

# 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 II**

SECOND REGULAR SESSION  
April 3 - April 16, 1986  
Index

SECOND SPECIAL SESSION  
May 28 - May 30, 1986  
Index

THIRD CONFIRMATION SESSION  
July 15, 1986  
Index

FOURTH CONFIRMATION SESSION  
August 29, 1986  
Index

THIRD SPECIAL SESSION  
October 17, 1986  
Index

FIFTH CONFIRMATION SESSION  
November 24, 1986  
Index

The House was called to order by the Speaker.  
Prayer by Reverend Timothy P. Hunt, Canaan  
Calvary Church.  
The Journal of Tuesday, April 8, 1986 was read  
and approved.  
Quorum call was held.

(Off Record Remarks)

On motion of Representative Macomber of South  
Portland,  
Recessed until 9:15 a.m..

(After Recess)

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

PAPERS FROM THE SENATE

Ought to Pass in New Draft/New Title

Report of the Committee on Human Resources on  
Bill "An Act to Require the Department of Human  
Services to Calculate Nursing Staff Ratios Taking  
into Account Both Nursing Assistants and Certified  
Nursing Assistants, Reimburse Nursing Homes for Entry  
Level Personnel, to Encourage Consistent Regulatory  
Policies Governing such Personnel and for Other  
Purposes" (S.P. 723) (L.D. 1846) reporting "Ought to  
Pass" in New Draft under New Title Bill "An Act  
Concerning Nursing Staffs in Nursing Homes, Staff  
Ratios, Reimbursement, Policies and Delegation of  
Duties" (S.P. 937) (L.D. 2350).

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

Report was read and accepted and the New Draft  
read once.

Under suspension of the rules, the New Draft was  
read the second time and passed to be engrossed in  
concurrence.

Ought to Pass in New Draft/New Title

Report of the Committee on Human Resources on  
Bill "An Act to Repeal the Annual Review of Fee  
Schedules for Providers under the Medical Assistance  
Program" (S.P. 850) (L.D. 2151) reporting "Ought to  
Pass" in New Draft under New Title Bill "An Act to  
Incorporate the Annual Review of Fee Schedules for  
Providers under the Medical Assistance Program into  
the Annual Medicaid Report" (S.P. 938) (L.D. 2351).

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

Report was read and accepted, the New Draft read

once.

Under suspension of the rules, the New Draft was  
read the second time and passed to be engrossed in  
concurrence.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Judiciary  
reporting "Ought Not to Pass" on Bill "An Act to  
Establish Policies Governing Medical Malpractice  
Claims" (S.P. 773) (L.D. 1945)

Signed:

Senators: CARPENTER of Aroostook  
CHALMERS of Knox

Representatives: PARADIS of Augusta  
PRIEST of Brunswick  
KANE of South Portland  
DRINKWATER of Belfast  
COOPER of Windham

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting  
"Ought to Pass" in New Draft (S.P. 940) (L.D. 2354)  
on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator: SEWALL of Lincoln

Representatives: MacBRIDE of Presque Isle  
LEBOWITZ of Bangor  
ALLEN of Washington  
STETSON of Damariscotta  
CARRIER of Westbrook

Came from the Senate with the Majority "Ought Not  
to Pass" Report read and accepted.

Reports were read.

Representative Kane of South Portland moved  
acceptance of the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the  
Representative from Harrison, Representative Jackson.

Representative JACKSON: Mr. Speaker, Men and  
Women of the House: I rise this morning to oppose  
that motion because we have a problem. That problem  
is with medical malpractice insurance. That problem  
is causing great concern to the physicians in the  
medical care community in my district. I am sure  
that it is causing concerns to the same people in  
your districts. I don't believe my concerns are  
unique.

