Yeas and Nays, which demand was sustained by the Constitutional number. The Clerk proceeded to call the roll and the question, Shall the bill be committed to the Committee on Health Care? was decided in the negative. Yeas, 46. Nays, 94.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Bancroft of Westford	Hango of Berkshire	Palasik of Milton
Batchelor of Derby	Harrison of Chittenden	Potter of Clarendon
Bock of Chester	Helm of Fair Haven	Quimby of Concord
Brennan of Colchester	Higley of Lowell	Rogers of Waterville
Brownell of Pownal	LaClair of Barre Town	Rosenquist of Georgia
Browning of Arlington	Lefebvre of Newark	Savage of Swanton
Canfield of Fair Haven	Leffler of Enosburgh	Seymour of Sutton
Cupoli of Rutland City	Marcotte of Coventry	Shaw of Pittsford
Donahue of Northfield *	Mattos of Milton	Smith of Derby
Fagan of Rutland City	McCoy of Poultney	Smith of New Haven
Fegard of Berkshire	McFaun of Barre Town	Strong of Albany
Feltus of Lyndon	Morgan of Milton	Szott of Barnard
Gamache of Swanton	Morrissey of Bennington	Terenzini of Rutland Town
Goslant of Northfield	Myers of Essex	Toof of St. Albans Town
Graham of Williamstown	Norris of Shoreham	
Gregoire of Fairfield	Page of Newport City	

Those who voted in the negative are:

Ancel of Calais	Giambatista of Essex	O'Brien of Tunbridge
Anthony of Barre City	Gonzalez of Winooski	Ode of Burlington
Austin of Colchester	Grad of Moretown	O'Sullivan of Burlington

Bartholomew of Hartland	Haas of Rochester	Pajala of Londonderry
Bates of Bennington	Hashim of Dummerston	Partridge of Windham
Beck of St. Johnsbury	Hill of Wolcott	Patt of Worcester
Birong of Vergennes	Hooper of Montpelier	Pugh of South Burlington
Briglin of Thetford	Hooper of Randolph	Rachelson of Burlington
Brumsted of Shelburne	Hooper of Burlington	Ralph of Hartland
Burditt of West Rutland	Houghton of Essex	Redmond of Essex
Burke of Brattleboro	Howard of Rutland City	Scheu of Middlebury
Campbell of St. Johnsbury	James of Manchester	Scheuermann of Stowe
Carroll of Bennington	Jerome of Brandon	Sheldon of Middlebury
Chase of Colchester	Jessup of Middlesex	Squirrell of Underhill
Chesnut-Tangerman of Middletown Springs	Jickling of Randolph	Stevens of Waterbury
Christensen of Weathersfield	Killacky of South Burlington	Sullivan of Dorset
Christie of Hartford	Kitzmiller of Montpelier	Sullivan of Burlington
Coffey of Guilford	Kornheiser of Brattleboro	Taylor of Colchester
Colburn of Burlington	Krowinski of Burlington	Till of Jericho
Colston of Winooski	LaLonde of South Burlington	Toleno of Brattleboro
Conlon of Cornwall	Lanpher of Vergennes	Toll of Danville
Conquest of Newbury	Lippert of Hinesburg	Townsend of South Burlington
Copeland-Hanzas of Bradford	Long of Newfane	Troiano of Stannard
Corcoran of Bennington	Macaig of Williston	Walz of Barre City
Cordes of Lincoln	Masland of Thetford	Webb of Shelburne
Demrow of Corinth	McCarthy of St. Albans City	White of Hartford
Dolan of Waitsfield	McCormack of Burlington	Wood of Waterbury
Durfee of Shaftsbury	McCullough of Williston	Yacovone of Morristown
Elder of Starksboro	Mrowicki of Putney	Yantachka of Charlotte
Emmons of Springfield	Murphy of Fairfax	Young of Greensboro
Gardner of Richmond	Nicoll of Ludlow	
	Notte of Rutland City	
	Noyes of Wolcott	

Those members absent with leave of the House and not voting are:

Cina of Burlington	Donovan of Burlington	Martel of Waterford
Dickinson of St. Albans Town	Gannon of Wilmington	Sibilia of Dover
	Kimbell of Woodstock	Trieber of Rockingham

Rep. Donahue of Northfield explained her vote as follows:

“Madam Speaker:

Is this a gun restriction law under the guise of suicide prevention, or a suicide prevention effort through the vehicle of a gun restriction law? A refusal to have the Health Care committee review it answers that question.”

Pending the question, Shall the bill be read a third time? **Rep. McCoy of Poultney** demanded the Yeas and Nays, which demand was sustained by the Constitutional number. The Clerk proceeded to call the roll and the question,

