

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 electronic originals
(may include minor formatting differences from printed original)

ONE HUNDRED THIRTY-FIRST LEGISLATURE
SECOND REGULAR SESSION
5th Legislative Day
Thursday, January 18, 2024

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

Prayer by Pastor Glenn Peterson, Hope Baptist Church, Manchester.

National Anthem by Sharon Hood, Pittsfield.

Pledge of Allegiance.

Medical Provider of the Day, Lisa Letourneau, MD, MPH, Portland.

The Journal of Tuesday, January 16, 2024 was read and approved.

COMMUNICATIONS

The Following Communication: (H.C. 358)

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

January 18, 2024

Honorable Rachel Talbot Ross

Speaker of the House

2 State House Station

Augusta, Maine 04333

Dear Speaker Talbot Ross:

Pursuant to Joint Rule 310, the Committee on Housing has approved the request by the sponsor, Representative Blier of Buxton, to report the following "Leave to Withdraw:"

L.D. 387 An Act to Promote Affordable Housing by Providing a Tax Exemption for Housing Choice Vouchers

Sincerely,

S/Robert B. Hunt

Clerk of the House

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

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

ORDERS

On motion of Representative MILLETT of Cape Elizabeth, the following Joint Resolution: (H.P. 1390) (Cosponsored by Senator CARNEY of Cumberland and Representatives: BELL of Yarmouth, DODGE of Belfast, DOUDERA of Camden, GRAMLICH of Old Orchard Beach, Senator: BRENNER of Cumberland)

**JOINT RESOLUTION AFFIRMING THE
LEGISLATURE'S ONGOING COMMITMENT TO THE
GOALS OF THE PARIS CLIMATE AGREEMENT
AND SUPPORT OF THE FOSSIL FUEL
NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY**

WHEREAS, the scientific consensus is clear that human activities are primarily responsible for accelerating global climate change and that the climate crisis now represents one of the preeminent threats to global civilization; and

WHEREAS, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, or IPCC, reported in 2018 that we must achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions, or GHGs, by the middle of this

century in order to have a reasonable chance of limiting global warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius; and

WHEREAS, the IPCC released its Sixth Assessment Report from Working Group II, which was approved by 195 member states, in February 2022, which notes that there is high confidence that "the rise in weather and climate extremes has led to some irreversible impacts as natural and human systems are pushed beyond their ability to adapt"; and

WHEREAS, the United Nations Secretary-General António Guterres has called the Working Group II report "an atlas of human suffering... according to current commitment, global emissions are set to increase almost 14 percent... It will destroy any chance of keeping 1.5 alive... coal and other fossil fuels are choking humanity"; and

WHEREAS, changes to the State's climate are already being felt, including such impacts as rising seas, an increased number of high heat days, increasingly frequent high intensity rain events and dramatic ocean heat waves in the Gulf of Maine that threaten natural ecosystems and the maritime economy; and

WHEREAS, the entire State is affected by the health and safety risks of fossil fuel expansion, particularly those who also face socioeconomic and health inequities, including low-income families; those experiencing homelessness; Black persons, indigenous persons and people of color; youth; seniors; those experiencing mental and physical disabilities; and people with health conditions; and

WHEREAS, our youth and future generations have the most to lose from a lack of immediate action to stop fossil fuel expansion as they face major and lifelong health, ecological, social and economic impacts from prolonged and cumulative effects of climate change, including food and water shortages, infectious diseases and natural disasters; and

WHEREAS, the Paris Climate Agreement remains silent on coal, oil and gas, an omission with respect to the supply and production of fossil fuels, which are the largest source of GHGs, that needs to be collectively addressed by other means; and

WHEREAS, global governments and the fossil fuel industry are currently planning to produce more than double the amount of coal, oil and gas by 2030 than can be burned if the world is to limit warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius and avert catastrophic climate disruption, and such plans risk undoing the work of the State to reduce GHGs; and

WHEREAS, the construction of new fossil fuel infrastructure and expanded reliance on fossil fuels exposes communities to untenable risks to public health and safety at the local and global levels; and

WHEREAS, the economic opportunities presented by a clean energy transition far outweigh the opportunities presented by an economy supported by expanding fossil fuel extraction and use; and

WHEREAS, the State is committed, as part of our climate emergency response, to a just energy transition and to ambitious investments in the green infrastructure and industries that will create jobs and rapidly decarbonize our economy; and

WHEREAS, the Legislature recognizes that it is the urgent responsibility and moral obligation of fossil fuel producers to lead in putting an end to fossil fuel development and to manage the reduction of existing production; and

WHEREAS, a new global initiative calling for a fossil fuel non-proliferation treaty would end new fossil fuel exploration and expansion, phase out existing production in line with the global commitment to limit warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius and accelerate equitable transition plans; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That We, the members of the One Hundred and Thirty-first Legislature now assembled in the Second Regular Session, on behalf of the people we represent, express our support for a fossil fuel non-proliferation treaty, urge the United States Government to support a fossil fuel non-proliferation treaty and express our support for the goals of the Paris Climate Agreement and the GHGs reduction targets as called for by the IPCC.

Representative THORNE of Carmel moved to **SUSPEND** the rules for the purpose of **DISPENSING WITH THE READING** of the Joint Resolution.

Representative MILLETT of Cape Elizabeth **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **SUSPEND** the rules for the purpose of **DISPENSING WITH THE READING** of the Joint Resolution.

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 to Suspend the Rules for the Purpose of Dispensing with the Reading. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 360

YEA - Adams, Andrews, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Blier, Boyer, Bradstreet, Campbell, Carlow, Carmichael, Collamore, Cray, Cyrway, Davis, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Dunphy, Faulkingham, Foster, Fredericks, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Landry, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, Millett H, Morris, Ness, Newman, Nutting, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Polewarczyk, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Sampson, Schmearsal-Burgess, Simmons, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Theriault, Thorne, Walker, White J, Woodsome.

NAY - Abdi, Ankeles, Arford, Bell, Brennan, Bridgeo, Cloutier, Cluchey, Collings, Copeland, Crafts, Craven, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Eaton, Fay, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Hobbs, Jauch, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, LaRochelle, Lee, Madigan, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, Meyer, Millett R, Milliken, Montell, Moonen, Moriarty, Murphy, O'Connell, Osher, Perry A, Perry J, Pluecker, Rana, Rielly, Roeder, Runte, Russell, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sayre, Shagoury, Shaw, Sheehan, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, White B, Williams, Zager, Zeigler, Madam Speaker.