I believe that the people in this state should be  
afforded the best medical services available. I  
think to continue in the manner that is being put  
forth today, as it relates to medical malpractice  
claims, is going to deny those people the best  
quality of care that is available to them. Why do I  
say that? Because of the rates that these people or  
these physicians or these hospitals have to pay in  
order to provide the medical care services that are  
needed. This bill attempts to address that and I  
believe that this is a good first step in that  
direction. It will put the medical care field on

notice that this Legislature and the State of Maine is prepared to address this issue. In addressing this issue today in a positive manner, it will ensure that many of our small community hospitals, many of our small community physicians, will stay in those small communities to perform the services and duties that are needed. Otherwise, if we continue to let the system go as it has gone in the past, these physicians are not going to be able to afford the premiums for that insurance.

It concerns me because I have a small community hospital in my district and that small community hospital is being stretched to the limits now. The physicians are being stretched to the limits. What occurs when they get to the limit -- that physician cannot afford to perform there any longer, so where does he go -- he goes to a large metropolitan area or to another state in order to survive and my people would be denied the service they are getting now. I think that is something all of us should consider here today -- these rates that these people have to pay. In attempting to address this with this L.D., I think that we can hold the rates where they are and possibly reduce them.

I would urge the members of this body to vote against the pending motion so that we have an opportunity to pass the Minority Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Norway, Representative Walker.

Representative WALKER: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I stand today to go along with Representative Jackson. I also have a small hospital in my area. They are having troubles. The doctors up there have stopped delivering babies. There was one surgeon up there and I was glad that he was there because he operated on me -- he is going to go into counseling, apparently counseling is a lot safer than an operation.

We need to let this bill in. This is designed from a law in California and it is working well. One was also passed in Maryland on Monday, so I think that we should defeat the motion today and let us go ahead with this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Washington, Representative Allen.

Representative ALLEN: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: Just for a bit of clarification. As you all know, the Judiciary Committee this year, had four medical malpractice bills before it. Two of those bills were granted "Leave to Withdraw" in committee and both of those bills had elements similar to the Divided Report that you have before you.

Before we vote, I just want to clarify what the issues are that remain before you. There was some discussion, at least within our caucus this morning, about another malpractice bill that is still in Judiciary. It has been voted out but it hasn't hit the floor yet. This bill is different than the provisions that were outlined this morning in our caucus.

In this bill, you are doing primarily two things. One, you are placing a cap on the amount of money that can be awarded for pain and suffering at \$250,000.

The second thing you are doing is limiting the amount of money lawyers can collect in contingency fees in this bill. It outlines that they can only collect thirty-three and a third percent on the first \$100,000 recovered; twenty-five percent on the next

\$100,000 and twenty-five percent for any amount over \$200,000.

There are other issues that we are going to deal with in a separate bill but the issues today are two things, one, placing the cap of \$250,000 on pain and suffering, and two, limiting the amount of money that can be paid to lawyers as a result of a settlement. That is the issue today and I would urge you to vote against the motion on the floor.

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

Representative NELSON: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I speak to you today as a person -- I suppose you could use the word -- consumed -- with health care, health care costs, quality of care, and access to care. Those are issues that my committee has been dealing with for at least the ten years that I have been serving here.

When I heard that there was an obstetrician who was no longer serving rural women because he could not afford the malpractice insurance, it went to the very core of the problem of access to care here in a rural, poor state, and quality medical care for the people of this state.

I began to read and research information regarding medical malpractice. As Vice-chair of the Eastern Regional Conference of Legislators, we had discussed and did, indeed, study the problem of medical malpractice and the effects of putting a cap on pain and suffering. We found that those states that have put a cap on medical malpractice insurance regarding pain and suffering have decreased the advance cost of premiums; in other words, it works if you put a cap, whatever that cap is. A cap was found to be constitutional in California, a cap that nine other states have. If you do that, you decrease up to twenty percent the rise of the premiums of medical malpractice. I think that is a very important issue that we must think about because that is what this bill addresses.