Shall the bill be read a third time? was decided in the affirmative. Yeas, 82. Nays, 58.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Ancel of Calais *	Giambatista of Essex	Ode of Burlington
Anthony of Barre City	Gonzalez of Winooski	O'Sullivan of Burlington
Austin of Colchester *	Grad of Moretown *	Partridge of Windham
Bartholomew of Hartland	Haas of Rochester	Patt of Worcester
Bates of Bennington	Hashim of Dummerston	Pugh of South Burlington
Birong of Vergennes	Hooper of Montpelier	Rachelson of Burlington
Briglin of Thetford	Hooper of Burlington	Ralph of Hartland
Brumsted of Shelburne	Houghton of Essex	Redmond of Essex *
Burke of Brattleboro	Howard of Rutland City	Scheu of Middlebury
Campbell of St. Johnsbury	James of Manchester	Sheldon of Middlebury
Carroll of Bennington	Jerome of Brandon	Squirrell of Underhill
Chesnut-Tangerman of Middletown Springs	Jessup of Middlesex	Stevens of Waterbury
Christensen of Weathersfield	Killacky of South Burlington	Sullivan of Dorset
Christie of Hartford	Kimbell of Woodstock	Sullivan of Burlington
Coffey of Guilford	Kitzmiller of Montpelier	Taylor of Colchester
Colburn of Burlington	Kornheiser of Brattleboro	Till of Jericho
Colston of Winooski	Krowinski of Burlington	Toleno of Brattleboro
Conlon of Cornwall	LaLonde of South Burlington	Toll of Danville
Conquest of Newbury	Lanpher of Vergennes	Townsend of South Burlington
Copeland-Hanzas of Bradford	Lippert of Hinesburg	Troiano of Stannard
Corcoran of Bennington	Long of Newfane	Walz of Barre City
Cordes of Lincoln	Macaig of Williston	Webb of Shelburne
Dolan of Waitsfield	Masland of Thetford	White of Hartford
Durfee of Shaftsbury	McCarthy of St. Albans City	Wood of Waterbury
Elder of Starksboro	McCormack of Burlington	Yacovone of Morristown
Emmons of Springfield	McCullough of Williston	Yantachka of Charlotte
Gardner of Richmond	Mrowicki of Putney *	
	Murphy of Fairfax	
	Nicoll of Ludlow	

Those who voted in the negative are:

Bancroft of Westford	Hango of Berkshire	O'Brien of Tunbridge
Batchelor of Derby	Harrison of Chittenden	Page of Newport City
Beck of St. Johnsbury	Helm of Fair Haven	Pajala of Londonderry
Bock of Chester	Higley of Lowell	Palasik of Milton
Brennan of Colchester	Hill of Wolcott	Potter of Clarendon
Brownell of Pownal	Hooper of Randolph	Quimby of Concord
Browning of Arlington	Jickling of Randolph	Rogers of Waterville
Burditt of West Rutland	LaClair of Barre Town	Rosenquist of Georgia
Canfield of Fair Haven	Lefebvre of Newark	Savage of Swanton
Chase of Colchester	Leffler of Enosburgh	Scheuermann of Stowe
Cupoli of Rutland City	Marcotte of Coventry	Seymour of Sutton
Demrow of Corinth	Mattos of Milton	Shaw of Pittsford
Donahue of Northfield	McCoy of Poultney	Smith of Derby

Fagan of Rutland City	McFaun of Barre Town	Smith of New Haven
Fegard of Berkshire	Morgan of Milton	Strong of Albany
Feltus of Lyndon	Morrissey of Bennington	Szott of Barnard
Gamache of Swanton	Myers of Essex	Terenzini of Rutland Town
Goslant of Northfield	Norris of Shoreham	Toof of St. Albans Town
Graham of Williamstown	Notte of Rutland City	
Gregoire of Fairfield	Noyes of Wolcott	

Those members absent with leave of the House and not voting are:

Cina of Burlington	Donovan of Burlington	Sibilia of Dover
Dickinson of St. Albans Town	Gannon of Wilmington	Trieber of Rockingham
	Martel of Waterford	Young of Greensboro

Rep. Ancel of Calais explained her vote as follows:

“Madam Speaker:

When my husband was serving in the Vermont Senate, he introduced a waiting period bill. He introduced it because of concerns about domestic violence and suicide prevention. That was 30 years ago. All I can think to say at this moment is, Finally!”

Rep. Austin of Colchester explained her vote as follows:

“Madam Speaker:

Andrew Black was a student of mine and I do wonder if this law had been enacted earlier if he would be alive today.”

Rep. Grad of Moretown explained her vote as follows:

“Madam Speaker:

I vote yes. S. 169 moves us towards our goals of suicide prevention, preventing domestic violence related homicides, and decreasing firearm related crimes such as human and drug trafficking. S. 169 is an important public health and safety measure that will save lives.”

Rep. Mrowicki of Putney explained his vote as follows:

“Madam Speaker:

My yes vote is for public safety. This bill will slow down a situation spinning out of control and help keep firearms out of the wrong hands at the wrong time. And, yes if it saves one life, it’s worth it.”

Rep. Redmond of Essex explained her vote as follows:

“Madam Speaker:

Today, Everytown for Gun Safety released the results of a survey of 800 VT adults. It shows that 80 percent of Vermonters support a 24-hour waiting

period for all handgun sales. The survey also indicates that 75 percent of Vermonters support gun violence prevention legislation that was passed by VT lawmakers last year. My Essex constituents overwhelmingly support S. 169 and I have heard from dozens and dozens of them. I cast my vote this evening in favor of a waiting period and I do so in honor of a beloved young man from Essex who departed this life much too early, and his courageous parents whose advocacy will save future VT lives.”

Adjournment

At eight o'clock and thirty-three minutes in the evening, on motion of **Rep. McCoy of Poultney**, the House adjourned until tomorrow at nine o'clock and thirty minutes in the forenoon.