ABSENT - Albert, Boyle, Costain, Crockett, Galletta, Haggan, Hall, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lookner, O'Neil, Parry, Pringle, Riseman, Roberts, Smith, Underwood, Wood, Worth.

Yes, 58; No, 73; Absent, 19; Vacant, 1; Excused, 0.

58 having voted in the affirmative and 73 voted in the negative, 1 vacancy with 19 being absent, and accordingly the rules were **NOT SUSPENDED** for the purpose of **DISPENSING WITH THE READING**.

Subsequently, the Joint Resolution was **READ**.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Cape Elizabeth, Representative Millett.

Representative MILLETT: Thank you, Madam Speaker. In 1990, in his message for the World Day of Peace, peace with God the Creator, peace with all of creation, St. John Paul II said the following: In our day, there is a growing awareness that world peace is threatened not only by the arms race, regional conflicts and continued injustices among peoples and nations, but also by a lack of due respect for nature, by the plundering of natural resources and by progressive decline in the quality of life.

Faced with the widespread destruction of the environment, people everywhere are coming to understand that we cannot continue to use the goods of the earth as we have in the past. The gradual depletion of the ozone layer and the related

greenhouse effect has now reached crisis proportions as a consequence of industrial growth, massive urban concentrations and vastly increased energy needs. Industrial waste, the burning of fossil fuels, unrestricted deforestation, the use of certain types of herbicides, coolants and propellants; all of these are known to harm the atmosphere and environment. The resulting meteorological and atmospheric changes range from damage to health to the possible future submersion of low-lying lands. The ecological crisis reveals the urgent moral need for a new solidarity, especially in relations between the developing nations and those that are highly industrialized.

When the ecological crisis is set within the broader context of the search for peace within society, we can understand better the importance of giving attention to what the earth and its atmosphere are telling us. Namely, that there is an order in the universe which must be respected and that the human person, endowed with the capability of choosing freely, has a grave responsibility to preserve this order for the well-being of future generations.

Madam Speaker, here we are, more than 30 years later, and the urgency of this moral matter is clear. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Winter Harbor, Representative Faulkingham.

Representative FAULKINGHAM: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in opposition to the pending motion. I rise in opposition to it being placed on the Calendar, but I also rise in opposition to the words that are in it. I oppose this Resolution because this Resolution is not about climate change or the theories of climate change or the discussion of anything to do with that. This Resolution is about the Paris Climate Agreement, which is an agreement that handcuffs the United States. It holds back our country, our development and the well-being of the American citizens and it empowers our enemies like China and India. This is a terrible agreement, this doesn't have anything to do with climate change or that discussion. This Resolution attacks fossil fuels, which mankind depends on, and to say otherwise is the height of ignorance. This Resolution talks about scientific consensus, which is really nothing because science is based in theories, facts and laws. Madam Speaker, I oppose this Resolution and I ask for a Roll Call.

The same Representative **REQUESTED** a roll call on **ADOPTION**.

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 Dexter, Representative Foster.

Representative FOSTER: Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Madam Speaker, I have not in my now going on six years here in this Chamber addressed this issue. Unfortunately, this Resolution is forcing my hand. In regards to the issue of climate change, I am not a climate change denier. I think you and I probably would agree the climate is changing. My thoughts are it always has. Where you and I might not agree is what mankind can do to stop it or change it or turn it around but, more importantly, we may also not agree on how much we should foist onto the 1.3 million citizens, our constituents in the State of Maine; on what they have to endure in order to do so.

Petroleum products and carbon fuels have both increased the longevity and the quality of life for mankind around the world. There's no doubt about that, and there's also no doubt that we are going to need those products in the future. It's also a fact that more people have died because of coal and the issues that it brings to our populations than they have from climate change. Last year, as a matter of fact, the numbers have just recently

come out when Texas, through their efforts to fight climate change with renewable energy sources, endured an unexpected long cold spell, the numbers are out that the final outcome was even worse than expected; 246 souls were lost due to hypothermia, carbon monoxide poisoning or frostbite. Just last week, the cold weather that went across our country, Washington state lost folks due to the cold weather, Tennessee lost folks, the numbers; I don't have the final tally, but it was up to 10 people total, due to cold, not heat.

Currently, if you check your ISO New England 'ISO to Go' app, you'll see, and it has been this way for several years now, New England relies on natural gas for 50-60% of the energy produced to provide electricity to heat homes through using heat pumps, provide electricity for all the other uses we have including to run the pumps that I use to heat my house through hot water circulation from a wood gasification boiler.

But Madam Speaker, my main reason for standing in opposition to this Resolution is one of home rule. Now, in my time here, I've heard both sides of the aisle rise and argue for bills that they felt promoted home rule or just took away from home rule. In Maine, we know what that means. This is about as far away as you can get from home rule for the citizens of Maine, and I certainly will oppose it. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Chelsea, Representative Lemelin.

Representative **LEMELIN**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I also rise in opposition of this Joint Resolution. However, I rise in opposition because I refute completely the thought of a global climate crisis. The global climate crisis is a hoax. Just recently, 1,600 of the top scientists, including two Nobel Prize winners, signed a declaration that the climate crisis is a hoax. Not one newspaper would put it out there. I notified Channel 6 three times; four times; to ask them to verify that that happened. They wouldn't do it. Finally, I contacted the Verify people and they said oh, where'd you get that from? Where'd you get that from? Everybody knows about it. I sent her the link, nothing back, silence. Why? Because it's true. And who would want to put on the news that 1,600 of the top scientists have refuted the climate crisis. Wow. Not all the fake people saying that we have a climate crisis.

When I was a little boy, I was told; I'm 66 years old and I was 17, I was told when I have children, they're not going to have a planet to live on. I was told the most gruesome things that are unbelievable, if we don't stop fossil fuels. Well, in the last 50 years, we've really done very little. It's only till recently that people have really pushed this nonsense forward. Our planet is no different today than it was when I was 17 years old. Now, people can stand up and shout out all the changes, but they're not real.

