

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 Fifteenth Legislature

OF THE

State Of Maine

VOLUME II

FIRST REGULAR SESSION

House of Representatives
May 20, 1991 to July 10, 1991

ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Yarmouth, Representative Foss.

Representative FOSS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I made it clear this morning and I will reiterate what happened on Saturday. We worked to get a unanimous package and indicated that if we had one with a specific limit, we would defend that and fight for it with our caucus. However, we did not get unanimity except on a few bonds. So, we did go with the will of our caucus because some of those bonds which we supported were for the purpose of getting unanimity.

I would like to speak to the prior speaker's reference to the under \$70 million package, I would like to go over for you what has passed this House, which I add up to be \$74.5 million without this bond. We have passed a Transportation Bond for \$27.5 million; a Corrections Bond for \$5.5 million; State Parks, \$5 million; Sewage and Clean Water, \$16.5 million; Recycling/Landfills, \$10 million; Education Bond for the Loan of Last Resort, \$10 million. That is \$74.5 million without this bond.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Fryeburg, Representative Hastings.

Representative HASTINGS: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I rise because of the remarks I heard the good Representative from Millinocket make relative to why one comes to this chamber. The people that live next to me have a nice house lot. I would like to buy it. I haven't bought it because I don't have the money to buy it. People in my town, in my district, are saying they don't have the money. I am told time and again, contrary to what I heard in earlier arguments regarding bond issues, why don't you decide these issues in Augusta, why do you continually ship these small items out to us when you are dealing in billions of dollars?

It seems to me that we have to decide what is going on in this state and take some responsibility for it right in this chamber. When we continually suggest bond issues to the people, we, by two-thirds vote of this body have suggested to the people, not necessarily that they have to do it, but two-thirds of us have said it is a good idea for you to seriously consider it. If that is not just about like a solicitation from a police officer with a uniform on I don't know what it is. We are the leaders of this state, supposedly, and when we put something on the ballot it has to mean something to somebody out there. I am not willing to put my name on a bond issue. I will tell you right now, for the Record, you have not seen me vote for any bond and you will not this year other than the DOT bond which has the contributing financing from the federal government. That is my vote and it will be my vote regularly.

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is passage to be enacted. In accordance with the provisions of Section 14 of Article IX of the Constitution, a two-thirds vote is necessary.

The Chair recognizes the Representative from Millinocket, Representative Clark.

Representative CLARK: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Rule 7, I request permission to pair my vote with Representative Heeschen of Wilton. If he were present and voting, he would be voting yea; I would be voting nay.

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is passage to be enacted. In accordance with

the provisions of Section 14 of Article IX of the Constitution, a two-thirds vote is necessary. Those in favor will vote yea; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 162

YEA - Adams, Aliberti, Anderson, Anthony, Bell, Boutilier, Cahill, M.; Carroll, D.; Cashman, Cathcart, Chonko, Clark, M.; Coles, Constantine, Cote, Crowley, Daggett, DiPietro, Dore, Duffy, Dutremble, L.; Erwin, Farnsworth, Gean, Goodridge, Gould, R. A.; Graham, Gray, Gurney, Gwadosky, Hale, Handy, Hichborn, Hogle, Holt, Hussey, Jacques, Jalbert, Joseph, Kerr, Ketover, Ketterer, Kilkelly, Kontos, LaPointe, Larrivee, Lawrence, Lemke, Luther, Macomber, Mahany, Manning, Marsh, Martin, H.; Mayo, McHenry, McKeen, Melendy, Michaud, Mitchell, E.; Mitchell, J.; Morrison, Nadeau, Nutting, O'Dea, O'Gara, Oliver, Paradis, J.; Paul, Pfeiffer, Pineau, Plourde, Poulin, Pouliot, Powers, Rand, Richardson, Ricker, Rotondi, Ruhlin, Rydell, Saint Onge, Sheltra, Simpson, Skoglund, Stevens, P.; Strout, Swazey, Tamaro, Tardy, Townsend, Tracy, Treat, Vigue, Waterman, Wentworth, The Speaker.

NAY - Aikman, Ault, Bailey, H.; Barth, Bennett, Bowers, Carleton, Carroll, J.; Donnelly, Duplessis, Farnum, Farren, Foss, Garland, Greenlaw, Hanley, Hastings, Heino, Hepburn, Hichens, Kutasi, Lebowitz, Libby, Lipman, Look, Lord, MacBride, Marsano, Merrill, Murphy, Nash, Norton, Ott, Parent, Pendexter, Pendleton, Pines, Reed, G.; Reed, W.; Richards, Salisbury, Savage, Small, Spear, Stevens, A.; Stevenson, Tupper, Whitcomb.

ABSENT - Bailey, R.; Butland, Paradis, P.; Simonds.

PAIRED - Clark, H.; Heeschen.
Yes, 97; No, 48; Absent, 4; Paired, 2;
Excused, 0.

97 having voted in the affirmative and 48 in the negative with 4 being absent and 2 having paired, the Bond Issue was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

The Chair laid before the House the following matter: HOUSE DIVIDED REPORT - Majority (9) "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-454) - Minority (4) "Ought Not to Pass" - Committee on State and Local Government on Bill "An Act to Promote Fully Informed Legislation and Rulemaking" (H.P. 913) (L.D. 1310) which was tabled earlier in the day and later today assigned pending the motion of Representative Joseph of Waterville that the House accept the Minority "Ought Not to Pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Yarmouth, Representative Foss.

