

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the
LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

Legislative Record
House of Representatives
One Hundred and Twenty-Sixth Legislature
State of Maine

Daily Edition

First Regular Session

December 5, 2012 – July 10, 2013

pages H-1 – H-1282

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SIXTH LEGISLATURE
FIRST REGULAR SESSION
61st Legislative Day
Friday, June 14, 2013

The House met according to adjournment and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by Honorable Bernard A. Ayotte, Caswell.
National Anthem by Honorable Emily Ann Cain, Orono.
Pledge of Allegiance.
Doctor of the day, Donald Strickland, M.D., Gardiner.
The Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMUNICATIONS

The Following Communication: (H.C. 204)

**STATE OF MAINE
CLERK'S OFFICE
2 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0002**

June 14, 2013

Honorable Mark W. Eves
Speaker of the House
2 State House Station
Augusta, Maine 04333

Dear Speaker Eves:

Pursuant to Joint Rule 310, the following Joint Standing Committee has voted unanimously to report the following bills out "Ought Not to Pass:"

Energy, Utilities and Technology

L.D. 1262 An Act To Reduce Energy Costs
L.D. 1375 An Act To Enhance Maine's Economy and Environment
L.D. 1425 An Act To Create Affordable Heating Options for Maine Residents and Reduce Business Energy Costs

L.D. 1426 An Act To Improve Maine's Economy and Lower Energy Costs through Energy Efficiency

The sponsors and cosponsors have been notified of the Committee's action.

Sincerely,
S/Millicent M. MacFarland
Clerk of House

READ and with accompanying papers **ORDERED PLACED ON FILE.**

ORDERS

On motion of Representative RANKIN of Hiram, the following House Order: (H.O. 26)

ORDERED, that Representative Henry John Bear of the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians be excused June 10, 11 and 12 for health reasons.

AND BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that Representative Michael G. Beaulieu of Auburn be excused June 11 for personal reasons.

AND BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that Representative Mark N. Dion of Portland be excused June 3 for personal reasons.

AND BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that Representative Paul E. Gilbert of Jay be excused June 10 for health reasons.

AND BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that Representative Richard S. Malaby of Hancock be excused June 10 for personal reasons.

AND BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that Representative Jane P. Pringle of Windham be excused May 28 for health reasons.

AND BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that Representative Roger E. Reed of Carmel be excused May 16 and 20 for personal reasons.

AND BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that Representative Beth P. Turner of Burlington be excused June 4 and 6 for health reasons.

READ and **PASSED.**

The following items were taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The following matters, in the consideration of which the House was engaged at the time of adjournment yesterday, had preference in the Orders of the Day and continued with such preference until disposed of as provided by House Rule 502.

Expression of Legislative Sentiment Recognizing the Town of Freedom, on the occasion of its 200th Anniversary

(SLS 156)

- In Senate, **READ** and **PASSED.**

TABLED - April 3, 2013 (Till Later Today) by Representative JONES of Freedom.

PENDING - **PASSAGE.**

Under suspension of the rules, members were allowed to remove their jackets.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Freedom, Representative Jones.

Representative **JONES**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. On behalf of the Town of Freedom, I invite the members of this House to join us in the celebration of our bicentennial. You will see a calendar of events placed on your desk. Freedom was first settled in 1794 by Stephen Smith, who served under George Washington on the Hudson River during the Revolutionary War. He followed the Sheepscot River up to its headwaters on a fishing trip in search of a mill location. He there built a sawmill and the first frame house in the Town of Freedom. On October 31, 1812, the first recorded town meeting was held and at the second town meeting, the officials voted for the electors who would in turn vote for the presidential election of 1812. Of special interest to the members of this House, Mr. Speaker, of the qualifications necessary for voting at the time, you had to be male, 21 years of age, a one-year resident of the municipality, an annual income of 3 pounds or an estate valued at 60 pounds. It also might be instructive to note the money rates that appropriated at this town meeting included 40 dollars for a road committee, 160 dollars for schools and 1,000 dollars overall layout of roads. Mr. Speaker, the laws created were simple. Hogs should not run at large. All important plantation officials should be paid 1 dollar a day for services. Two hundred years ago, Wednesday, on June 11, 1813, Freedom was incorporated a town. Once again, of special historical interest to this House is Daniel F. Davis, born in Freedom in 1843, who served here from 1871 to 1875, served in the Maine Senate from 1875 to 1879, and as Governor of the great State of Maine from 1880 to 1881. Mr. Speaker and Men and Women of the House, I, again, invite all of you to our Bicentennial Celebration, July 5th and 6th of this year. I guarantee there will be something for everyone, from historical lectures to parades, from an antique auto show to a pie baking contest, from a frog jumping contest to a flint firearms demonstration, and of course fireworks. There will be good food,

good music and good people. Once again, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Town of Freedom invites you to join us as we celebrate our 200th year as an incorporated municipality. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Subsequently, the Sentiment was **PASSED** in concurrence.

An Act To Improve Work Readiness for Families Facing Significant Barriers to Employment

(H.P. 960) (L.D. 1343)
(C. "A" H-345)

TABLED - June 10, 2013 (Till Later Today) by Representative FREDETTE of Newport.

PENDING - **PASSAGE TO BE ENACTED.**

Subsequently, the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

SENATE DIVIDED REPORT - Majority (8) **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-250)** - Minority (5) **Ought Not to Pass** - Committee on **LABOR, COMMERCE, RESEARCH AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT** on Bill "An Act To Amend the Maine Workers' Compensation Act of 1992 To Provide Benefits to Seriously Injured Workers"

(S.P. 175) (L.D. 443)

- In Senate, Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-250) AS AMENDED BY SENATE AMENDMENT "A" (S-265)** thereto.

TABLED - June 12, 2013 (Till Later Today) by Representative McCABE of Skowhegan.

PENDING - **ACCEPTANCE OF EITHER REPORT.**

Subsequently, Representative BERRY of Bowdoinham moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Scarborough, Representative Volk.

Representative **VOLK**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am always happy to be able to stand up. Like I said, I have a little bit of a story to tell you. We've heard a lot around here lately about the possibility of a state shutdown and hopefully we've actually sort of put that behind us and we may not be looking at that possibility. But I want to take you back to the days before the last state shutdown when Governor McKernan was in office. Back in '92, Governor McKernan was willing to go to the mat for a cause that he believed in. Our workers' compensation system, at that time, was a complete mess. We had the most expensive system in the entire country. It was horrible for our business climate. Governor McKernan actually allowed this state to go into shutdown mode because he believed so strongly that this system needed reform. So while the state was shut down, he negotiated, in good faith, and came to a compromise and that was the system that we lived under for 20 years, until last year with the passage of LD 1913. While the ink was still drying on 1913, this new bill was written. The only problem with Governor McKernan's bill, the biggest issue was that it was flawed and he knew that that flaw lay in Section 213, which is the part of the law that deals with partial incapacity. Fast-forward 20 years. Former Governor McKernan and the new director of the Workers' Comp Board, Director Paul Sighinolfi, meet up for the first time since Director Sighinolfi's appointment. While he is still shaking his hand, Mr. Speaker, former Governor McKernan says to Director Sighinolfi, "What are you going to do about Section 213?" He knew that that section which had stayed law for 20 years needed

to be changed. And so we worked on it and we changed it, and we came to the bipartisan compromise that was agreed upon in the second year of the 125th Legislature.

Now I am a little bit disappointed that we had to deal with this issue all over again. Here we are with what is almost a complete rollback to the days before that state shutdown of '92. This bill has three parts and two of the three would add significant cost and litigation to our system while doing absolutely nothing to help get employees well and back to work. While we made some improvements last year, this new bill, LD 443, the one before you now, would attempt to repeal large parts of that reform, just a few months after they went into effect. I think it's important to note that this bill leaves intact the weekly increase of nearly \$80 per week for injured workers which was included in LD 1913, in the last Legislature. What it takes out is the section that encouraged employees to return to work and may have generated cost savings to our system. Again, this law is so new that we don't even know what savings are going to be realized. We haven't even had a chance. Why is this important? Because workers' compensation insurance is a cost born by all employers and it is therefore inextricably linked to jobs. Higher costs for workers' compensation means fewer jobs for the people of Maine. Have we not heard this clearly from our constituents? Is that not their highest priority? While Maine has made great strides in workers' comp since '92, our costs remain among the top third of states in the United States. Furthermore, our costs for the category of injuries known as partial incapacity are higher than most states in the Northeast.