I have a book, it's called *Climate at a Glance for Teachers and Students*, and I recommend that everybody read it. It talks about the actual facts rather than just the malarkey that you keep hearing in the news, these little catchphrases that aren't real. And it says as the climate has modestly warmed, U.S. crop yields have set new records almost every year. The same is true for nearly all other nations, too. Thanks in large part to longer growing seasons, fewer frost events, more participation and the fertilization effects of atmosphere carbon dioxide, farmers are producing greater amounts of food on fewer acres of land, allowing them to feed the world's growing population.

The facts that I'm reading are from actual climate scientists; Anthony Watts, James Taylor, H. Sterling Burnett, PhD; these are real climate scientists, not people just trying to get you to buy electric cars, not people trying to get you to get

away from fossil fuels so that these people don't become rich, but these people will. All this climate crisis is doing is changing the wealth from one organization to another. It has no consideration of the people of Maine. And I'm going to go on reading. The 2019 global crop year brought record production of staple cereal crops such as corn, rice and wheat. Further, prior to 2019, crop production records of staple cereal crops were set nearly every year during the previous decade. This is from the USDA.

Drought. Real-world data shows drought conditions in the United States have become less frequent and less severe as the climate has modestly warmed. Moreover, the United Nations reports low confidence there are negative trends globally; droughts globally; droughts have always occurred, and they always will. The available evidence shows the droughts that have occurred in recent years were not caused or worsened by global warming. Instead, global and U.S. drought data shows recent droughts were less frequent and severe than the droughts of early and mid-20th century. This is from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Floods, another big deal. Occasionally, heavy precipitation events and floods have always occurred and always will. The IPCC, which was quoted earlier by my friends, reports it has low confidence climate change has had a measurable impact on flooding. Why is this not reported, Madam Speaker? Moreover, IPCC acknowledges that climate change is as likely to have reduced flooding as it has to have made flooding events more common. When climate activists point to a particular flooding event and claim climate change is to blame, the assertion defies objective data and even the IPCC's own analysis. This is science.

Next, water levels. In the early 2010s, during a brief low period for the water levels of the Great Lakes, climate activists repeatedly asserted low water levels were creating a crisis. Climate change was to blame for the low levels and that water levels would keep falling in the future. For example, in 2013, Think Progress claimed several different climate models for the Great Lakes region all predict that lake levels will decline over the next century. However, since Think Progress and others made these dire claims, Great Lake watermarks have reached their highest record levels as shown in figures. Further, the Great Lakes have sustained abundant above water levels since 2014. Again, all that we're hearing, all that's in this Resolution, is fake. Proven by climate scientists.

Coral reefs. Coral reefs have existed continuously for a long time. Corals require warm water, not cold water, to live. Coral cannot survive outside of tropical and subtropical waters. The primary reasons for coral bleaching events, which vary significantly depending on the time and location, include sediment and fertilizer pollution from nearby coastal lands, chemicals found in sunscreen, fertilizer and nitrogen loading from agriculture and cold-water events. The argument that corals are being decimated by man-created carbon dioxide emissions is easily disproven by the available data. Again, it's all fake.

The Greenland ice melt. Sea level measurements contradict claims that the loss of ice in the Greenland ice sheet threatens to cause global coastal flooding. NASA satellite images, which include readings dated back to 1993, show sea levels rising at a pace of merely 1.2 inches per decade, which is not significantly different than the typical rate of sea level rise recorded since 1800s. Over the past couple of decades, claims of ice melt in Greenland have been used to bolster fears of runaway sea level rise. For example, NASA scientists said the following about Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets; the two

regions have lost 6.4 trillion tons of ice in three decades. Unabated, this rate of melting could cause flooding that affects hundreds of millions of people by 2110. Although several million tons of ice sounds like massive ice loss, it amounts to less than 1% of Greenland's total ice mass. The total ice loss each year is nearly undetectable, coming in at just 0.005% of Greenland's ice sheet. Similarly, on July 30, 2021, media outlets touted scary headlines such as "Greenland: Enough Ice Melted on Single Day to Cover Florida in 2 Inches of Water." While that might sound troubling, data shows this amount of ice melt is not unheard of in Greenland, where temperatures are known to rise above freezing on particularly sunny days, melting a large amount of surface ice in a short span. It's an event that has happened many times before, including as recently as 2012 and earlier. It's stuff that's been happening forever.

I'm just going to quote a few more. Hurricanes. Devastating hurricanes occurred long before the invention of automobiles and coal-fired powerplants, and real-world hurricane activity shows little if any impact from global warming. The IPCC has largely agreed with this view. In its 2018 interim report, IPCC stated there is only low confidence for the attribution of any detectable changes in tropical cyclone activity in anthropogenic influences. Similarly, in the IPCC's WG1 report released in August 2021, the IPCC noted identifying past trends in tropical storm metrics remains a challenge, a statement that essentially admits scientists have yet to identify a solid measurable upward trend in the data.

These IPCC quotes that I've been making refute everything in this Joint Resolution. Why would we vote for a Joint Resolution that's fake? Scientifically proven to be fake, 1,600 top scientists said it's fake.

Tornadoes typically form when very cold and dry air clashes with warm, humid air. Climate change warms the arctic more than the tropics and subtropics, resulting in less of a clash between cold arctic air masses and warm Gulf of Mexico air masses. As a result, fewer and less violent tornadoes are occurring today than in previous periods, despite media claims that tornadoes are getting more frequent, stronger or both. The number of tornadoes in the United States as well as in other countries have been slowly declining for the past 45 years. At the same time, the number of strong and violent tornadoes, the F3 or higher, have been dramatically declining for the past 45 years.

So, again, Madam Speaker, this is all fake. These are climate scientists that are standing up, saying that everything in here is fake. I'll stick with one more; as a matter of fact, I'll do two more, just for the fun of it.

Polar bears. Climate activists often speculate that even a modest amount of warming would reduce arctic ice and food availability by so much that it would push polar bears to extinction. The evidence suggests this is false, however. Polar bears evolved thousands of years ago and have thrived under much warmer climatic conditions than those that exist today, including during the mid-Holocene warm period which lasted for 2,000 years and occurred between 5,000 to 7,000 years ago. After dropping to a low of 10,000 bears in 1950, during the middle of a global cooling period, polar bear numbers have quadrupled to as many as 39,000 today. Further, polar bear experts such as Susan Crockford have documented at length how polar bear populations have managed to increase despite a modestly warming world.