I would hope that you would consider that in your vote today and vote to keep this bill alive so that issue can be used and perhaps folded into other legislation that will be coming down the pike on this issue.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from South Portland, Representative Kane.

Representative KANE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Just so that the people understand what the posture of this bill and the other bills dealing with this issue is, there is one other medical malpractice bill left, which is the large coalition bill, namely that is the bill that the Maine Medical Association, the Maine Hospital Association, the Maine Bar Association are supporting. It is the one that they have worked on for so long, the one they submitted to us.

This bill is Senator Twitchell's bill and, although I appreciate his efforts, I have talked with him at great length, and frankly I don't think he is going to be that upset about its demise. I think as far as Representative Nelson's assertion that any one thing is going to result in a twenty percent reduction, in my experience in dealing with this issue, it is impossible to find anybody to make such an assertion if he or she is connected with these insurance companies.

I would just ask you to vote with the Majority Report. Those supporting this Majority Report are

just as concerned about professional malpractice liability as those on the Minority Report. It is the feeling of those on the Majority Report on this issue that there is a better bill waiting in the wings.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Monmouth, Representative Davis.

Representative DAVIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have a neighbor who is a doctor and he is of the old type, he still makes house calls, his fees are very minimal compared to most, and he has been in the business twenty years. Recently, the court awarded a judgment against him for a quarter of a million dollars because he referred a patient to a surgeon because he is not a surgeon. Believe me, I think we have got to do something about putting caps on these awards for non-economic means. I think this is a good bill for that and I just cannot understand why we want to put it down. As has been mentioned here on the floor, it has been instituted in other states, it is working, and I don't see why we here in Maine should fall behind. Let's defeat this motion and send this one on its way in the right direction.

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

Representative STETSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Far be it for me to disagree with the Representative from South Portland, my brother lawyer, Representative Kane. Far be it for me to disagree with our Senate Chairman, Senator Carpenter of Aroostook, my brother lawyer. Far be it for me to disagree with Senator Chalmers, my sister lawyer. Far be it for me to disagree with Representative Priest of Brunswick, another brother lawyer. This is a good bill.

This is a bill that does more to address the problem of malpractice liability and malpractice insurance premiums than the other bill that has been referred to. The other bill is called the coalition bill. We were told when it was introduced that the lion had laid down with the lamb and I can tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that the lion has devoured the lamb.

The lawyers were represented in that coalition group, not just by the Maine Bar Association, but by the Maine Trial Lawyers Association as well. They were up against formidable opposition in the form of the Maine Medical Association and the Maine Hospital Association, represented by a lawyer.

Ladies and Gentlemen, there will be another bill coming down the pike and that will probably come out as a Divided Report. One reason that it is going to come out as a Divided Report is because it does not have a cap in there on legal fees. I will correct that -- not just a cap but a scale on legal fees.

The other bill that is coming down the pike will not have any cap on pain and suffering. This is the essence of the the bill before us and this is what is needed in this whole field.

I urge you to vote against the Majority Report and go with the six people on the Minority and let's keep this bill alive.

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

Representative PARADIS: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: Very briefly, I would like to say, far be it for me to disagree with anyone in this body this morning. I think we ought to ponder two questions before we vote and then vote which ever way

we think is correct.

This bill, if enacted, would not in my opinion get rid of bad doctors practicing medicine in this state. It is bad doctors who make it necessary to have malpractice claims. If I follow the logic that if we didn't have accidents happening in the field of surgery and other fields of medicine, we wouldn't have malpractice claims.

The consequence that I am very worried about, and the reason I signed the Majority Report was that, if there is a cap put on a settlement, let's say \$200,000 or \$100,000 for different accidents, then after that money is exhausted and that person has been found to have a real claim of malpractice, everything has been settled, and there was a wrong that was done -- say you are on the operating table and the anesthesiologist does the wrong job and you go into a coma, and you are no longer a person after that, you are comatose in the hospital, you are twenty years old -- what happens for the next fifty years? Who takes care of you and who pays? The taxpayers pay because you go on Medicaid, you go on welfare. Pure and simple. So after the insurance company has said, by law we only have to pay you \$200,000 or \$300,000, then the town, the state, and the federal government are stuck with the rest. That is an important consideration.