Last year, as I said, we passed a bill that earned bipartisan support in both houses of the Legislature. That bill addressed these problems by creating reasonable limits while also providing a safety belt for workers who truly need more than 10 years of benefits. Yes, you heard that right. The current Maine law provides more than 10 years of benefits for workers who have partial incapacity in two ways. First, if they show economic hardship, the Workers' Compensation Board can award additional benefits. This is not a locked in system. This is not a hard 10-year deadline. There are safety valves. Secondly, when they had suffered a serious injury, as measured by what is known as the permanent impairment rating, and they are demonstrating that they are attempting to get back to work within the restrictions of their incapacity. We understand some people will never return to the same level of functioning that they had prior to an unfortunate accident. They are still compensated for that. They can earn additional years of benefits. This current law helps people with serious but partial incapacity and puts the motivation in the right place, to encourage return to meaningful work which study after study shows is important to our self-worth. It's not good to receive a check for the rest of your life, if you could be out earning your own living, at least in part.

It is also important to note that there is a whole other section of the Maine Workers' Compensation Act, which provides unlimited benefits for a worker who is totally disabled. That's not what we're talking about here. These people can and should receive lifelong benefits. The bill before you today takes us back, not only to the days before last year when we had an arbitrary and inconsistent standard for extending benefits, but this takes us to the days before '92 when Maine's workers' comp system was a disaster. You may recall that the days before the reform of '92 were dark days for Maine, as we just heard in my little story. I truly hope that none of us wants to go back to those days, just as we don't want to have a shutdown this year. Unfortunately, the bill before you today could indeed lead us down that path. According to estimates from the National Council on Compensation Insurance, the changes put forth in this bill would

likely double or triple the number of cases which could qualify for lifetime benefits. That would mean a cost increase. Who is going to pay those lifetime benefits? Yes, the insurance companies, but 40 percent of our market is self-insured. Sixty percent of our market is going to see their premiums skyrocket. These are real costs. This is also a cost to the state, which is self-insured. You want to try to balance the budget next year when you are paying these higher worker compensation costs? That would mean a cost increase of between 5 and 20 percent for workers' compensation insurance and you all have that letter on your desks, or you can look at it online if you don't get these circulations. Altogether, that would mean an increase for Maine employers of between approximately \$16.4 and \$64 million annually. That's every year. Annually.

Included in those figures would be some information, which might be important to my good colleagues on the Appropriations Committee. Just as I said a minute ago, estimates indicate that this bill would increase costs by between \$450,000 and nearly \$2 million annually to the state's cost for providing workers' compensation to its employees. How much did it cost for us to give the small increases that we were able to give to our state workers? How much more difficult would that be with these increased costs? Obviously, that would be even more in the biennium. I've heard those who would seek to discredit these estimated cost increases, but I would caution that NCCI, which the letter is on your desk, performs these kinds of evaluations for 38 states in the United States and the Maine Bureau of Insurance relies on this data for the annual filing of rates in Maine. Make no mistake; a vote for this bill is a vote for a significantly higher cost for workers' compensation insurance in Maine. Neither Maine employers nor Maine employees can afford this reckless bill. Mr. Speaker, I would request a roll call, please.

The same Representative **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Belfast, Representative Herbig.

Representative **HERBIG**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. What happens to you when the shaft on a valve operator fails and a chain wheel hits you in the head causing you a permanent brain injury? Or what happens to you when your hand gets caught in a nip point on a pulp machine causing you to lose a hand, maybe both hands? No matter what the injury, your life has changed forever. There are hardworking Mainers that have had their lives significantly, horrifically and permanently changed because they got up that morning and went to work, and can you imagine the mental anguish of your injury preventing you from being able to do your job or to complete basic daily activities? No one wants to be in this position. No one wants this to happen to them or to their loved ones. No one wants to be on workers' compensation. In Maine, we reward work. Workers who get seriously injured on the job need to know they will be taken care of. No matter how long it takes them to heal, they need to know their basic needs will be met while they are healing so they can get back to work. In Maine, we should not turn our back on these workers or their families.

During last year's session, the Chief Executive signed into law a piece of legislation that gutted our Workers' Compensation Act. It dismantled a true compromise that was made in 1993. That compromise had lowered the cost of premiums for businesses, had lowered the number of cases and had lowered the number of weeks people were on workers' compensation. It was clearly a

system that was working for everyone. The legislation that went through last year currently allows for too many workers to fall through the cracks and was most harmful to those who are most significantly injured. Despite what we're hearing today, let me be clear. Last year's workers' compensation bill was not a compromise. Last year's workers' compensation bill was not a bipartisan piece of legislation. I was there. And, no, we do not need to wait to see what happens to know that this is a bad law. It's like depriving someone of their basic needs and waiting until they're starving to know it's bad. We're smarter than that. And, no, this bill does not completely roll back what had happened in 1993. There was no savings proposed for employers, nor have we seen any. LD 443 protects those workers in Maine who sustain the most serious injuries and also who sustain the greatest wage lost as a result of those injuries. It allows injured Maine workers to maintain their self-sufficiency and their ability to provide for their families. LD 443 puts balance back into Maine's workers' compensation system. It reflects a true compromise between employees and employers as workers' compensation should be. I urge you to support LD 443 and restore the integrity in Maine's workers' compensation system.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Newfield, Representative Campbell.

Representative **CAMPBELL**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As my good colleague from Scarborough was talking about it, LD 443, which provides benefits to seriously injured workers, I didn't hear too much about the injured workers, but I heard a lot about dollars and cents. I heard about that in the last Legislature. The last Legislature has come and gone. This is the 126th and a lot of people better get used to it. This bill will provide the benefits to seriously injured workers and that's what it's all about. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Topsham, Representative Mason.

Representative **MASON**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to just try to bring some clarification to this. The vast majority of injured workers suffer partial disability, not total disability. That's already been discussed. And the 1992 reforms did include a major provision stating that injured workers with partial disability can be subjected to a cap, a 10-year cap for the amount of time that they receive weekly checks. This cap, whether you exceed the cap or not, is based on what's called permanent impairment rating. If the permanent impairment rating is over a certain threshold, the injured worker can receive benefits beyond these 10 years, and since 1993, after this reform, after the '92 reform, the threshold has fluctuated between about 11.8 percent and 13.4 percent. Fast-forward again, as we've heard, to 2012, LD 1913, which radically altered the availability of partial benefits beyond the cap. LD 1913 raised the threshold by over 50 percent so an injured worker must now have a permanent impairment rating of 18 percent to get benefits beyond 10 years. This guarantees that virtually every partially injured worker will now be limited to 10 years of benefits. The 2012 changes represented an enormous step backwards for severely injured workers. There was no legitimate policy based need for this change because, as we heard, that Maine's workers' compensation system was the most expensive in the country in '92.

Since 1992, the cost for Maine workers' compensation has been declining 59 percent, so the reforms were working. The major provision that is before you now, which is LD 443, encompasses a compromise that was tentatively agreed to in the last session during 2012 negotiations, but it was actually turned around after pressure from management side interests who didn't

want to agree to this compromise anymore. This isn't bringing something new, where the ink has been barely dried. This is the compromise that was tentatively agreed to by all parties because all parties agree that permanent impairment rating is actually a very poor proxy for determining how disabled a person is and how eligible a person should be for ongoing benefits. LD 443 removes the harsh and arbitrary PI threshold concept. In its place, it allows partial benefits beyond 10 years, only if the injured worker is working and demonstrates actual earning loss. This is a far more logical and humane way to address long-term benefits. We've also heard that there are concerns that LD 443 is going to increase costs to the Maine workers' compensation system. There are claims that the bill would increase costs. They come from a report from NCCI that's loaded with hypotheticals and inaccurate claims. All of the claims about cost, all of the claims come from a hypothetical table in the report. At the bottom of the report, and I have it here, it says, in bold font, "The above table is included for illustrative purposes only and is not to be interpreted as [our] estimated cost impact for this bill." So all of the cost estimates being put out there are from a report that says they should not be interpreted as being the cost estimate for this bill.