Carbon dioxide taxes. Here's my best one. A carbon dioxide tax is a fee imposed on the use of carbon-based fuels such as coal, oil and natural gas. Although carbon dioxide taxes have often been touted as revenue neutral, the purpose of a

carbon dioxide tax is to make conventional energy so expensive that people will be coerced into buying wind and solar power, which is already very expensive. Under a revenue neutral carbon dioxide tax system, energy bills and price for goods and services throughout the economy increase dramatically because industries and individuals rely increasingly more on expensive wind and solar power. We're already seeing this. If people were to purchase expensive wind and solar power exclusively, there wouldn't be any carbon dioxide tax to collect, so no revenue would be collected. When that happens, the carbon dioxide tax becomes revenue neutral for government but inflicts substantial cost on households.

Many people in this room better think about this. Analysts have reportedly found that carbon dioxide taxes would raise energy costs; geez, that's happening; affecting all consumers. For example, researchers Mark Hapstead and Paul Picciano conducted an analysis that estimated carbon taxes of \$50 per metric ton would raise gasoline prices 44 cents per gallon in the United States. The same tax would raise natural gas and coal prices, which would account for nearly two-thirds of the U.S. electricity generation by 62% and 330%, respectively.

Everything we're doing, all this fake climate crisis problem, is destroying our economy. The number one existential threat to Maine and America is not what our President said, climate change. It used to be global warming but, Madam Speaker, do you know why they got rid of the term global warming? Because it was proved to be a hoax, so they changed it to climate change. I can't refute climate change, no person on the planet can, because it happens every single day. Climate always changes. Easy. Is there a climate crisis? No, and all the real climate scientists throughout the world say it isn't true, including the 1,600 that signed the declaration stating that it's a hoax. So, Madam Speaker, I oppose this Resolution because it's a hoax and I'm tired of the people of Maine being fooled by this. Thank you.

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

Representative **COLLAMORE**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I stand respectfully to object the motion and the language of the Joint Resolution. My objection is not with the use of green energy. I've already expressed my support for offshore wind to this Body on numerous occasions. My objection is to the Paris Climate Agreement and its inability to protect our other natural resources. I object to the decimating of natural resources like clear-cutting to make way for solar farms. Madam Speaker, trees are the reason we breathe. Maine has laws to prevent clear-cutting without planting trees to replace those cut for commercial purposes. I have watched large, forested areas in my town and surrounding communities be clear-cut and have not seen trees replanted in these areas to replace our lost oxygen producers.

Also, Madam Speaker, the Paris Climate Agreement does nothing to protect these natural resources that keep us alive. Additionally, the Paris Climate Agreement fails to formally recognize all sources of clean energy such as nuclear power. Madam Speaker, nuclear power is a clean power. It does not need fossil fuels to operate. Neither does hydrogen or hydropower. Madam Speaker, for these reasons and others, I cannot support this Joint Resolution as written. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Albion, Representative Cyrway.

Representative **CYRWAY**: Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've been thinking about the other Body lately, so. Anyway, I just wanted to get down to the basics, and the basics is this is a Paris Climate Agreement,

which I disagree with because here we're looking at putting in solar farms, wind farms, all kinds of; electric cars. And I traveled to Europe and I've gone to Paris, France, and I've gone to Italy, and I don't recall seeing very many powerlines. It's all underground. And if we're going to put 150-foot poles all the way from southern Aroostook, all the way to Coopers Mills, and then they're going to have maybe 12 other projects coming in from other ways, we are going to be a science project, not the beauty of State of Maine that we all remember.

When we think about, you know, I think about Christmas, and my family's pretty strong about Christmas Day and we decorate and everything and I went to New Hampshire and I went into a Christmas shop that says come and get your chestnuts. Remember chestnuts roasting on an open fire? You know, that won't be what we're going to be looking at in the future. That's going to be pollution. We have to think logical, but we also have to think common-sense-wise. You know, people are; still have to survive on wood and other; in places in the State of Maine. They're not going to have all the luxuries that we're talking about. And when you talk about luxuries, it is a luxury. When you buy an electric car, it's very expensive, and it's 80% more to fix that vehicle than it is a gas car. So, I was just talking to one of the sheriffs today and he said that they have six experimental electric cars and they said that the cost to repair those has been so outrageous that they're probably not going to buy another electric car. And it's because it just is not workable in their environment.

Not to mention that we aren't concentrating on what really our big issues are, and when you're talking about water, air and heat and whatever, think about our sewage issues. We had almost; we have 32 treatment plants that were almost to the point where they were going to overflow this last year into the rivers. It would've polluted all our waters. We had a major catastrophe going on and nobody really talked about it much. It was a crisis, and we should be looking at investing in how we can take care of this sewage because what's going to happen in about two years is Casella is not going to truck it to Canada because they won't accept it because of our PFAS problem. We have a serious PFAS problem and what are we doing, we're going to put up solar farms; 900 acres in Unity township, just in my area; of solar fields, and tell me that's not pollution? We're putting up more waste than we ever thought of or imagined and we're not even thinking about it. We don't even have a plan where that would go and how we take care of it.

So, we should be looking at microplasma-type way of getting rid of our sewage and we should be investing in that at treatment plants where it can actually have zero emissions, zero waste. And, to me, that would be a big thing that in the State of Maine to do and invest in something that's really going to work. These polluted solar farms or whatever is not really doing what we should be looking at. I think also we should be looking at our individual homes. We should be incentivizing our people when they build a home or when they change their windows or they change their heating systems to make them where they're a very low emissions and waste and doing it that way. We could do it in a way where it makes sense, where it's going to the State of Maine. That 900 acres, for example, all that power is going to Massachusetts, it's not even going to Maine. We have sold our souls, we've sold our property. That property is no longer Maine, it is Massachusetts, and that's what's happening. We are really; and the power stations that we're looking at, most of them are going to be subsidized by other states, and so, we're being; losing our land and our property in the State of Maine.