The other one is that many people, when they go to an attorney and they believe they have case, and the attorney believes they have a case, they cannot pay them up front and say we will charge you by the hour, we take it on a contingency basis, so if we can get you \$300,000, we'll get a third or a quarter, what have you, that definitely impacts on most of the people. You have to go on a contingency basis -- if I get you something, I get paid; if I get you nothing, I don't get paid. Otherwise, all you will have is people who have the necessary means to pay up front and say I don't care if I spend \$20,000, I am taking this doctor to court. Well, that is okay, but there are very few people who can do that. I ask you to consider those questions before you vote.

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

Representative STETSON: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I just have to answer those fallacious arguments. In the first place, we are not dealing with a bunch of bad doctors. We are dealing with a consuming public as Representative Nelson alluded to. We are dealing with the people of Maine who are faced with the problem of not getting any medicine or any medical care.

In Damariscotta, we have a doctor who has stopped doing certain types of operations, namely he has stopped doing Caesarean sections because he is being fed potential lawsuits so he has just stopped doing them. He is the best surgeon in the area.

I tell you, it is not the bad doctors that are the problem, it is the bad lawyers who are the problem. The economic losses are taken care of without regard to pain and suffering. The economic losses are not capped. It is the pain and suffering. It is the lawyers bonanza that is going to be capped in this bill and, as to the legal fees and the poor people that cannot afford a lawyer, I tell you that in this bill it is not, in any sense, depriving people of legal representation, it is simply saying that as the judgments get bigger, the fees get smaller. It still keeps the door open to

the lawyers offices for the poor and for anybody. I can tell you there will be plenty of lawyers to jump in and take these cases even with these scaled down fees for lawyers.

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

Representative PRIEST: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I will be brief. I think we need to get back to this particular bill that is before us and not discuss the general issue because there is another bill coming.

This bill does two things essentially. It concerns itself with contingency fees for attorneys who are plaintiffs' representatives and it establishes a cap. I would remind this House that contingency fees have absolutely nothing to do with medical malpractice insurance because the medical malpractice insurer pays the settlement no matter what the contingency fee is. Enacting that section will have absolutely no effect on medical malpractice insurance. The issue there is equal access to justice. It seems to me an entirely different issue than what this bill should be concerned with.

The other question is the question of caps. I would remind this House that in Ontario, where pain and suffering is capped out at \$185,000, insurance rates have gone up by 400 percent. The discussion of caps in our committee was in fact very limited, there was very little discussion, very little evidence presented that this will have any effect on medical malpractice rates. I do not think this bill is terribly well thought out and I would urge you to support the majority of the committee.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from St. George, Representative Scarpino.

Representative SCARPINO: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: Just quickly, many of you have seen my daughter, the baby I have brought in here with me a couple of times because my wife had to work and we could not get a babysitter, that baby is defined as a high risk infant because she was premature. The only way we got a doctor in the State of Maine that was willing to deal with that baby was going through a medical group out of Harvard University and getting a recommendation from them of a doctor who was willing to treat her because of the high risk definition. The other doctors, people we contacted, quite simply put, because of fear of malpractice, they weren't willing to take the child as a patient. It is important that the people of the state of Maine have access to proper medical care, not just proper care, but proper care when they are ill or have a chronic problem. This bill will help alleviate that because it will take off some of the pressure on malpractice. I would urge you to support that "Ought to Pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is the motion of Representative Kane of So. Portland that the House accept the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

14 having voted in the affirmative and 100 in the negative, the motion to accept the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report did not prevail.

Subsequently, the House voted to accept the Minority "Ought to Pass" Report, the bill read once and assigned for second reading later in today's session.

#### Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act Concerning State Contribution to Pollution Abatement (H.P. 1469) (L.D. 2071) (H. "B" H-614 to H. "A" H-540; S. "A" S-389) which was passed to be enacted in the House on April 4, 1986.

Came from the Senate passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" (H-540) as amended by House Amendment "B" (H-614) thereto and Senate Amendment "A" (S-389) as amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-463) thereto in non-concurrence.

The House voted to recede and concur.

#### Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act to Expand the Maine Conservation Corps (Emergency) (H.P. 1251) (L.D. 1761) (C. "A" H-524) which was Passed to be Enacted in the House on February 28, 1986.

Came from the Senate passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-524) as amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-460) thereto in non-concurrence.

The House voted to recede and concur.

#### COMMUNICATIONS

The following Communication:

HEALTH CARE FINANCE COMMISSION  
STATE HOUSE STATION 102  
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333

March 31, 1986

The Honorable John L. Martin  
Speaker, Maine House of Representatives  
State House  
Augusta, Maine 04333

Dear Speaker Martin:

The Commission is required to report annually to the Governor and the Legislature. It is my pleasure to transmit the enclosed copy of our Annual Report for 1985 to you.

During 1985, the Commission completed the task of establishing a gross patient service revenue limit for each of Maine's forty four hospitals. As we forecast a year ago, and the data presented in this Report now indicate, the early results of our work have been most promising. Hospitals' charges have been reduced. The increase in the income they derive from their patient care services has been slowed to approximately five percent per year. At the same time, our hospitals have been afforded a degree of protection that has become increasingly important in

light of the arbitrary and severe reductions in the Federal Government's payments for the services they provide to Medicare beneficiaries.

As indicated in the final sections of the Report, we have now adopted rules defining those practices of payors that result in savings to hospitals or other payors and, thus, are to be matched by "differentials" or discounts. These rules are necessary to assure that all payors contribute fairly to hospitals' support. They are also important to our efforts to stimulate productive competition within our health care system.

Copies of this Annual Report have also been forwarded to a number of your colleagues including the members of the Joint Standing Committee on Human Resources. We would welcome an opportunity to meet with you to discuss any questions you may have regarding either its content or our work.

Sincerely,

S/David Wihry  
Chairman

Was read and with accompanying report ordered placed on file.

#### ORDERS

On motion of Representative McSWEENEY of Old Orchard Beach, the following Order:

ORDERED, that Representative Mona Walker Hale of Sanford be excused April 8 for the duration of her illness.

Was read and passed.

#### SPECIAL SENTIMENT CALENDAR

In accordance with House Rule 56 and Joint Rule 34, the following item:

Recognizing:

Ruben Ryder, of Hallowell, who is retiring as Executive Housekeeper after 17 years of service for the State with special recognition for his work in organizing the Capital Area Parkinson's Support Group; (HLS 942) by Representative REEVES of Pittston. (Cosponsors: Senators BUSTIN of Kennebec, DOW of Kennebec, and Representative DELLERT of Gardiner)

On motion of Representative Reeves of Pittston, was removed from the Special Sentiment Calendar.

Was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Pittston, Representative Reeves.

Representative REEVES: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: Many of us know Ruben Ryder. He

is a familiar figure in this building as one of our Executive Housekeepers and many of us also know him for his excellent work in organizing and coordinating the local Parkinson's Disease Support Group. Ruben has worked hard over the years to publicize to us in the legislature and to the public at large in Maine some basic facts about Parkinson's Disease, namely, its widespread nature and the extreme importance of support groups to help victims and their families share their experiences and the latest therapeutic and medical information.

We will miss having Ruben working in the State House but I am sure we will continue to work with him as an advocate for families and individuals who are learning to cope with Parkinson's Disease.

