

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

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



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

LEGISLATIVE RECORD

OF THE

***One Hundred and Twelfth
Legislature***

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

Volume I

FIRST REGULAR SESSION

December 5, 1984 - June 20, 1985

HOUSE

Thursday, April 11, 1985

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

Prayer by Reverend Winifred Reynolds, Windsor Memorial Baptist Church.

Quorum called; was held.

The Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

Papers from the Senate

Bill "An Act to Define Eligibility for School Purposes and to Determine Financial Responsibility for the Education, Care and Treatment of State Agency Clients" (Emergency) (S.P. 477) (L.D. 1284)

Came from the Senate, referred to the Committee on Education and Ordered Printed.

Was referred to the Committee on Education in concurrence.

Bill "An Act Concerning Children in Need of Social Services" (S.P. 478) (L.D. 1285)

Came from the Senate, referred to the Committee on Human Resources and Ordered Printed.

Was referred to the Committee on Human Resources in concurrence.

Bill "An Act to Make Improvements in the State Workers' Compensation System" (S.P. 479) (L.D. 1286)

Came from the Senate, referred to the Committee on Labor and Ordered Printed.

Was referred to the Committee on Labor in concurrence.

Unanimous Leave to Withdraw

Report of the Committee on State Government reporting "Leave to Withdraw" on Bill "An Act to Establish a Maine Commission for Men" (S.P. 315) (L.D. 804)

Was placed in the Legislative Files without further action pursuant to Joint Rule 15 in concurrence.

Ought to Pass in New Draft

Report of the Committee on Taxation on RESOLVE, Reimbursing Certain Municipalities on Account of Taxes Lost due to Lands being Classified under the Tree Growth Tax Law. (Emergency) (S.P. 44) (L.D. 1278)

Came from the Senate, with the report read and accepted and the New Draft passed to be engrossed.

Report was read and accepted, the Bill read once and assigned for Second Reading tomorrow.

Reports of Committees**Ought to Pass in New Draft/New Title**

Representative WARREN from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Relating to Employment of Minors Under the Liquor Laws" (H.P. 311) (L.D. 400) reporting "Ought to Pass" in New Draft under New Title Bill "An Act to Amend the Liquor Laws" (H.P. 904) (L.D. 1281)

Report was read and accepted, the Bill read once and assigned for Second Reading tomorrow.

Ought to Pass in New Draft/New Title

Representative PAUL from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act to Provide for Licensing of Bottle Clubs" (H.P. 189) (L.D. 223) reporting "Ought to Pass" in New Draft under New Title Bill "An Act to Provide for Registration of Bottle Clubs" (H.P. 905) (L.D. 1282)

Report was read and accepted, the New Draft read once and assigned for Second Reading tomorrow.

Ought to Pass in New Draft/New Title

Representative FOSTER from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act to Allocate Oil Overcharge Money"

(H.P. 308) (L.D. 397) reporting "Ought to Pass" in New Draft under New Title Bill "An Act to Appropriate and Allocate Oil Overcharge Money" (Emergency) (H.P. 906) (L.D. 1283)

Report was read and accepted, the New Draft read once and assigned for Second Reading tomorrow.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on State Government reporting "Ought to Pass" on Bill "An Act to Authorize the Use of Energy Service Companies and 3rd Party Financing for Conservation Improvements at State Facilities" (H.P. 302) (L.D. 391)

Signed:

Sensors:

KANY of Kennebec

ANDREWS of Cumberland

HICHENS of York

Representatives:

BOUTILIER of Lewiston

GWADOSKY of Fairfield

DESCOTEAUX of Biddeford

LACROIX of Oakland

COTE of Auburn

NADEAU of Saco

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting "Ought Not to Pass" on same Bill.

Signed:

Representatives:

HICHBORN of LaGrange

DILLENBACK of Cumberland

WENTWORTH of Wells

SPROUL of Augusta

Reports were read.