We also have to look at our beauty. The beauty of Maine, they come here to see our mountains, our forests, our waters to

fish from, the wildlife that we have here and also, you know, the people. The people enjoy the outdoors. It's kind of like when you say Paris or Italy or any of those places, they have a lot history and they go; tourism is on their history where; and their wine and those type of things. And when I went to Italy, it was just amazing, it was just like you went back in time. You could see the chariot tracks three inches deep into the rock where it wore in. It just amazed me, and it was a wonder, but you know what, there was no power lines, there was no issues about that but there was pollution in certain areas. So, we're basing our property which we have forests and mountains and water on another country that has; and we're going to be putting up power lines when they don't put power lines, so, how does that work? I think we really should relook at what we have here in Maine and not in other countries and let's try to do what we can to help our people.

When I talk to my people in my county, or my country, my area, in my State, they talk about this all the time. They said they do not want electric cars, they want something that's efficient, they want something that they can afford and they also want good heat, and there is ways to do heat efficiently and I think we could do it in ways just like the heat pumps, I do think that there's many types of furnaces now, getting more and more efficient and to the point where they could actually almost be zero emissions. I think we could really invest in that. But I think that we're just doing it in a backwards way. I think we should not be just doing something without a plan. I tried to get a feasibility study in, I did get it to the third time through Leg Council, but I think that everything should be studied before we do something, you know, instead of just doing it and then worry about it after, that doesn't work, and we're just ending up having a lot of people upset in our State because they just don't have the understanding of what we're doing and how we're doing it.

So, I really appreciate this actually coming up because I do believe that we really do have an issue, I think that there is some type of global warming, but there's also other factors. I think when we develop, if you look at these cities with skyscrapers and everything else, that's not even mentioned, but it's got to be a factor of how the weight distribution is and how our axis is moving. If you look, our temperatures have shifted in a year, it's like almost a whole month or two months have shifted and then it's later in the spring before we get to summer. So, there's something happening, but it isn't all emissions or the fossil fuels. There's a lot more to this than what we see. So, I really appreciate everybody's concern and I think we're doing it, but we're panicking and we're just pulling at straws and we're really affecting what we're doing to our State. That's what I'm saying. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Wiscasset, Representative Polewarczyk.

Representative **POLEWARCZYK**: Madam Speaker, I'm retired after 34 years in the Space Shuttle program. Many of you know that. I retired as the Director of Orbiter Production and Operations for United Space Alliance. We were the prime contractor for NASA on that program. I've had many opportunities to share my experiences with any group that's willing to listen.

Some time ago, I was asked to speak to the 5th grade at Wiscasset Middle School. And during that presentation, I talked about a problem we had on one of our flights. The problem was with an astronaut who was doing her daily exercises and developing a significant headache. We're in a closed environment and the first thing that comes to our mind is we have a problem with carbon dioxide. So, I'm giving this presentation, explaining the problem, our attempts to find out the

real root cause of that problem, what our solution might be and what unintended consequences we might create in the process, and this young lady in the 5th grade interrupts me and says why don't you take plants up there? They remove carbon dioxide and generate oxygen. And that stuck in my mind.

Fast-forward, a couple of months ago, I'm at a public hearing up at the Civic Center with the Bureau of Environmental Protection and the subject is California emissions, electric vehicles, et cetera. While I was there, I'm reading Maine's Climate Action Plan. And in it, it stated that our transportation sector emits about 8 million tons of carbon dioxide a year, it's 54% of our total emissions. I can't conceive of what that looks like, but I can do some simple math. If 8 million is 54%, then the total amount is on the order of 15 million tons of carbon dioxide a year. And that was startling to me. I'm not sure what that all means, but it stuck in my mind.

A little bit later, I had an invitation to Aroostook County to participate in a Maine Principals Association meeting. And my wife and I spent three days in Aroostook County and really enjoyed the drive up. We have some beautiful countryside, some incredible forests, and while I was there, I had the opportunity to speak at the Maine School of Science and Mathematics and Limestone Community School. And in both of those places, I had the opportunity to repeat that same story about the carbon dioxide problem we had on the shuttle orbiter. And as I'm driving home, again looking at this wonderful forest that we have throughout the State of Maine; we are blessed; I'm wondering how much forest do we really have here in Maine? Quick Google search, we have over 17 million acres of forest here in Maine. And that comment from that young lady comes back to me, well, plants remove carbon dioxide. Okay, so, I'll do another quick Google search, how much carbon dioxide is removed by our forests. It didn't take long, the answer was 2.6 million tons per year from an acre of forest, all the way up to four, and it varied with the maturity of the forest, the type of trees, et cetera. So, I said well, I'll just do some simple math, I'll use 2.6 million tons per year. Gosh, I just said simple math, and what came to my mind is only 36% of the students here in Maine are proficient in math; just an aside. So, I did the simple math, 2.6 million tons; 2.6 tons, 17 million acres; oh, we are blessed here in Maine with a forest that removes 45 million tons of carbon dioxide a year. We remove 45, we generate 15. Wow.

So, what is this all about? Why, then, if we're in that kind of a condition, do we destroy our forests to install solar panels that result in increased energy rates for our; the people of Maine. Madam Speaker, this is not rocket science. Maine today is beyond net zero. I cannot support a Resolution that will ultimately harm the people of Maine. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Representative **MATLACK**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, after our friend from Chelsea, the Good Representative from Chelsea, talked about the World Climate Declaration, I decided to find out what it was all about. So, I looked it up and I found of couple of interesting tidbits. One was from NASA that said that; and this is in 2022; that between 2005 and 2022, the 15 warmest years on record occurred. And that doesn't include the last two years. They say on their report that it's important to remember that scientists always focus on the evidence, not on opinions. Scientific evidence continues to show that human activities, primarily human burning of fossil fuels, have warmed the earth's surface and its ocean basins, which in turn have continued to impact earth's climate. This is

based on over a century of scientific evidence forming the structural backbone of today's civilization.

And then there was a report by Cornell University, also in; well, in 2021. This was a study that looked at studies. And what they found was that 99.9 percent of peer-reviewed scientific papers agree that climate change is mainly caused by humans. It's critical to acknowledge the principal role of greenhouse gas emissions so that we can rapidly mobilize new solutions since we are already witnessing in real time the devastating impacts of climate related disasters on businesses, people and the economy.