What's more, there are a number of problems with the report. An honest assessment of the cost impacts of the system would compare LD 443, the current bill, to what happen before the 2012 changes. The changes made in 2012 guarantee that virtually zero workers are going to qualify for extended partial benefits. A true benefit analysis would look at the benefits under this bill, under LD 443, and the reforms under 1992 that we've been working with prior to that, when people were getting benefits. The system before last year's legislative changes have seen overall costs declined by roughly 60 percent. If they had actually compared LD 443 to the pre 2012 systems, they would find that it is pretty much cost neutral. The proposal before you is less generous to many of the most severely injured workers than our system was before 2012 because it's simply taking the compromise that was agreed to in principle last year before it was scuttled at the last minute. Thank you very much, and I urge you to follow my light and accept the Majority Ought to Pass.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Amherst, Representative Lockman.

Representative **LOCKMAN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to the pending motion. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would encourage you to take a look at the fact sheet that was distributed a while ago from the Maine State Chamber of Commerce and the Maine Chapter of the National Federation of Independent Business and other business and trade associations. I spent 18 years as a territory manager for the NFIB in eastern Maine. Those NFIB members are the small, independent mom-and-pop businesses who are the backbone of our rural economy, and I can tell you that they are overwhelmingly opposed to this attempt to undo the workers' comp reforms. This is a bad bill. It will gut the reforms from 1992. It is nothing more than a full employment act for workers' comp lawyers. I urge you to follow Representative Volk's light. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Pittsfield, Representative Short.

Representative **SHORT**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in favor of the pending motion. For many years, I worked in a plant here in Maine as a certified pipe welder, and during that time, I also served as the president of the local lodge union that represented the workers. One day, while working in that plant, I witnessed a terrible injury. One of my fellow workers and members had a $\frac{3}{8}$,

4 by 8 steel plate fall out of a rack and hit him just below his kneecap, and it pushed his muscles and everything below his kneecap into his boot. What he had to go through after that injury was absolutely atrocious. He was continually harassed by private investigators that were hired by workers' comp insurance companies, to the point that he would come to my house on a pretty regular basis and sit in my kitchen and cry because he was being harassed so much, on top of the injury that he was suffering with. On numerous occasions, he tried to get back to work and did return to work, only to find that he could not continue working due to that injury. He certainly was not somebody that was taking advantage of the workers' comp insurance. I would suggest that if these insurance companies are looking to save money, they might take a look at stopping the practice of hiring private investigators to needlessly harass those people that were injured on the job. These injured workers need all the help that we can give them and they deserve all the help that we can give them in this Legislature, and I would ask all of you to please vote in favor of the pending motion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Jay, Representative Gilbert.

Representative **GILBERT**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the pending motion. The change enacted into law in 2012 was an anti-injured worker change in Maine workers' comp law. This proposed change would bring us back to 2011, not to 1992. In the 20 years prior to 2012 – let me remind you I spoke on this bill when it was proposed to us last time – in the 20 years prior to 2012, workers' comp premiums reduced 19 of the 20 years. One year it was stagnant. No other state can boast of that. There was no need for this change. There is a big need now for us to stand up for the injured workers. Also, I just wanted to remind you that this here, the way the law stands now, injured workers can receive benefits for a limit of 10 years. When you lose a leg or any other part of your body like that, it's not just the 10 years. The way the law stands now, you are dropped, you have hit a cliff and you end up losing your house, losing your vehicle, probably losing your family and going on welfare. I think we need to take care of our injured workers and I support this bill and urge you to also.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Scarborough, Representative Volk.

Representative **VOLK**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for rising again. I wanted to address a couple of the issues that were brought up. First of all, this was a bipartisan compromise. Former Senator from Cumberland, Senator Bartlett, was intimately involved in the compromise that was worked out in the other body in the 125th Legislature. That compromise was then sent back down here to the House. The House passed it with a bipartisan vote. Some of the members who were here may not have liked that vote. They may have voted against it, but it was in fact bipartisan in both bodies of the Legislature. Also, the original 1992 Act set partial incapacity at 15 percent. It was at 15 percent until 1998. There was an increase in the law passed last year of \$80 a week. I don't believe that that was anti-worker. One last thing, if you are engaged in vocational rehab, if you cannot find reasonable work within your geographic area, there are extensions to that 10-year deadline. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Gorham, Representative Sanborn.

Representative **SANBORN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just want to correct one thing that I just heard the good Representative from

Scarborough say and that is that I sat in last year on that Senate debate and I heard Senator Phil Bartlett speak forcefully against this law that was approved. So I just don't believe that that is accurate and I want to correct that record. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Newfield, Representative Campbell.

Representative **CAMPBELL**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to repeat one more time. This is the 126th Legislature, not the 125th, and those that are dreaming about the 125th better get a life. Thank you.

Representative MORIARTY of Cumberland asked leave of the House to be excused from voting on L.D. 443 pursuant to House Rule 401.12.

The Chair granted the request.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought to Pass as Amended Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 325

YEA - Beavers, Berry, Boland, Briggs, Brooks, Campbell J, Carey, Cassidy, Chapman, Chenette, Chipman, Cooper, Daughtry, Devin, Dickerson, Dill, Dorney, Evangelos, Farnsworth, Fowle, Frey, Gattine, Gideon, Gilbert, Goode, Graham, Grant, Hamann, Harlow, Herbig, Hobbins, Hubbell, Jorgensen, Kaenrath, Kent, Kornfield, Kruger, Kumiega, Kusiak, Lajoie, Libby N, Longstaff, Luchini, MacDonald W, Marks, Mason, Mastraccio, McCabe, McGowan, McLean, Monaghan-Derrig, Moonen, Morrison, Nadeau C, Noon, Peoples, Plante, Powers, Priest, Pringle, Rankin, Rochelo, Rotundo, Russell, Rykerson, Sanborn, Saucier, Saxton, Schneck, Shaw, Short, Stanley, Stuckey, Theriault, Tipping-Spitz, Treat, Verow, Villa, Welsh, Werts, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Ayotte, Beaulieu, Bennett, Campbell R, Casavant, Chase, Clark, Cotta, Crafts, Crockett, Davis, Doak, Dunphy, Duprey, Espling, Fitzpatrick, Fredette, Gifford, Gillway, Guerin, Harvell, Hayes, Jackson, Johnson D, Johnson P, Keschl, Kinney, Knight, Lockman, Long, MacDonald S, Maker, Malaby, Marean, McClellan, McElwee, Nadeau A, Newendyke, Nutting, Parry, Pease, Peavey Haskell, Pouliot, Reed, Sanderson, Sirocki, Timberlake, Turner, Tyler, Volk, Weaver, Willette, Wilson, Winchenbach, Winsor, Wood.

ABSENT - Beaudoin, Beck, Black, Bolduc, Cray, DeChant, Dion, Hickman, Jones, Libby A, Nelson, Peterson, Wallace.

Yes, 81; No, 56; Absent, 13; Excused, 1.

81 having voted in the affirmative and 56 voted in the negative, with 13 being absent and 1 excused, and accordingly the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (S-250)** was **READ** by the Clerk.

Senate Amendment "A" (S-265) to **Committee Amendment "A" (S-250)** was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED**.

Committee Amendment "A" (S-250) as Amended by **Senate Amendment "A" (S-265)** thereto was **ADOPTED**.

Under suspension of the rules the Bill was given its **SECOND READING WITHOUT REFERENCE** to the Committee on **Bills in the Second Reading**.

Under further suspension of the rules the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED** as Amended by **Committee Amendment "A" (S-250)** as Amended by **Senate Amendment "A" (S-265)** thereto in concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

Bill "An Act To Provide Immunity for Prescribing and Dispensing Intranasal Naloxone Kits"

(H.P. 737) (L.D. 1046)

- In House, **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-436)** on June 11, 2013.

- In Senate, **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-436) AS AMENDED BY SENATE AMENDMENT "A" (S-266)** thereto in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

TABLED - June 13, 2013 (Till Later Today) by Representative BERRY of Bowdoinham.

PENDING - **FURTHER CONSIDERATION**.