Subsequently, the Order was passed and sent up for concurrence.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

##### Divided Report

##### LATER TODAY ASSIGNED

Majority Report of the Committee on Business and Commerce reporting "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-656) on Bill "An Act to Establish the Maine Workers' Compensation Reinsurance Association" (H.P. 1560) (L.D. 2199)

Signed:

Senators: BUSTIN of Kennebec  
KERRY of York

Representatives: STEVENS of Bangor  
BRANNIGAN of Portland  
TELOW of Lewiston  
MARTIN of Van Buren  
MURRAY of Bangor  
RYDELL of Brunswick

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

Signed:

Senator: SEWALL of Lincoln

Representatives: BAKER of Orrington  
HILLOCK of Gorham  
ARMSTRONG of Wilton  
ALIBERTI of Lewiston

Reports were read.

Representative Brannigan of Portland moved that the House accept the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report. On motion of the same Representative, tabled pending his motion and later today assigned.

#### CONSENT CALENDAR

##### SECOND DAY

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

(H.P. 1635) (L.D. 2308) Bill "An Act to Extend the Deadline and Increase the Appropriation for the Special Select Commission on the Administration and Financing of General Assistance"

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.

---

ORDERS OF THE DAY

The following matter, in the consideration of which the House was engaged at the time of adjournment yesterday, has preference in the Orders of the Day and continues with such preference until disposed of as provided by Rule 24.

The Chair laid before the House the first matter of unfinished business:

An Act to Amend the Drug Enforcement Law (S.P. 797) (L.D. 2004) (C. "A" S-440)

TABLED - April 4, 1986 by Representative DIAMOND of Bangor.

PENDING - Passage to be Enacted.

On motion of Representative Diamond of Bangor, retabled pending passage to be enacted and later today assigned.

---

The Chair laid before the House the first tabled and today assigned matter:

HOUSE DIVIDED REPORT - Report "A" (7) "Ought to Pass" in New Draft (H.P. 1667) (L.D. 2348) - Report "B" (5) "Ought Not to Pass" - Report "C" (1) "Ought to Pass" in New Draft (H.P. 1668) (L.D. 2349) - Committee on Business and Commerce on Bill "An Act Relating to Handling Fees and Unredeemed Deposits in the Returnable Container Law" (Emergency) (H.P. 1492) (L.D. 2103)

TABLED - April 8, 1986 by Representative BRANNIGAN of Portland.

PENDING - Motion of same Representative to accept Report "A" "Ought to Pass" in New Draft.

Subsequently, the House voted to accept Report "A" "Ought to Pass" in New Draft.

The bill was read once and assigned for second reading Thursday, April 10, 1986.

---

The Chair laid before the House the second tabled and today assigned matter:

Bill "An Act to Prohibit Mandatory Retrospective Rating in Workers' Compensation Insurance Policies" (H.P. 1598) (L.D. 2251)

TABLED - April 8, 1986 by Representative BRANNIGAN of Portland.

PENDING - Passage to be Engrossed.

Subsequently, the bill was passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

---

The Chair laid before the House the third tabled and today assigned matter:

HOUSE DIVIDED REPORT - Majority (9) "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-650) - Minority (4) "Ought Not to Pass" - Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act to Improve Compliance with Maine Tax Laws" (H.P. 1511) (L.D. 2131)

TABLED - April 8, 1986 by Representative CASHMAN of Old Town.

PENDING - Motion of same Representative to accept the Majority "Ought to Pass" as amended Report.

On motion of Representative Cashman of Old Town, retabled pending his motion to accept the Majority "Ought to Pass" as amended Report and later today assigned.

---

Under suspension of the rules, the following Bill was given its second reading without reference to the Committee on Bills in the Second Reading.

Bill "An Act to Establish Policies Governing Medical Malpractice Claims" (S.P. 940) (L.D. 2354)

Under further suspension of the rules, the Bill was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

---

(Off Record Remarks)

---

On motion of Representative Martin of Van Buren, Adjourned until Thursday, April 10, 1986 at eight-thirty in the morning.

---