Representative Gwadosky of Fairfield moved that the House accept the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Cumberland, Representative Dillenback.

Representative DILLENBACK: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is a rather involved and complex bill. It is third party financing. What does third party financing do? Third party financing allows an outside firm to come in and purchase equipment which will be used for energy reduction and that equipment will be rented to the state and the state will receive the savings. Now I can understand this. We have a law on the books right now for a biomass boiler situation like we are doing at Pineland where you are getting into millions of dollars. This makes sense perhaps because we do not have the expertise perhaps in this state to go into biomass boiler construction and operation.

The thing that bothers me about this bill is that it is really a back door approach to taking care of normal procedures that the state would go through. As an example, if we wanted to put storm windows on this State House, there is no question we could have a savings. But what this allows us to do is hire a firm to come in and make an evaluation, come up with a proposed savings, charge the state 40 percent of the savings. Now this does not make sense to me. If there is any savings to be realized, the state should have all the savings.

Another good example is, we need boilers in certain areas. They would come in and make an evaluation, they would put a boiler in and perhaps they would finance it over a basis of ten to twenty years and at the end of twenty years, the boiler would revert back to the state. At the end of twenty years, the boiler is probably no good anyway and the savings attained would be again split between the people who are making the installation and ourselves. Why do they do this? Because they are taking advantage of a tax situation that we cannot take advantage of. The federal government now is in debt to a great extent and we hear day to day how we are going to lose money because the federal government is not going to send back to the towns in the state monies to run the programs that they have been do-

ing. But what does this do? These people who are third party, we are not allowed to do it because we are a government in ourselves, are going to get a tax benefit, they are going to get an accelerated depreciation. Where does that money come from? It comes from the federal government.

We talk about corporations not paying any taxes. We are critical of corporations not paying taxes. Why don't they pay taxes? Because they take advantage of the same situation that is being explained right here. They get a tax break on the equipment they buy, they get a accelerated depreciation and we are a party to the same thing if we go along with the third party financing.

Another example of how this might work is that a company could come in here, the electrical bill is based on peak usage, the company would come in and they would make an analysis and they would put a computer here at the State House. They know they are going to save money because they are going to make darn sure that we do not reach above that peak usage. How do they do it? They install a computer and, when we approach that peak, they cut off the heat and hot water units, they will cut off half the parking lot lights, they will reduce the lighting in certain areas and therefore they do make a savings. My whole contention on this bill is that the State of Maine can do this themselves. We have a Bureau of Public Improvement. This bureau is here to take care of the state buildings. If we have to buy a boiler or we have to put a computer in, we have done it on telephones, we have done it on everything else. It is a major expense so why can't we go out and put a bond out and let the people decide whether they want to have this improvement?

The arguments have been given to us that we are not interested in energy savings. I don't believe that. I believe this is a process of a way of getting around things.

The law is now here for most of the biomass work. I don't think we need this law right now. I hope you will give it some due consideration.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Lagrange, Representative Hichborn.

Representative HICHBORN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Third party financing sounds very attractive. It sounds as though we were getting something for nothing. We buy today and pay tomorrow and pay out of savings. It sounds attractive certainly. We have the argument presented that there are projects that need to be done for the state but that the legislature won't approve. If the legislature won't approve, there must be a good reason for it. They claim that all the expenses for these projects can be paid for out of savings. Representative Dillenback has made it plain that if there are savings to be made that we are perfectly capable of making those savings ourselves. We were given a list of people who were interested in third party financing. It is interesting to note that over 90 percent of those firms are out-of-state concerns. If there is money to be saved, it should be saved here in the State of Maine for the people of Maine, by you and me, who are representatives of the people of Maine.

I hope that you will accept the "Ought Not to Pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Fairfield, Representative Gwadosky.

Representative GWADOSKY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Every once in a while a bill comes across here that you can really get excited about and this is one of those bills for me.