Representative EVES of North Berwick moved that the House **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

Representative FREDETTE of Newport **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Recede and Concur. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 326

YEA - Beaulieu, Beavers, Berry, Boland, Briggs, Brooks, Campbell J, Carey, Casavant, Cassidy, Chapman, Chenette, Chipman, Cooper, Crockett, Daughtry, DeChant, Devin, Dickerson, Dill, Dorney, Evangelos, Farnsworth, Fowle, Frey, Gattine, Gideon, Gilbert, Goode, Graham, Grant, Hamann, Harlow, Hayes, Herbig, Hobbins, Hubbell, Jones, Jorgensen, Kaenrath, Kent, Kornfield, Kruger, Kumiega, Kusiak, Lajoie, Libby N, Longstaff, Luchini, MacDonald W, Marks, Mason, Mastraccio, McCabe, McGowan, McLean, Monaghan-Derrig, Moonen, Moriarty, Morrison, Nadeau C, Nelson, Noon, Peoples, Plante, Powers, Priest, Pringle, Rankin, Rotundo, Russell, Rykerson, Sanborn, Saucier, Saxton, Schneck, Shaw, Short, Stanley, Stuckey, Theriault, Tipping-Spitz, Treat, Verow, Villa, Welsh, Werts, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Ayotte, Bennett, Campbell R, Chase, Clark, Cotta, Crafts, Davis, Doak, Dunphy, Duprey, Espling, Fitzpatrick, Fredette, Gifford, Gillway, Guerin, Harvell, Jackson, Johnson D, Johnson P, Keschl, Kinney, Knight, Lockman, Long, MacDonald S, Maker, Malaby, Marean, McClellan, McElwee, Nadeau A, Newendyke, Nutting, Parry, Pease, Peavey Haskell, Pouliot, Reed, Sanderson, Sirocki, Timberlake, Turner, Tyler, Volk, Weaver, Willette, Wilson, Winchenbach, Winsor, Wood.

ABSENT - Beaudoin, Beck, Black, Bolduc, Cray, Dion, Hickman, Libby A, Peterson, Rochelo, Wallace.

Yes, 88; No, 52; Absent, 11; Excused, 0.

88 having voted in the affirmative and 52 voted in the negative, with 11 being absent, and accordingly the House voted to **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

SENATE DIVIDED REPORT - Majority (8) **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-156)** - Minority (5) **Ought Not to Pass** - Committee on **VETERANS AND LEGAL AFFAIRS** on Bill "An Act To Strengthen the Maine Clean Election Act"

(S.P. 452) (L.D. 1309)

- In Senate, Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE**

ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-156).

TABLED - June 13, 2013 (Till Later Today) by Representative LUCHINI of Ellsworth.

PENDING - Motion of same Representative to **ACCEPT** the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report.

Representative WILLETTE of Mapleton **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Ellsworth, Representative Luchini.

Representative **LUCHINI**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of LD 1309 which strengthens the Maine Clean Election Act. As many of you know, Clean Elections came about as the result of a popular citizen's initiative back in 1996. The people of Maine made it clear that they wanted to know that politicians were beholden to their constituents and the Maine people only and not have obligations to special interests. The citizens of Maine continue to support this program and I think this session we have 70 percent of the legislators in the 126th using the program. The bill before us today strengthens Clean Elections by allowing candidates the option to seek supplement financing. This financing is not automatic. It comes as the result of gathering more qualifying contributions from constituents. By passing this bill, we can reinforce the will of the citizens of Maine. We can continue our work towards keeping big money out of our elections and out of our government decisions. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Sabattus, Representative Wood.

Representative **WOOD**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I cannot believe we are bringing this bill forward. We have put more money onto the taxpayers and here we want to give us legislators more money so that we can buy more signs, more ads. This is just a really ridiculous bill.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Auburn, Representative Beaulieu.

Representative **BEAULIEU**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I appreciate, again, being called upon and I have deep respect for Representative Luchini, the good House Chair of the Veterans and Legal Affairs Committee, and he is right about the fact that this certainly was a citizen's initiative, a very important one indeed. If in fact we were voting on that today, if we were voting on a bill that would keep and maintain Clean Elections, I would support it wholeheartedly and I think many of the members in this chamber who have used it – I have used it three times myself in the four terms I've run – would indeed show support for it. But I think what is present in this bill, 1309, is an expansion that even the voters of the state would find reprehensible. We're talking about the qualifying contributions being extended to the point that races are going to cost an enormous amount of money, money that we presently don't have, money that we are taking from one program in order to pay for another. It's an abrogation of responsibility, truthfully, that we engage in this kind of activity. I hope that, honestly, I want this particular program to continue, but I think that it has to take a refresher, just for a short period of time, until we get through what we all understand is a major economic crisis, and I hope that you will share that and support that feeling and vote for the present motion before us. Thank you very much. Again, I appreciate your calling on me, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Portland, Representative Russell.

Representative **RUSSELL**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. This is a good policy. It's a policy that not only do the people of Maine want, but they actually asked for overwhelmingly in a referendum about a decade ago. How short our memories are. How short our consideration of the people is. Yes, we passed a budget yesterday and I voted for it, a very difficult vote, but we passed a budget and most of the items in that budget have never been asked for by the people, in terms of a citizen's initiative. But this one was because the people of Maine spoke back then and they continue to speak and say that the obnoxious amount of money that has been descending on the political sphere has been overwhelming and has drowned out voices. But the Clean Elections Act isn't just about giving people a fair shot at having their voice heard, giving people a fair shot at allowing them to participate in government. This has allowed everyday people to be able to run for office without being rich, without being forced to ask special interests for big checks, without opening a rolodex that they may not have. The only reason I serve in this chamber is because of Clean Elections, because when I was serving in this chamber, the only job that was available and I was a highly qualified college educated person, still am, was a convenience store cashier. With all due respect, I didn't have a huge budget and I'll tell you I didn't have a very big rolodex of people that wanted to support a convenience store cashier to run for office, but the Clean Elections system allowed us to do that.

Now, we can hear that some people decided that they didn't want to see this move forward so they brought something to the Supreme Court, and that's true, and two years ago, the *McComish* decision unraveled a significant portion of the Clean Elections system, not in its entirety, but a very important provision and that was the matching funds. That was voted on by the people. They wanted people to be able to compete in big elections as well as small elections, that they wanted to be able to allow folks an opportunity to have their voice heard when they were being drowned out by other money. We had an opportunity two years ago to fix that system and we chose not to. I voted to fix that system. But what was brought before us this year was actually even better. It would strengthen the Clean Elections system. It would restore it to its original integrity. It would do precisely what the people of Maine have wanted us to do and have asked us to do, whether it was through the matching funds system or a system that would ultimately replace that, that's what the bill before us does. Now, there is an issue and that is that the budget deal made that we voted on yesterday weakens Clean Elections. Now, I voted for that budget because I did not believe that it was prudent to shut down state government over disagreements on political perspective, but we actually lopped off the entire gubernatorial section of funding for Clean Elections. That is not what the voters approved in 1996. This bill at least ensures that gubernatorial elections in the future will continue to be able to be available when funding becomes available.

Now, we can hear we should compare this money to other choices that we've had to make, and those were difficult choices, but there are two things that I want people to keep in mind. One, that the people of Maine brought this forward and specifically said we want a fair shot at our political government to make sure that that government is run for the people and by the people, not by the special interests. And two, we want people to devoid of special interests when they are making their decisions, we want to take away that dollar agreement, that quid pro quo that we know happens, so that when we make decisions here on the floor of the House, that those decisions reflect the values and the

needs of the people of Maine, the people that are our constituents and that those decisions do not reflect whether or not a big donor is going to write a check in the next election cycle. So I believe that we should be passing this bill, but I want to caution folks to think that we are strengthening the law because what we need to do is to also fund public financing once and for all, and when well over 70 percent of Maine people consistently say that they would like to get money out of politics, that they would like to strengthen the Clean Elections system. I believe that is a mandate, but I believe that we should be doing that not just with our vote today, but we should be looking for ways to fundamentally fund this program going forward, not just for legislative races but for the top of the ticket too, because the top of the ticket makes the decisions at the end of the day that are far more powerful than any one of us individually can make. So I would hope that we would pass this and I would hope that we would make sure that, in the future, it is completely funded so that we do not make decisions based on who may or may not write a check to us in the future. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Farmington, Representative Harvell.