And then, as regards to the survey, I looked to see who was involved; not the survey, in the declaration, and I looked and it was touted as 1,200 leading scientists and academics. In actuality, it was only 1,107, including six people who are now dead, less than 1% are listed as climatologists or climate scientists, eight of the signatories are former or current employees of the oil giant Shell, one of the signatories did win a Nobel prize in Physics for work on superconductors but he has never done work on climate science. So, it looks as if there's a little bit of a gap in knowledge for those people that signed that paper. What the investigators who were looking at the signatories found that practically none of the signatories to the World Climate Declaration are climate scientists and that 21% were engineers, many linked to the fossil fuel industry, lobbyists and some even worked as fishermen or airline pilots and while they have a vested interest in knowing about the climate, they are not scientists. So, I encourage everybody to read what the scientists have to say.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Vassalboro, Representative Bradstreet.

Representative **BRADSTREET**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Quite a debate going on here this morning. Just think if we had a real bill to debate, how we would be doing.

I rise in opposition to the Resolution because I believe that underlying all this is the eventual ceding of our responsibilities to represent the citizens of Maine to an unknown but essentially foreign entity that actually care very little about the people that we represent. It's steps like this that opens the door to situations where we have small boards such as the BEP, where a small minority of people can require something like the 43% of all cars be essentially electric within three model years.

Beyond this, I also want to point out that the Resolutions before this Body should and ought to reflect the values and beliefs of a substantial majority of us and that we could support, and this Resolution certainly does not do that and I hope that in the future we'd be more circumspect about the Resolutions we bring before this Body. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Auburn, Representative Libby.

Representative **LIBBY**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It comes as no surprise to anyone in this Chamber that I rise in opposition to this Joint Resolution.

Last night, I sat down to read the House Calendar and, of course, this Resolution sparked my interest and, as I read it, I was struck by the quote, an atlas of human suffering. I am sure that I am not the only Representative in this Chamber who has seen human suffering in her own district. And I think of walking up to a door and speaking to a constituent who literally buys her fuel by the gallon because she can't afford to heat her trailer. And I hear stories like that over and over and over again. That is human suffering here in Maine, looking us in the face, Madam Speaker. It's not a faceless Resolution about the Paris Climate Agreement. There are people suffering in our own State and their suffering is made worse by this green agenda that we

demand that they pay for, in multiple ways. We are ignoring human suffering in our own State by pushing this green agenda that ignores our very own constituents.

We talk about whereas the entire State is affected by the health and safety risks of fossil fuel; you know what is a bigger health and safety risk? That when my constituent has to pay a huge heating bill, that is the difference between living in her trailer or living in her car. That is a real effect that is staring us in the face for many in our State. If we want to combat homelessness, then let's make it more affordable for people to heat their homes by proliferating greater access to the fuels they need like natural gas. If we want to prevent homelessness, then let's make sure that people can afford to pay their electricity bills and they're not supplementing wind and solar that people are making so much money off of on the backs of Maine people. Maine people cannot afford the costs of these green policies.

Economic opportunities. Whereas the economic opportunities presented by a clean energy transition; economic opportunities that are mandated by this Legislature and that are propped up by subsidies paid for by Maine citizens. That is the reality. Maybe we're not all scientists in here, but I know the face of human suffering and I see it in my district, and they don't want us to sit here and pass a Resolution that speaks not of the realities that they face every day, but of concepts that don't matter in their life. This does not matter to Maine people; the majority of Maine people. Maybe it matters to a subset, but where folks are struggling, Madam Speaker, to pay for their groceries, to pay for their electricity, to heat their homes and keep their children warm, that's what matters to them.

The State is committed; who is that? Is that we the people, Madam Speaker? The State is committed. How about we think about the people, not the State, but we, the people. Are they committed? I don't think so. Madam Speaker, this talks about a new global initiative. I am not interested in a global initiative. Madam Speaker, I am interested in an initiative that helps Maine people who are struggling in their everyday lives. I am interested in an initiative that helps my constituent move from buying gallons of fuel at a time to heat her uninsulated trailer to initiatives that make it affordable for her to pay for her electricity and her fuel in the same month.

It is so entitled of us to sit in this Chamber and pass a Resolution like this that does not consider the realities that so many of our constituents are facing. We talk like getting rid of plastic bags and passing Joint Resolutions like this or passing bills like LD 2777 *[sic]* that we'll be hearing more about this session, like that's going to make a difference for this; this battle against climate change. You know what is going to make a difference to Maine people? Being able to pay their bills, heat their homes and feed their families. I would invite anyone with common sense and compassion to vote against this Resolution. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Kennebunk, Representative Sayre.

Representative **SAYRE**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to speak in support of this Resolution. Like many of you, I consider myself to be a citizen first, someone who's been called to serve my community, if only temporarily. I've served in this Body for just a year. I still resist being called a politician. It doesn't seem right that something that I've done for such a short phase of my life should define me. I consider myself defined by my relationships. I'm a neighbor and friend, a father and grandfather, a husband and son to a great many people here in Maine. I'm also defined by my experience. My profession isn't politician. I'm a book publisher. I have nearly four decades of experience in scientific and professional publishing for people in

engineering, computer science, environmental science and, yes, climate science. I've seen four decades of climate science and four decades of climate science denial. And through all that time the one thing that has held true is that the effects predicted by climate scientists have become clearer. The gap between prediction and reality has steadily narrowed. So, it's this combination of my relationships with past, present and future generations of Mainers and Americans as well as my decades of experience with the science of climate change that compel me to share a few words in response to what's been said this morning.

Climate science is not a faith-based enterprise. We don't have to believe it to make it true. What we know to be true is based on the evidence that's been gathered over decades. Some of it, such as ice core data, reveals evidence going back centuries, and we have other techniques for determining millions of years of climate history, with a strong consensus as to its accuracy. I will not take up this Body's time reading through a mountain of science that refutes outlier opinions of a handful of industry-funded figures. We've got work to do and we've got to do it now.

Let me just briefly reiterate why it's so important that we work together to complete an effective energy transition, a transition away from fossil fuels which the recent Congress of Parties meeting determined it is necessary to defend the way of life we love here in Maine and throughout the world. We know that human activity has added an excessive amount of carbon and other greenhouse gasses to the atmosphere. We know that greenhouse gasses already loaded into the atmosphere will increase average global temperatures by 1.5 degrees Celsius over recent pre-industrial levels. If we don't work together faster to bring down greenhouse gas emissions more quickly, we will see global heating increase by 2 degrees or more, and that will have far more dire consequences. To cite just one example, at 1.5 degrees heating, we lose something like 75% of coral reefs, but at 2 degrees, we lose 99%.