This legislation specifically authorizes the use of energy service companies and third party financing for the conservation improvements with state facilities. More importantly, this innovative financing arrangement

allows the state to pursue some very important energy conservation improvements resulting in enormous energy savings without any capital investment on the part of the state.

One aspect I want to emphasize is that this is enabling legislation. This is permissive legislation. This bill doesn't mandate that the state do anything about anything. This bill simply allows an alternative for the state in their attempt to create greater energy efficiency in our state facilities.

Let me just give an specific example of how this bill might work. Let's say the state has a particular building at the state facility that they believe they are paying an inordinate amount of money for energy costs. The state could bring in one of these energy service companies and they would perform an energy audit on this particular building. They would calculate exactly how much we are spending for energy cost on this facility. They would then create a package of the type of energy improvements they believe should be put into this facility to save money. The state then could take that into consideration, they could do whatever they wanted to. If the state wanted to get involved with these people, they could then negotiate a contract. If they did negotiate a contract, the energy service company would come in, they would install the identified improvements, they would operate and maintain the improvements and they would pay for all the expenses incurred.

What does the energy service company get out of this? In the event that there are energy savings from putting these energy improvements into place, they receive a percentage of those savings. If there is no savings, they receive nothing. At the termination of these various contracts there is usually three things that can happen, three options: the contract could be renewed at a renegotiated amount; the state could actually purchase the energy improvements at fair market value or simply they could have the energy service company remove the energy improvements altogether.

Now obviously there are three distinct advantages with this type of contract arrangement: (1) the state government can save a great deal of money in satisfying its energy needs without making any monetary investment. Now, as you know, in the past the way we have created these energy improvements or the way we have been able to acquire them is to try to bond for these things and you know how difficult it is to try to get the electorate to support the bonding for these facilities. They are not the high priority items that people like to have. Given that, this is a very attractive method particularly in today's tight financial situation.

Secondly, since the energy service company only receives a return on its investment based on the amount of money actually saved, there is a built-in incentive for the energy service companies to create as much energy savings as possible.

Thirdly, the state incurs no risk in buying energy savings measures that may or may not perform as expected.

The State of Maine last year spent some \$8 million in non-transportation oriented energy, \$4.8 million was just for fuel oil and you know where that money is going. The Office of Energy Resources estimates the state government could save at least \$500,000 annually through the use of energy service contracting. It is an innovative financing arrangement that is in many other states. In Maine, Bates College has taken advantage of this, Bates Fabric Manufacturing Company, the A.C. Lawrence Leather Co. in South Paris, St. Mary's Hospital in Lewiston, Miles Memorial Hospital in Damariscotta, have all been in third party financing arrangements. The Office of Energy Resources is currently in discussions with the City of Bangor, Blue Cross-Blue Shield, Maine

National Guard, Northern Maine Vocational Technical Institute. Passage of this legislation clears the way for some serious pursuit of new approaches to satisfy the energy needs that we all need without any capital risk for the state. It seems to me that if we are in a position to save some enormous amounts of money, taxpayer money, at no risk, that is the direction we ought to be heading in.

I would urge you to adopt the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Cumberland, Representative Dillenback.

Representative DILLENBACK: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I will not keep this going too much longer but there are a few points I would like to make.

We had an example given to us where an investment of \$200,000 would return \$100,000 a year. Can you imagine why anybody would want to be involved with something like this? I think we all ought to go into business, because if you can get returns like that, there is something wrong. We have an Office of Energy Resources. There are sixteen positions in there and their salaries and fringe benefits are \$455,000 a year. The federal government puts in salaries of \$245,000, \$98,000 fringe benefits or \$343,000 a year. . . .

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Fairfield, Representative Gwadosky and inquires for what purpose he rises?

Representative Gwadosky: Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully submit that the Representative from Cumberland is attempting to debate another bill to abolish the Office of Energy Resources which is not before this body.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the Representative from Cumberland, Representative Dillenback, that the point is well taken, that he is not to discuss the abolishment of the Office.