Representative **HARVELL**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I know that being drowned in money is one of the six ways I want to die. When we say that ordinary people run for office, I've got a confession to make and I think everybody in this body ought to make it too. None of us are normal or ordinary because ordinary people do not take big signs with their names on them and stick them on their neighbor's lawn. This is not a normal or ordinary thing to do. We are politicians. And, yes, the *Citizens United* decision, that free speech is really a; well, you know what I was going to say. What it said was that you cannot compel individuals to give their money to something they actually oppose, and what could be wrong with that? As to the fact that the people of Maine, in 1996, decided that they wanted Clean Elections, you are absolutely right, that they wanted to take money out of elections. They didn't seek to quadruple it for a House race and quadruple it for a Senate race. If this isn't evidence that this is an abysmal failure at this point, I don't know what is, and it won't be hard to find my red light because I'm seeing red.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Fort Kent, Representative Nadeau.

Representative **NADEAU**: Mr. Speaker, may I pose a two-part question through the Chair?

The SPEAKER: The Representative may pose his question.

Representative **NADEAU**: Mr. Speaker, for anybody that can answer, I would like to know who the sponsor/cosponsor of this bill is and what is the fiscal note on this.

The SPEAKER: The Representative from Fort Kent, Representative Nadeau, has posed a question through the Chair to anyone who may care to respond. The Chair recognizes the Representative from Ellsworth, Representative Luchini.

Representative **LUCHINI**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The sponsor of the bill is Senator Youngblood. I don't have the list of cosponsors. I believe the fiscal note is a transfer of \$4.5 million.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Belgrade, Representative Keschl.

Representative **KESCHL**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to the pending motion that provides more taxpayer money to fund elections for politicians who can and should raise the money for their own campaigns. Since taxpayer funded elections were instituted in Maine, the cost of elections have more than doubled, due in large part to significant amounts of money that have been poured into PACs that have been used for

election campaigning. Now, we are adding more money into the program. I would rather give this 5 million more dollars to the hardworking state workers in Maine that we couldn't provide funding for for a second year of merit increase than to politicians. I urge you to vote no on the pending motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Morrill, Representative Pease.

Representative **PEASE**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask you to stop and think for a second. Five million dollars more for our campaigns. Five million dollars, as the previous speaker said, that could go to over two-thirds of the merit increase for the employees of the State of Maine. Think back to yesterday, the day before and last week, when we talked about 3,100 people still in need of our help on our lists waiting. How many of those could we take care of, but we don't want to because we would rather have more money for us to stick more signs in more places? Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Berwick, Representative Plante.

Representative **PLANTE**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I realized we discuss here today taxpayer money and allocating it appropriately. Well, I'd like to go back and look at the *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife* case. Justice Scalia wrote, just because you say there is a harm in the use of your tax dollars, if it is basically in the mere sense of a couple of pennies and you can't even prove that that's the case, it doesn't mean you have the taxpayer standing to oppose the spending and then, thusly, say the Federal Government can't use your dollars in tax money to be spent that way, just because it's a small amount. We had an initiative to establish Maine Clean Elections and the overwhelming majority said, "We want this." So at this point, this isn't an issue really of whether or not the taxpayer said, "Well, we don't want this." In fact, they've already said they do. We're just properly funding it to the level that we said we would when they enacted the initiative. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from York, Representative Weaver.

Representative **WEAVER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to answer one of the questions Representative Nadeau asked a minute ago. The sponsors and cosponsors of the bill are Senator Youngblood, Representative Carey, President Alford, Speaker Eves, Senator Langley, Senator Saviello, Representative Luchini, Senator Katz, Senator Hill, Senator Tuttle. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Gardiner, Representative Grant.

Representative **GRANT**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I didn't realize there would be so much debate on this, this morning, because so many of us in the House, on both sides of the aisle, have used the Clean Elections system and the bill, as was just read, was sponsored bipartisanly. I would just like to add to the debate today that as a new member of the House, I started out my campaign and I learned intimately about the Clean Elections system and all the paperwork and all the rules. At first, I was thinking, "Why do I want to do this?" Why do I want to spend taxpayer money to run for office?" It seemed incongruous to me, and so I researched. I remembered the referendum and I did some research, and I came to this conclusion and this is what I would like to add. Because I was a Clean Election candidate, I stand in this House and I represent only the people of the State of Maine, the people of my district. I don't represent funders. I don't represent lobbyists. I don't represent anyone but the people of the State of Maine. That's why they instituted this system. That's why they still support it. There are long-term and there are

short-term investments. This is a long-term investment in the dignity of our democratic system to ensure that those of us who sit here do so always with the first rule that we represent the people of Maine. That is not to say that those who choose not to use that system don't also do that in their hearts, but this is the way to do it on paper and out there for everyone to see. So I ask you to support the Clean Elections system as the citizens intended. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Orrington, Representative Campbell.

Representative **CAMPBELL**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. As I mentioned before, I am new here, but I do have long-term experience into issues. One, term limits, and the other, Clean Elections. I was here before when the people decided they wanted to take a hold of this system and change it. We just came after a state shutdown. We just came after accusations and confirmation of stuffing ballot boxes. We had just come after the wrong that we had become, so the people decided that they wanted to do something about it. They decided that we were only going to be here for four terms and then the law was written. We can be here for four terms, but then we can go over there. After we've been over there for one term, we can come back here. After we've sat out for one term, we can come back here. Clean Elections was to eliminate the influence of money. Well, I think Bangor just saw the results of that, a Senate race that had over \$400,000 spent on it. Four hundred thousand dollars on a Senate race and both candidates were Clean Elections. How is that working for us? I've won 12 elections. I've been successful in most of them, but haven't been in a few of them. The only time I ran with Clean Elections was one of them that I lost. There was outside influence beyond the money that I was given for my primary, so I called Ethics, hoping to get a little help with the matching funds. I was told that another campaign can't influence. I was told that businesses can't influence. I was told a lot of things, but they had no teeth to give me that little respect of matching funds to compete with all the outside influences on that election, which is fine, but the rules aren't working.

Candidates have one primary goal and that's to be elected, but they also have to earn it and to think that people can go out and get money from the taxpayer to run for this body and have it easy enough to go get a few \$5 checks doesn't make any sense to me. Number one, a candidate needs to organize their campaign. A good way to organize is to go out and see if there is financial support. Raise your own money. Now that we don't have matching funds to help you offset that outside influence, all the PAC money. We heard some debate earlier about all these candidates are Clean Elections and have these huge tens of thousands of dollar PACs. That doesn't make any sense. All these independent expenditures, you can't keep up with it. Unfortunately, those who voted for it thought they were trying to do something positive, and we, those who participate, have taken their good will to try and affect it and turn it on its head. Clean Elections does not work. A good friend of mine on the other side of the aisle, when I was here, David Shiah, and the organization, got it in place. It was well intended, but they didn't expect these PACs, individuals who come here and serve in this body and raise money in PACs, and all these independent expenditures that come from all over the nation, just so we can say, "I'm a Clean candidate." This doesn't work. I would encourage you to oppose the motion. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Calais, Representative Maker.

Representative **MAKER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've said this

before and I'll say it again, I like the Maine Clean Elections, but I do not think this is the time to be expanding the program. I try to spend as little money as I can. I try to get out in the public and talk door to door, talk to the people. I think we're spending way too much money on politics when we have such a need in this state. I really think you ought to consider where things that have been cut out of this budget for the people that need it and we're adding for us to run campaigns, and we passed a bill recently on having parties afterwards? That is absolutely ridiculous. That is not the purpose of Maine Clean Elections, so I really think you ought to think about what you're doing here today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Augusta, Representative Wilson.

Representative **WILSON**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I spoke on a similar bill to this not too long ago. I'm going to be short and sweet. If you want to run clean, run clean. If you want to run traditional, run traditional. The idea that you run clean and actually pretend to think that it is clean and then go out and raise tens of thousands of dollars for a PAC is wrong. Raise money or don't raise money. I would support this bill if it had something in there that said if you want to run clean, you can't raise money for a PAC. That's perfectly fine with me. But don't sit here and pretend that this is actually about running a clean election. All this will do is mean that traditional candidates will raise more money, increasing the costs every single year. Elections cost enough money as it is. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Scarborough, Representative Sirocki.