This past decade was the hottest on record. The year 2020 was more than 1.2 degrees Celsius hotter than the average year in the 19th century; 2023 was hotter still, it was the hottest year on record. And the results of this excessive heating are apparent all around us; melting ice cores, raised sea levels, warmer oceans, increased intensity of storms. We have robust evidence from this past week alone of what happens when rising water levels and stronger storm surges reach our shores. The economic and personal devastation to Mainers is real. The human suffering caused by climate change is real.

The amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere reached record levels in 2020, hitting 417 parts per million. The last time CO₂ levels exceeded 400 parts per million was around 4 million years ago, when global temperatures were 2-4 degrees warmer and sea levels were 30-80 feet higher. Take a moment to consider what your community would look like with sea levels 30-80 feet higher. So, this is absolutely a local control concern, a Maine concern. I sat in a meeting in December in Kennebunkport, the town next door, listening to business leaders in my and other local communities. All of them agreed that regular tides are higher than they used to be, and so are storm surges. Their businesses are at risk now. They are asking what we are doing now.

So, let me wrap up with the good news. The primary driver of this change, of global heating, is human activity. We are in charge of the technologies and systems that form those drivers. We have the technologies to affect the change we need. We just need the will, the collective will, to put them in place. This Resolution expresses our support for taking action that makes

sense, that will address the real problem that real people see is really happening. I don't have a lot of patience left for debating what we can all see is true. I'd just like to see us get to work. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Milford, Representative Drinkwater.

Representative **DRINKWATER**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. In 1977, I built a brand-new house. The movement at that time was electric heat. I had a brand-new house with electric heat, put a woodstove in the basement. And within two years, we had two little babies in our house. I could not afford the electric bill because everybody was going electric. Guess what that does to prices? Prices went up. I had to pull out the electric heat and had to borrow money to put in a hot water baseboard heating system and I supplemented that with a woodstove.

In 1998, Madam Speaker, the great ice storm that we all; some of us here; lived through. My neighbor, who was a widowed lady in her 80s; I had the luxury of having a generator. I went over to her house after two and a half days, knocked on her door. She had lived next to her gas stove for two and a half days, freezing, and her daughter had a brand-new newborn baby, no heat. Luckily, I was able to hook up her heating system to my generator, and we survived. That's what Mainers do, we look out for one another.

Two weeks ago, Madam Speaker, I had my oil tank filled, \$3.55 a gallon. I'm being inundated with senior citizens telling me here's their options, cut their medicine in half or go without heating oil. I don't think that's where we want to go. And last August, Madam Speaker, this Body had a field trip for a few days and a lot of us went, both on this side of the House and that side of the House. We were touring Wyman's Blueberries. Wonderful operation. Thankfully, they're staying in Maine. We asked them about their cost of electricity, they said it was atrocious, they had put some solar fields to help defray the cost. Out behind that factory is the barrens; 10,000 or so acres of nothing but plain open land. And the tour guide was explaining to us that these fields were made over a thousand years ago by the glaciers melting. Well, that begged the question, Madam Speaker, was that melting caused by industrial revolution? He couldn't answer it, obviously, because we didn't have industry a thousand years ago. So, climate change has been with us since the beginning of time. I remember in 1960, the great storm we had as a 10-year-old and we had snow that came in October, stayed, you know, until springtime. The climate is always changing.

Madam Speaker, if we want to do something to help Maine people, this is not the way to go. Let's put in a Joint Resolution demanding that India and China cut their carbon emissions and reduce climate change. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Representative **WARREN**: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to say just quickly that for those who may not be supporting this Resolution that, especially when you're speaking to cost and what poor and working people go through every day to pay for their electric bills or get from one place to another with a gas-powered vehicle, that though I'm supporting this Resolution today for all the reasons it states, that I hear you and I'm sure there's many that do as well and that my support for this Resolution has in part to do with its mentioning of poor and working people, historically disenfranchised people, but chiefly a commitment to adjust transition, one that isn't leaving people behind because they can't afford to come along, and

that's something that I believe I've tried to fight for as a Representative and will seek to continue to do.

I'm not going to; my belief is I don't intend to lecture or tell anyone what to believe, I know that we all were represented by the same number of people, roughly, and we all have a job to do to represent our constituents, but I come here representing constituents who, by and large, believe in climate change, want me to fight on that issue and yet, I think it's important; it's incumbent on those of us who stand as advocates on climate change to hear what are absolutely legitimate concerns about how we get from here to where we want to go, and I just wanted to say I do support this Resolution, chiefly that consideration about a just transition. I don't believe we're always doing it the best way, I believe we need to continue to listen to those who disagree and appreciate that these conversations, these dialogues must continue and that the fight, in my view, the fight on climate change is one that will be fought for many years, perhaps one that was not fought soon enough, strongly enough, but as we go from here to where I believe we need to get to, I appreciate and I hear you and thank you for advocating for your constituents as I feel I'm advocating for mine. Thank you.

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

Representative **CAMPBELL**: Thank you, Madam Speaker, Men and Women of the House. This is a Resolution. I know I'm a freshman, but in my past lives, I've watched these Resolutions come and go. The Resolution to the Chief Executive for this, the Resolution to the Congress for that, the Resolution to the President for that. These Resolutions make us feel good, but what good are they? What we should be doing is we should be working on things that have come through these Bodies and now passed into law. We talk about generation of energy, the generation of alternative energy. At this point, the energy produced is X and of that X, six, maybe ten percent of it, is alternative. The law now says that in six years 80% of that energy is to be produced by alternative energy. Alternative energy with subsidies; solar. The public advocate tells us it's subsidized twice as much as it should be, and wind subsidy, and then there's waste to energy, incinerators. That subsidy has gone away. But guess what? Of that 6-10%, waste to energy produces 58% of the alternative energy. What are we doing here?