The Chair recognizes that same Representative.

Representative DILLENBACK: It is true there is another bill coming before this body and I guess the bill is to do away with the Department of Energy Resources, that was my point. I would like to point out to my Chairman that nobody does anything for nothing. And there is a great reason for people wanting third party financing. You know, if that were true, we would all lease our automobiles and, at the end of six years, they would give them to us. I hope you give this some consideration.

I would request a roll call.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call, it must have the expressed desire of more than one-fifth of the members present and voting. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken and, obviously, more than one-fifth of the members present and voting having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is the motion of the Representative from Fairfield, Representative Gwadosky, that the House accept the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

Roll Call No. 34

YEAS:—Aliberti, Allen, Baker, H.R.; Beaulieu, Boutillier, Brannigan, Brodeur, Brown, A.K.; Carroll, Carter, Chonko, Clark, Coles, Connolly, Cooper, Cote, Crouse, Crowley, Daggett, Descoteaux, Diamond, Duffy, Erwin, Gwadosky, Hale, Handy, Hayden, Hickey, Hoglund, Jacques, Joseph, Lacroix, Macomber, Manning, Martin, H.C.; Mayo, McCollister, McGowan, McHenry, McSweeney, Melendy, Michael, Michaud, Mills, Mitchell, Moholland, Murray, Nadeau, G.G.; Nadeau, G.R.; Nelson, O'Gara, Paradis, P.E.; Paul, Perry, Pouliot, Priest, Racine, Reeves, Richard,

Rioux, Roberts, Rolde, Rotondi, Ruhlin, Rydell, Simpson, Smith, C.B.; Soucy, Stevens, P.; Swazey, Tammaro, Tardy, Theriault, Vose, Walker, The Speaker.

NAYS:—Armstrong, Begley, Bell, Bonney, Bott, Bragg, Brown, D.N.; Cahill, Callahan, Conners, Davis, Dellert, Dexter, Dillenback, Drinkwater, Farnum, Foss, Foster, Greenlaw, Harper, Hichborn, Hillock, Holloway, Ingraham, Jackson, Jalbert, Kimball, Lander, Law, Lawrence, Lebowitz, Lord, MacBride, Masterman, Matthews, McPherson, Murphy, E.M.; Murphy, T.W.; Nicholson, Nickerson, Paradis, E.J.; Parent, Pines, Randall, Rice, Salsbury, Scarpino, Seavey, Sherburne, Small, Smith, C.W.; Sproul, Stetson, Stevens, A.G.; Stevenson, Strout, Taylor, Telow, Webster, Wentworth, Weymouth, Whitcomb, Willey, Zirkilton.

ABSENT:—Baker, A.L.; Bost, Carrier, Cashman, Hepburn, Higgins, H.C.; Higgins, L.M.; Kane, Lisnik, Ridley, Warren.

76 having voted in the affirmative and 64 in the negative with 11 being absent, the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report was accepted, the Bill read once and assigned for Second Reading tomorrow.

Consent Calendar Second Day

In accordance with House Rule 49, the following items appeared on the Consent Calendar for the Second Day:

(H.P. 777) (L.D. 1098) Bill "An Act Related to the Observance of Memorial Day" (Emergency)

No objections having been noted at the end of the Second Legislative Day, the House Paper was Passed to be Engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

(H.P. 742) (L.D. 1052) Bill "An Act to Make Additional Allocations from the Federal Expenditure Fund for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1985" (Emergency)

(H.P. 417) (L.D. 583) Bill "An Act to Increase the Annual Public Utilities Commission Regulatory Fund Assessment and to Clarify the Current Statutes" (Emergency) (C. "A" H-67)

No objections having been noted at the end of the Second Legislative Day, the House Papers were Passed to be Engrossed or Passed to be Engrossed as Amended and sent up for concurrence.

Passed to Be Engrossed Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act to Amend the Municipal General Assistance Law" (H.P. 576) (L.D. 847)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Second Reading and read a second time.