Representative **SIROCKI**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wasn't going to rise and speak today, so I do not have a prepared speech, but I think a lot of people in this body know that I had kind of a rough race and back when I went to the voting booth and voted for Clean Elections, I thought it was clean. Boy was I mistaken. I think we are fooling ourselves if we think that outside money is not involved in our races. I have had people come to my door at night on foot with flashlights. When asked where they were from, one was from Connecticut; one was from a Midwestern state. My opponent was able to say with nice clean hands that she didn't have anything to do with this. This outside money is influencing our races in this state. This is not clean. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Eddington, Representative Johnson.

Representative **JOHNSON**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have several problems with this bill. First of all, this bill actually raises the Clean Election money available to a higher level than it was prior to the loss of matching funds. At a time when we are having trouble balancing the budget, do we want to add this extra expense onto the people of the State of Maine? We just heard about the independent expenditures, that's my other thing. It doesn't keep outside money out of Clean Elections. People are there and money is getting spent on. We just heard from our good friend, my good friend from Orrington, about how much money was spent on the Bangor Senate race. You know, it's just outlandish, in my eye. The two things Clean Elections were supposed to do when they started out was keep big money out, and we know it's not doing that, and it was supposed to level the playing field for everyone, and it's not doing that either. It never has. I heard from the other side of the aisle that with Clean Elections, you have to file reports and everybody knows where the money comes from. Well, when you run traditional, you have to file the same reports and all that information is public

information so everybody can see it. So I think we ought to stay away from this bill. I'd urge you to vote Ought Not to Pass on this bill. Thank you.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Limington, Representative Kinney.

Representative **KINNEY**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today, I rise in opposition of the pending motion. This program has become so different than what it used to be that I feel that this needs to go back out to the people and they need to rethink and revote on this program. This legislation, if so enacted, will establish an opportunity for legislative candidates to qualify for a supplemental payment. The Commission on Government Ethics and Election Practices will require other special revenue fund allocation of \$6,351,750 for fiscal year '13 and '14 and \$1,653,750 in '14 and '15. Just so that the people of the House understand what is going on here, current law will give each member the opportunity to run clean for the House, current law, \$4,923. If you pass this, moving forward, you will have \$16,500. Over in the other body, current law, \$21,455. If this passes, they will now each have \$65,000. Thank you.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Portland, Representative Moonen.

Representative **MOONEN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I rise because there seems to be a lot of complaints about outside special interest funding and I think those complaints are valid, I think we all share those concerns, but Clean Elections is not about getting rid of outside special interests. If we want to do that, we should do PAC reform. PAC reform would get rid of or help alleviate outside special interest money. What Clean Elections is intended to do is separate money from candidates. So I've heard a lot about this Bangor race from last fall, where \$400,000 was spent, and again, that's an issue of PAC reform, to address that amount of money. What was great about Clean Elections was that \$400,000 was not given directly to the previous Senator from Penobscot, Senator Farnham, and it was not given directly to the current Senator from Penobscot, Senator Gratwick. Clean Elections is about separating the money from the elected official and if we want to talk about special interest money, then let's talk about PAC reform, but they are two separate issues. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Chelsea, Representative Sanderson.

Representative **SANDERSON**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have to agree with our last speaker. Clean Elections should separate money and PACs and money from the candidate, and that's why what we're currently getting under Clean Elections should be plenty, because part of our job and actually the best part of our job is to go out and actually shake the hands of the people that we are asking to vote for us so we can represent them. When it comes to other outside money influencing, we're never going to stop that. Neither side is going to stop that. We are all going to have mercenaries employed by the other side coming at us. My good friend and colleague, Representative Sirocki, from Scarborough, number two targeted race for the House this year. Myself, number three targeted race. We had people crawling on the ground, coming after us from who knows where. How did we do this? We raised our own money. We fought back our own way and that's what you need to do. Expanding the money in Clean Elections puts a burden on the taxpayer, when really it's upon us to make sure that what we're using, if you choose to take Clean Election money, is you run your race, you budget for your race and you get out there and you do the work and you knock on

every door. That's what wins elections, not more taxpayer money being handed to you under the Clean Elections Act. Thank you.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Bangor, Representative Goode.

Representative **GOODE**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I often try to contain myself from rising around bills that were worked on by other committees, but having run for office a number of times in Bangor and knowing the member of the other body from a party other than the one I'm in, who serves, whose district is across the river from the city I represent, I just felt compelled to stand up. I've always been a fan of the Clean Elections program and I think that there is a lot of public discussion around how it influences the amount of money in elections. I was a fan of it before I ran for us and upon running my first and second and third times for the Legislature, I've grown to respect maybe a less recognized value of the Clean Elections program. We all know that we only have so much time and energy and attention in our campaigns. I know that folks on both sides of the aisle have jobs and families, and we have a very diverse body with a large range of interests. I've spent a lot of time on my campaign knocking on doors, asking people what they think. I've spent time raising money for things that are important to me prior to serving in the Legislature, and I am able to raise money. I have always chosen to run clean because I only have so much time and energy, and I want to spend that time and energy and attention listening to my constituents. I think my experience has been that most of the people I represent like that I devote my campaign time to going to their homes, asking them what they think and I believe that I am a better politician for having heard them. I know that without the Clean Elections program, folks like myself, and many folks in this body who I am confident are able to raise money, are able to do all the work through their connections, their friends, people who live outside their district, their family members who live all over the country could raise the money. But we only have so much time and we only have so much attention and I think that all of us are better politicians and better candidates for spending our time meeting with the folks in our district, listening to their concerns.

I was obviously aware of the money that was spent in the city that I represent in the last election cycle and I know that both the prior Senator from Bangor and Herman and the current Senator from Bangor and Herman spent a lot of time talking to voters, and they were not spending lots of time raising money. I know that prior to the referendum on this that was overwhelmingly passed by the people, we were in the process of a having major arms race around raising money, that candidates were spending lots of time raising money, either from special interests or from personal interests, and they were not as focused on doing the door to door work, listening to their constituents. I feel like it's very important to limit the influence of money in politics, but it's also very important for all of us to keep our eye on the prize and to spend our limited campaign time, our limited campaign attention meeting with the folks in our district, asking them what they think, and I think this program does that so I will be supporting the pending motion.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Mexico, Representative Briggs.

Representative **BRIGGS**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. When I was first asked to run for the House of Representatives, I knew nothing about the campaign and legislative process. After my realization of what this entailed, my first thought was "Oh my God, how am I going to pay for this? How am I going to compete to run against an opponent?" I felt like I was just one of us, a commoner. My first thought was, with all due respect, what if a lawyer or doctor

or someone with lots of money runs against me? I don't have a chance. Without the Clean Election process, I wouldn't be here today. As the good Representative from Gardiner said, we are here representing the people of Maine, paid for by the people. Our commitment and responsibilities are to them and none other. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Caswell, Representative Ayotte.

Representative **AYOTTE**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't really relish getting up and speaking, but I thought I would speak on this one because I have never run a Clean Election campaign; however, as a matter of fact, my last campaign cost me \$447.75. That's in the Ethics report. I do want to say, however, that I am in favor. I want to make it very clear I am in favor of Clean Election money. Why am I in favor of Clean Election money? Because I know of a number of people, Representatives and Senators, who sit in this House and Senate, who perhaps would not be here had it not been for Clean Election money. Therefore, I will not resent anyone getting the money. What I do resent is when money is forcibly collected, dues, from people, workers, and then that money is used to give to an opponent. That is what I do not agree with. As far as Clean Elections money, I do not see a problem. I know of a lot of good people that are here. In my first election, I was paying my own way on every front, so when I got an Ethics report that I was supposed to have due on some date, July 24 or August 24 or whatever, I said, "Gee, I'm paying my own way. What's the problem here?" Well, it didn't quite work that way. I was fined \$135 and I thought, "Gee, this is kind of interesting." My opponent just got \$6,000 from the people of Maine and I am forced to pay \$135 in fines, and yet I did not resent it because I, again, many good people are here today because of Clean Elections and I will not be so small minded as to resent that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Fort Kent, Representative Nadeau.