So, 80% of the energy produced in the State of Maine by 2030, six years, is supposed to be 80% alternative energy. Now, that's got some work to do. And oh, by the way, by 2050, it's going to have to be 100%. A hundred percent. How are we ever going to do this? And then we've got bills around us that are going to limit our opportunities to generate energy by sources that work? What are we doing here? Madam Speaker, I move the question.

The same Representative **MOVED THE PREVIOUS QUESTION**.

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

Representative **GRAMLICH**: Thank you, Madam Speaker, Colleagues of the House. I respect my Colleague from Orrington's intent to move the question. I have a couple of brief remarks, if I may, with your indulgence, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would reply that the only thing that can be debated at this moment is Shall the Main Question be Put Now.

More than one-third of the members present expressed a desire that the **MAIN QUESTION BE PUT NOW**, and accordingly **THE PREVIOUS QUESTION** was **MOVED**.

The SPEAKER: A roll call having been previously ordered, the pending question before the House is Adoption. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 361

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Arford, Bell, Brennan, Bridgeo, Cloutier, Cluchey, Collings, Copeland, Crafts, Craven, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Eaton, Fay, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Hobbs, Jauch, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, LaRochelle, Lee, Lookner, Madigan, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, Meyer, Millett R, Milliken, Montell, Moonen, Moriarty, Murphy, O'Connell, Osher, Perry A, Perry J, Pluecker, Rana, Rielly, Roeder, Runte, Russell, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sayre, Shagoury, Shaw, Sheehan, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, White B, Williams, Zager, Zeigler, Madam Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Andrews, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Blier, Boyer, Bradstreet, Campbell, Carlow, Carmichael, Collamore, Cray, Cyrway, Davis, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Dunphy, Faulkingham, Foster, Fredericks, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Henderson, Javner, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, Millett H, Morris, Ness, Newman, Nutting, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Polewarczyk, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Sampson, Schmersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Theriault, Thorne, Walker, White J, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Albert, Boyle, Costain, Crockett, Galletta, Gifford, Haggan, Hall, Hymes, Jackson, Landry, Lanigan, Lavigne, O'Neil, Parry, Pringle, Riseman, Roberts, Underwood, Wood, Worth.

Yes, 74; No, 55; Absent, 21; Vacant, 1; Excused, 0.

74 having voted in the affirmative and 55 voted in the negative, 1 vacancy with 21 being absent, and accordingly the Joint Resolution was **ADOPTED** and sent for concurrence.

On motion of Representative LAJOIE of Lewiston, the following House Order: (H.O. 36)

ORDERED, that Representative Lucas John Lanigan of Sanford be excused Jan 3 for personal reasons, and Jan 9 for health reasons.

AND BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that Representative Sheila A. Lyman of Livermore Falls be excused Jan 9 and 11 for personal reasons.

AND BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that Representative Rebecca J. Millett of Cape Elizabeth be excused Jan 3, 9 and 11 for health reasons.

AND BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that Representative Daniel J. Newman of Belgrade be excused Jan 3 for personal reasons, and Jan 9 for health reasons.

AND BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that Representative Sophia B. Warren of Scarborough be excused Jan 3 for health reasons.

READ and PASSED.

SPECIAL SENTIMENT CALENDAR

In accordance with House Rule 519 and Joint Rule 213, the following item:

Recognizing:

Jacqueline R. Murphy, of Portland, who is celebrating her 80th birthday on February 18, 2024. We extend our congratulations and best wishes;

(HLS 736)

Presented by Representative BAGSHAW of Windham.

Cosponsored by Senator CHIPMAN of Cumberland, Senator DUSON of Cumberland, Speaker TALBOT ROSS of Portland, Representative BRENNAN of Portland, Representative COLLINGS of Portland, Representative CROCKETT of Portland, Representative LOOKNER of Portland, Representative MOONEN of Portland, Representative SKOLD of Portland, Representative ZAGER of Portland.

On **OBJECTION** of Representative BAGSHAW of Windham, was **REMOVED** from the Special Sentiment Calendar.

READ.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Windham, Representative Bagshaw.

Representative **BAGSHAW**: Thank you, Madam Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I rise today in honor of my mother, Jacqueline R. Murphy, to celebrate her 80th birthday. I'd like to give a special thanks to the Good Representative from Portland for allowing me to sponsor this Sentiment.

My mother was big into politics. She served on a local School Board and many campaigns. My mother will be delighted to see all the co-sponsors from Portland on this Sentiment. If my parents were here today, they'd be sitting on that side of the aisle. Many people would ask how my brother and; my two brothers and I came from those two because my brothers would be sitting on this side of the aisle. My mother and I don't always see eye to eye but I believe what unites us all is greater than what divides us. I love you, Mom, and happy birthday.

Subsequently, this Expression of Legislative Sentiment was **PASSED** and sent for concurrence.

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

SENATE PAPERS

The following Joint Order: (S.P. 922)

ORDERED, the House concurring, that when the Senate and House adjourn, they do so until Tuesday, January 23, 2024, at 10:00 in the morning, or until the call of the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, respectively.

Came from the Senate, **READ** and **PASSED**.

READ and **PASSED** in concurrence.

Bill "An Act to Prioritize School Construction Projects for Schools Affected by Disasters"

(S.P. 921) (L.D. 2170)

Came from the Senate, **REFERRED** to the Committee on **EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS** and ordered printed.

REFERRED to the Committee on **EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS** in concurrence.

Bill "An Act to Support the Development of Workforce Housing to Promote Economic Development in Maine"

(S.P. 920) (L.D. 2169)

Committee on **LABOR AND HOUSING** suggested and ordered printed.

Came from the Senate, **REFERRED** to the Joint Select Committee on **HOUSING** and ordered printed.

REFERRED to the Joint Select Committee on **HOUSING** in concurrence.

Bill "An Act Establishing Concurrent Jurisdiction with the Federal Courts in Certain Juvenile Matters"

(S.P. 923) (L.D. 2171)

Came from the Senate, **REFERRED** to the Committee on **JUDICIARY** and ordered printed.

REFERRED to the Committee on **JUDICIARY** in concurrence.

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

On motion of Representative LANIGAN of Sanford, the House adjourned at 12:40 p.m., until 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, January 23, 2024, or until the call of the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, respectively, pursuant to the Joint Order (S.P. 922) and in honor and lasting tribute to Donald A. Cormier of Sanford.