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

Representative ROLDE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I spoke yesterday about drawing up an amendment. That amendment is being prepared now. It is not ready and I would request somebody table this for one legislative day.

On motion of Representative Nelson of Portland, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and tomorrow assigned.

As Amended

Bill "An Act to Amend the Laws Relating to Admission to the Bar" (S.P. 220) (L.D. 579) (C. "A" S-40)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Second Reading and read a second time.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Biddeford, Representative Racine.

Representative RACINE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Before we pass this bill to be engrossed, looking at the bill,

there are a lot of changes and I feel that the title may be sort of deceiving. It reads "An Act to Amend the Laws Relating to the Admission to the Bar." It looks like the bill makes a lot of substantial changes. Before we pass this bill to be engrossed, I would like to have someone explain to us exactly what we are doing. Are we trying to protect the turf of the attorneys or is this something that is needed or necessary? I would like to have someone explain it to me.

The SPEAKER: The Representative from Biddeford, Representative Racine, has posed a question through the Chair to anyone who may respond.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Brunswick, Representative Priest.

Representative PRIEST: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Basically, this is a housekeeping bill. It accomplishes two things as far as I am concerned that are of some importance to the consumers of the state. It provides that before an attorney can be admitted to the bar, he or she has to observe a certain number of legal proceedings and get someone who is at that legal proceeding to sign off the fact that the prospective candidate has been there. This assures that attorneys will not start practicing law without having any conception of what a trial is like or Workers' Compensation is like or any other legal proceeding is like.

The second thing it does is that, within 18 months after a person is admitted to the bar, he or she must complete a practical skills course which is going to be set up by the Board of Bar Examiners. That is generally called bridging the gap and is approximately a day to a day and a half course which most people attend anyway. The purposes of this bill is primarily a housekeeping except it does ensure some practical experience for those people who are going to be practicing law in this state. You recall, of course, there are many people who practice law in this state and are admitted to practice law from other states, come into Maine and have little conception in many cases how the legal system works here. This bill is intended to make sure that those people when they are admitted do have some conception of how the legal system works. It is not a turf protection bill by any means. It is merely something to help consumers in the state be sure that people admitted to the bar have some practical experience in addition to academic experience.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Damariscotta, Representative Stetson.

Representative STETSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I had not intended to get up and debate this bill today but now that it has come before us, I would just like to suggest one thing to you, that this bill is not a good bill. It is, in fact a false bill in the sense that it creates the impression that a young attorney can learn how to try a law suit in a cram course of two days. I will tell you this that I have been practicing law a good many years and I have been a trial lawyer a good many years and you don't learn how to try a case in two days. I believe that this bill really gives false security to the idea that a graduate of a law school, who has taken a bar exam, might in any way qualify as a trial lawyer. This is not the case. I would urge you to give this very careful consideration and vote no on this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Presque Isle, Representative MacBride.

Representative MacBRIDE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think this is a good bill. This is just another way to tighten up admission to the bar. It is a small way, indeed, but I think it is important to have this practical experience. I think this addition will really make a difference. I hope you will

support the Majority Report today and pass the bill.

Representative Racine of Biddeford requested a roll call vote.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call, it must have the expressed desire of more than one-fifth of the members present and voting. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken and, obviously, more than one-fifth of the members present and voting having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is passage to be engrossed. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