Representative **NADEAU**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Maine Clean Election Act, I contend, is anything but. If I made one mistake during campaigning, it was to utilize these funds. From the time that I was eight or nine years old and I wanted to go to the movies, which were eight miles away, I would leave home without a nickel and I would make my way to town picking up bottles, so I could get downtown, sell the bottles and go to the movies. I'm used to paying my way. I'm not used to charity. Through this process, I have been fighting for my own life and for my family, friends, neighbors, even families from other states that are being investigated by the district attorney of the State of Maine on I'm not sure what the allegations are, but I can tell you that the expense that I'm spending right now is beyond what we are making in the first session. That's where my bill is up to at this point. With no formal allegations, I've had one meeting with the committee in six months, almost six months, and that's what it's done. So yes, I made a mistake. It's not coming here and coming for office. It's that I stepped on the wrong toes and they have the money and the power and the funds, and without limit, are tearing apart my family. And friends, when this is done, and it will get done soon, you will be appalled at the allegations against me and my family. I'm telling you, once and for all, I will be reimbursed by the state or by somebody.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Gardiner, Representative Grant.

Representative **GRANT**: Thank you. If it hasn't already been requested, Mr. Speaker, I would request a roll call.

The SPEAKER: A roll call is in order having been requested by the Representative from Mapleton, Representative Willette. The Chair recognizes the Representative from Waterville, Representative Longstaff.

Representative **LONGSTAFF**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As a member of the Joint Standing Committee on Veterans and Legal Affairs, I have heard the arguments on both sides of this very often, and the thing I'd like to emphasize in my, hopefully brief, comments today is that we don't make good laws by focusing on the unusual examples, if you will, on the outliers. We've heard statements about how much money each candidate would receive with the proposed legislation before us. It would be far more accurate to talk about the maximum amount of money that a candidate (blank) receives if they took advantage of all of the options in this current legislation. The truth is that many candidates do not even use the minimal allocation that they receive and return funds to the Clean Election system. I used the Clean Election system in two campaigns. Each time, I received an allocation of approximately \$4,000. Each time, I returned to the Clean Election system over \$1,000 of those funds. The system does work for the majority of candidates. The problem is less with additional funds for those candidates who are in the unusual and highly contested races than it is with the influence of that outside money that comes with strings attached, whether those connections are articulated or not, and so I think the system does work for the majority of candidates. It enables people who might otherwise be unable to run for this body, and I urge you to vote for the motion before us.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Old Orchard Beach, Representative MacDonald.

Representative **MACDONALD**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is my first time running. When I ran for this office, I spent \$518.46. I took not one penny from anybody and I won in a district that has not been won by a Republican since 1956. Pretty significant, I think, the work that you have to do when you run for any office. Every day of my political life, I've worked to just figure out how to put more money back into my taxpayers' pockets. Yesterday, we had the budget process and the budget talks. We had all of these amendments. You know, none of them went anywhere because that's how it works up here. This money – \$65,000; \$4,000 – is a lot of money to the people in my community and we should be putting a moratorium on anything for Clean Election funding until we can figure out how to put more money back in the people's pockets. That's where we should be going with this today. This is one thing that we should say. You know what, let's all stand together and say we're going to put more money back in our taxpayers' pockets and use this money to help more revenue sharing instead of thinking about ourselves. It might be a little bit harder next time when we run, but you know what? Maybe that's what the people of Maine need. Maybe they want to see something different in their politicians. So I'm standing up in opposition to this motion and I urge everybody else to. Let's put the money back in the people's pockets.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Scarborough, Representative Volk.

Representative **VOLK**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I will be very brief. Last I checked, the limit for a donation to a campaign that is privately funded is \$350 and, in my opinion, if you can be bought off by \$350, you probably don't belong up here. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Portland, Representative Russell.

Representative **RUSSELL**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I don't think that any more prolonged debate is going to change anybody's opinion about this, but I do want to state a couple of things for the record to clarify. First, I'd like to remind the chamber that we passed not that long ago a bipartisan resolution to overturn *Citizens United*, precisely because there was such a problem with money in politics, and this body overwhelmingly supported this resolution. I would also argue that this past election is precisely why we need to fix the program. The Senate race in Bangor was mentioned numerous times and one of the big issues that came out from both candidates was that they did not have enough money to actually articulate their views up over the debate that was happening way above their heads with the money, and it was precisely because we did not fix the program two years ago that they did not have money to raise above that frame. We are not adding money at this point. We are restoring what has been cut to some degree and the budget, I would argue, has been set. So we're not adding more money, but we are changing the system so that in the future we can respond to the *McComish* decision.

One last thing, we are debating ourselves here, but let's remember that this is not about us, as has been stated. This is actually about what the people asked us to do just about a decade ago. So we can sit here and debate our own selves and claim that we're on one side of the people or the other, but the people actually spoke on this and they spoke resoundingly. I believe the vote was somewhere in the neighborhood of 59 percent, which is a rare occasion. So if it does come down to it, there will be a referendum and I am happy to support that if this chamber and this body does not do the right thing, and just like when this body chose to repeal Election Day registration two years ago, I will be right there in the trenches with the people bringing this back so that it is proper. But I would hope that the people in the chamber that have been elected by the very people that voted for this would ultimately do the right thing, change the law so that we can respond to the *McComish* decision appropriately and set ourselves up for the future so that when there is revenue, that we would be able to fund public financing once and for all, which, by the way, has not been an unsuccessful program but has been one of the most successful programs this state has ever brought forth and that's because, I would argue, it came from the people. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Hiram, Representative Rankin.

Representative **RANKIN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First, the things about Clean Elections that I was never aware of, even though I've used that approach for three times now, I think it's a perfect setup to keep people honest. I wonder how many of you here, I thought probably everybody knew we had an Ethics Commission and they keep track of every single cent that you have and if you spend, and if you don't spend all the money that's been allocated to you, you must return it, you must have a receipt for everything you do. It keeps your conscience clear. I would certainly think so anyway. We're limited in what we can get for outside contributions. People sometimes might like to give you a little more and that would be okay, but that could get out of hand. You are not supposed to go above a certain limit and you have to keep a receipt, as I think I've already said, and I, unfortunately, lost a receipt and, let me tell you, Ethics didn't let me get away with it. I had to find that and prove that I was being honest, as I hoped to think that I was honest anyway, but it's a rule, you have to do that. If you have any money left from what you got at the end of the campaign, you return that. I've never heard of a Clean Elections candidate having a PAC. I've heard of PACs, certainly,

but I thought that was illegal for a Clean Election candidate. If your competition gets extra funds, you may get money to match that. As a matter of fact, I had a competitor once and I got \$7,000. I returned every cent of it to the state. I just kind of think that you ought to think twice about accusing people that run Clean Elections are being dishonest. I truly do not believe that. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Sanford, Representative Boland.

Representative **BOLAND**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just wanted to add one thing about the Clean Elections. I've brought some challenging bills to this Legislature on labeling, cellphones, and challenging the reliability of the electric grid, smart meters, that sort of thing, and vaccines, and I end up hearing from people all around the country about that and they ask why it's not happening in other places. They are concerned that they can't get their legislators to bring bills like that. My explanation has typically been because we are fortunate enough in Maine to have a Clean Election Law and it's just not I. Other people have brought challenging bills. I think that is what allows us to feel free to bring challenging legislation because we know that we don't have to depend on big money to return us to office, and everyone is always very excited and thrilled to hear about the Maine Clean Election Law. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought to Pass as Amended Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 327

YEA - Ayotte, Beavers, Berry, Boland, Briggs, Brooks, Carey, Cassidy, Chapman, Chenette, Chipman, Cooper, Daughtry, DeChant, Devin, Dickerson, Dill, Dorney, Evangelos, Farnsworth, Fowle, Frey, Gattine, Gideon, Gilbert, Goode, Grant, Hamann, Harlow, Hayes, Herbig, Hobbins, Hubbell, Jones, Jorgensen, Kaenrath, Kent, Kornfield, Kruger, Kumiega, Kusiak, Lajoie, Libby N, Longstaff, Luchini, MacDonald W, Marks, Mason, Mastraccio, McCabe, McGowan, McLean, Monaghan-Derrig, Moonen, Moriarty, Morrison, Nadeau C, Nelson, Noon, Peoples, Plante, Powers, Priest, Pringle, Rankin, Rochelo, Rotundo, Russell, Rykerson, Sanborn, Saxton, Schneck, Shaw, Short, Stanley, Stuckey, Theriault, Tipping-Spitz, Treat, Verow, Villa, Welsh, Werts, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Beaulieu, Bennett, Campbell R, Casavant, Chase, Clark, Crafts, Cray, Crockett, Davis, Doak, Dunphy, Duprey, Espling, Fitzpatrick, Fredette, Gifford, Gillway, Graham, Guerin, Harvell, Jackson, Johnson D, Johnson P, Keschl, Kinney, Knight, Lockman, Long, MacDonald S, Maker, Malaby, Marean, McClellan, McElwee, Newendyke, Nutting, Parry, Pease, Peavey Haskell, Pouliot, Reed, Sanderson, Saucier, Sirocki, Timberlake, Turner, Tyler, Volk, Weaver, Willette, Wilson, Winchenbach, Winsor, Wood.

ABSENT - Beaudoin, Beck, Black, Bolduc, Campbell J, Cotta, Dion, Hickman, Libby A, Nadeau A, Peterson, Wallace.

Yes, 84; No, 55; Absent, 12; Excused, 0.

84 having voted in the affirmative and 55 voted in the negative, with 12 being absent, and accordingly the Majority Ought to Pass as Amended Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (S-156)** was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED**.

Under suspension of the rules the Bill was given its **SECOND READING WITHOUT REFERENCE** to the Committee on **Bills in the Second Reading**.

Under further suspension of the rules the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-156)** in concurrence.

SENATE PAPERS

Bill "An Act To Make Supplemental Appropriations and Allocations for the Expenditures of State Government and To Change Certain Provisions of the Law Necessary to the Proper Operations of State Government for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2013" (EMERGENCY)

(S.P. 604) (L.D. 1563)

Committee on **APPROPRIATIONS AND FINANCIAL AFFAIRS** suggested and ordered printed.

Came from the Senate, under suspension of the rules and **WITHOUT REFERENCE** to a Committee, the Bill **READ TWICE** and **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED**.

Under suspension of the rules, the Bill was given its **FIRST READING WITHOUT REFERENCE** to a committee.

Under further suspension of the rules, the Bill was given its **SECOND READING WITHOUT REFERENCE** to the Committee on **Bills in the Second Reading**.

Under further suspension of the rules, the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED** in concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The following matters, in the consideration of which the House was engaged at the time of adjournment yesterday, had preference in the Orders of the Day and continued with such preference until disposed of as provided by House Rule 502.

Bill "An Act To Promote Tourism and Foster Economic Development" (EMERGENCY)

(H.P. 1005) (L.D. 1409)

- In House, Majority (9) **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report of the Committee on **TAXATION READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-401)** on June 10, 2013.

- In Senate, Minority (4) **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report of the Committee on **TAXATION READ** and **ACCEPTED** in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

TABLED - June 13, 2013 (Till Later Today) by Representative McCABE of Skowhegan.

PENDING - **FURTHER CONSIDERATION**.

Subsequently, on motion of Representative HAMANN of South Portland, the House voted to **RECEDE**.

The same Representative **PRESENTED House Amendment "A" (H-504)**, which was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED**.

Subsequently, the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-401)** and **House Amendment "A" (H-504)** in **NON-CONCURRENCE** and sent for concurrence.

HOUSE DIVIDED REPORT - Majority (8) **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-494)** - Minority (4) **Ought Not to Pass** - Committee on **HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES** on Resolve, Directing the Department of Health and Human Services To Amend Its Rules of Reimbursement under the MaineCare Program for Audiology and Speech-language Pathology Services

(H.P. 832) (L.D. 1188)

TABLED - June 13, 2013 (Till Later Today) by Representative BERRY of Bowdoinham.

PENDING - **ACCEPTANCE OF EITHER REPORT**.

Subsequently, on motion of Representative FARNSWORTH of Portland, the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Resolve was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (H-494)** was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED**.

Under suspension of the rules the Resolve was given its **SECOND READING WITHOUT REFERENCE** to the Committee on **Bills in the Second Reading**.

Under further suspension of the rules the Resolve was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-494)** and sent for concurrence.

Reference was made to Bill "An Act To Protect Maine Communities by Prohibiting Horse Slaughter for Human Consumption and the Transport of Horses for Slaughter"

(H.P. 913) (L.D. 1286)

In reference to the action of the House on June 13, 2013 whereby it Insisted and Joined in a Committee of Conference, the Chair appointed the following members on the part of the House as Conferees:

Representative DICKERSON of Rockland

Representative VILLA of Harrison

Representative KNIGHT of Livermore Falls

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on **HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES** reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act To Restore Funding for Head Start"

(S.P. 207) (L.D. 517)

Signed:

Senators:

CRAVEN of Androscoggin

HAMPER of Oxford

LACHOWICZ of Kennebec

Representatives:

FARNSWORTH of Portland

DORNEY of Norridgewock

GATTINE of Westbrook

MALABY of Hancock

McELWEE of Caribou

PRINGLE of Windham

SANDERSON of Chelsea

SIROCKI of Scarborough

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-199)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Representative:

STUCKEY of Portland

Representative BEAR of the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians - of the House - supports the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

Came from the Senate with the Reports **READ** and the Bill and accompanying papers **INDEFINITELY POSTPONED**.

READ.

On motion of Representative FARNSWORTH of Portland, the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** in concurrence.

COMMUNICATIONS

The Following Communication: (S.C. 473)

**MAINE SENATE
126TH LEGISLATURE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

June 13, 2013

Honorable Millicent M. MacFarland

Clerk of the House

2 State House Station

Augusta, Maine 04333

Dear Clerk MacFarland:

Please be advised the Senate today insisted to its previous action whereby it accepted the Minority Ought Not to Pass Report from the Committee on Labor, Commerce, Research and Economic Development on Bill "An Act To Require the Use of Preapproved Subcontractors for Publicly Funded Construction Projects" (H.P. 922) (L.D. 1295), in non-concurrence.

Best Regards,

S/Darek M. Grant

Secretary of the Senate

READ and ORDERED PLACED ON FILE.

The Following Communication: (S.C. 475)

**MAINE SENATE
126TH LEGISLATURE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

June 13, 2013

Honorable Millicent M. MacFarland

Clerk of the House

2 State House Station

Augusta, Maine 04333

Dear Clerk MacFarland:

Please be advised the Senate today insisted to its previous action whereby it Indefinitely Postponed Bill "An Act To Facilitate the Processing of Livestock That Is Not for Resale" (S.P. 104) (L.D. 271) and all accompanying papers, in non-concurrence.

Best Regards,

S/Darek M. Grant

Secretary of the Senate

READ and ORDERED PLACED ON FILE.

CONSENT CALENDAR

First Day

In accordance with House Rule 519, the following items appeared on the Consent Calendar for the First Day:

(H.P. 25) (L.D. 27) Bill "An Act To Enable the Town of Livermore Falls To Withdraw from Androscoggin County and Join Franklin County" Committee on **STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-503)**

(H.P. 704) (L.D. 1006) Bill "An Act To Clarify Transparency of Medical Provider Profiling Programs Used by Insurance Companies and Other Providers of Health Insurance" Committee on **INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-502)**

Under suspension of the rules, Second Day Consent Calendar notification was given.

There being no objection, the House Papers were **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended** and sent for concurrence.

(H.P. 819) (L.D. 1154) Bill "An Act To Establish the Maine Length of Service Award Program" Committee on **LABOR, COMMERCE, RESEARCH AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-501)**

On motion of Representative FREDETTE of Newport, was **REMOVED** from the First Day Consent Calendar.

The Unanimous Committee Report was **READ**.

On further motion of the same Representative, **TABLED** pending **ACCEPTANCE** of the Committee Report and later today assigned.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

ENACTORS

Emergency Measure

An Act To Make Supplemental Appropriations and Allocations for the Expenditures of State Government and To Change Certain Provisions of the Law Necessary to the Proper Operations of State Government for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2013

(S.P. 604) (L.D. 1563)

Reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 129 voted in favor of the same and 5 against, and accordingly the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

On motion of Representative FREY of Bangor, the House adjourned at 12:34 p.m., until 9:00 a.m., Monday, June 17, 2013.