Roll Call No. 35

YEAS:—Aliberti, Allen, Baker, H.R.; Beaulieu, Begley, Bell, Bott, Boutilier, Brannigan, Brodeur, Brown, A.K.; Cahill, Carroll, Carter, Chonko, Clark, Coles, Connolly, Cooper, Cote, Crouse, Crowley, Daggett, Descoteaux, Diamond, Drinkwater, Erwin, Farnum, Foss, Foster, Gwadosky, Hale, Handy, Harper, Hichborn, Hickey, Higgins, H.C.; Hoglund, Holloway, Ingraham, Jacques, Jalbert, Kane, Kimball, Lacroix, Law, Lawrence, Lebowitz, Lord, MacBride, Macomber, Manning, Martin, H.C.; Matthews, Mayo, McCollister, McGowan, McHenry, McPherson, McSweeney, Melendy, Michael, Mills, Mitchell, Moholland, Murphy, E.M.; Murphy, T.W.; Murray, Nadeau, G.G.; Nadeau, G.R.; Nicholson, Nickerson, O'Gara, Paradis, E.J.; Paradis, P.E.; Paul, Perry, Pines, Pouliot, Priest, Randall, Reeves, Rice, Richard, Rioux, Roberts, Rolde, Rotondi, Ruhlin, Rydell, Small, Sproul, Stevens, P.; Stevenson, Strout, Swazey, Tamarro, Tardy, Taylor, Telow, Theriault, Vose, Walker, Wentworth, Whitcomb, Willey

NAYS:—Armstrong, Baker, A.L.; Bonney, Bragg, Brown, D.N.; Callahan, Davis, Dellert, Dexter, Dillenback, Duffy, Greenlaw, Hillock, Jackson, Lander, Masterman, McPherson, Parent, Racine, Salsbury, Scarpino, Seavey, Sherburne, Smith, C.B.; Smith, C.W.; Stetson, Stevens, A.G.; Stetson, Stevens, A.G.; Webster, Weymouth, Zirkilton

ABSENT:—Bost, Carrier, Cashman, Connors, Hayden, Hepburn, Higgins, L.M.; Joseph, Lisnik, Nelson, Ridley, Simpson, Soucy, Warren, The Speaker

106 having voted in the affirmative and 30 in the negative with 15 being absent, the motion did prevail.

Sent up for concurrence.

The following items appearing on Supplement No. 1 were taken up out of order by unanimous consent.

Papers from the Senate Non-concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Increase Academic Learning Time" (H.P. 161) (L.D. 195) on which the Minority "Ought Not to Pass" Report of the Committee on Education was read and accepted in the House on April 9, 1985.

Came from the Senate with the Majority "Ought to Pass" in New Draft (H.P. 862) (L.D. 1215) Report of the Committee on Education read and accepted and the New Draft passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

Representative Brown of Gorham moved that the House adhere to its former action whereby "Ought Not to Pass" Report was accepted.

Representative McCollister of Canton requested a Division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will order a vote. The pending question before the House is the motion of the Representative from Gorham, Representative Brown, that the House adhere. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

104 having voted in the affirmative and 30 in the negative, the motion to adhere did

prevail.

Passed to Be Enacted Emergency Measure

An Act to Make Permanent the Special Fuel Tax Act (H.P. 316) (L.D. 405)

Was 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. 121 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.

Emergency Measure

An Act to Create a Maine Sentencing Guidelines Commission (H.P. 359) (L.D. 479) (C. "A" H-59)

Was 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. 127 voted in favor of the same and none against and according to the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

An Act to Prohibit Smoking in Certain Retail Stores (H.P. 108) (L.D. 133) (C. "A" H-58)

An Act to Provide a 10% Contingency in the School Construction Debt Service Limit (H.P. 423) (L.D. 603) (C. "A" H-63)

An Act to Adjust the Boundaries between House District 103 and House District 55 (H.P. 611) (L.D. 881)

An Act to Establish Eligibility for Burial in the Maine Veterans' Memorial Cemetery for Members of the Maine National Guard (H.P. 769) (L.D. 1061) (H. "A" H-65)

An Act to Increase Fairness to Workers' Compensation Claimants (H.P. 864) (L.D. 1221)

Were reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed, passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

(Off Record Remarks)

At this point, the House recessed for the purpose of joining in "Welcome Back Day" ceremonies.

On motion of Representative Diamond of Bangor.

Adjourned until twelve o'clock tomorrow noon.