Representative FOSS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I sponsored this bill for the Portland Area Chamber of Commerce along with Senators Baldacci, Rich and Representative Small. There were many letters of support and testimony in the committee.

The bill requires an economic impact statement to be prepared for proposed laws and rulemaking. Those statements would be prepared at the request of a legislator serving on the committee hearing a bill and as part of any proposed rule coming out of an

agency.

At the present time, Florida, New Jersey and Colorado have similar statutes and Louisiana and Washington law also provide for the creation of economic impact statements as part of the rulemaking process.

I would like to read into the Record some of the testimony that was presented to the committee and also some of the concerns that one might expect from state bureaucrats. First of all, the National Federation of Independent Business in support states, "Dating back to at least the 1980 Brainhouse Conference on Small Business, there has been a keen interest among small business owners in Maine for paper work reduction, economic impact analysis of regulations and special consideration of potential disproportionate impacts of regulations on small business."

The Maine Chamber of Commerce wrote and presented testimony, "There was a time when Maine lawmakers could pass laws or make rules impacting Maine business with only a limited concern of the cost to those businesses. Maine businesses were largely Maine-owned and were selling within the state. A business could simply raise its prices to cover the increased costs caused by the legislation or regulation and pass that cost on to its customers. Those days are long gone. Today Maine manufacturers compete with companies across the country and around the world for customers. If they raise their prices to incorporate costs forced on them by unique Maine laws or regulations, they lose customers. Even retailers find themselves competing with out-of-state businesses because of ever growing catalog and mail order sales. Almost no Maine business can pass on governmentally imposed costs with impunity. If you can't compete on price, you can't survive."

"L.D. 1310 won't do anything to address the problems which already exist in Maine because legislators didn't know the size of the burden they were placing on business. It will, however, stop things from getting worse. Passage of L.D. 1310 would be a giant step towards making Maine business competitive during the last ten years of this century because it would give legislators the critical information necessary to make informed decisions."

I would also like to quote from a memo from Gary Wood, Director of Maine Municipal Association. "MMA supports the fundamental position that economic considerations should be taken into account in the creation of either legislation or rulemaking. It will help elected officials seek the least costly solution to a particular problem. The injection of some consideration of economic impact into both legislation and rulemaking is a healthy change that would help to restore some balance to those processes. They have been out of balance for several years and the results has been a rapid rise in both property taxes and the cost of doing business in Maine."

As I mentioned to you earlier, there were concerns raised at the committee level and not surprisingly they came from the Departments of Agriculture, Human Services, DEP and from the State Tax Assessor himself who complained about the inordinate burden that would be placed on his department. In a memo from the State Tax Assessor to those of us who sponsored this bill, he listed all the terribly burdensome duties he must perform in the complicated rulemaking process. To get a flavor of

what that criticism is and the terrible impact preparing an economic statement would be on his current job performance, this is a list of what his agency is now required to do: (1) draft the rule; (2) complete form, MAPA3; (3) complete top part of check list; (4) complete fact sheet; (5) file one copy of materials with Secretary of State; (6) file 20 copies of materials with Legislative Council; (7) send MAPA3 to affected persons and trade groups; (8) conduct a hearing; (9) assemble and consider comments made at the hearing; (10) prepare final version of rule; (11) prepare form MAPA1; (12) obtain certification from the Attorney General; (13) complete remainder of check list; (14) prepare basis statement; (15) prepare a brief summary of the rule; (16) update the fact sheet; (17) (and it gets more onerous) present three copies of materials to the Secretary of State; and (18) send one copy of materials to Attorney General. And for that burdensome list, he could not continue and add an economic impact statement.

State bureaucrats have flooded this issue and this request for new personal service lines, computers, capital, work space, work stations, the list goes on and on. At the end of this memo, the State Tax Assessor says, "At some point, a rulemaking process that is too complicated provides a disincentive to the promulgation of needed rules from a purely procedural point of view it is easier for an agency to secure a statutory amendment than to amend one of the agencies own rules. The proposed bill, L.D. 1310, would further discourage agencies from exercising their rulemaking authority."

I submit to you that that argument may be the strongest reason for the passage of this bill. I think it would be irresponsible (and it is irresponsible) not to know the economic impact of the laws and rules created by state government both by the legislature and by our state bureaucracies. You certainly would not run your own households that way and I hope we would not vote to kill this bill.

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

Representative GWADOSKY: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: During my legislative career, I have spent a fair amount of time dealing with issues of rules and regulations as a member of the Joint Standing Committee on State Government. We served on a committee on codification of rules, on legislative veto of rules and have always taken an interest when this issue has come up. I have in fact worked with NFIB on occasion on changing some of the existing statutes. I believe that the proposal before us has been advanced with great sincerity and I understand the support of various business interests whether it be certain chambers or NFIB.

However, I want to bring to the attention of the House a couple of concerns I have with this legislation. First of all, there is in existing law already a requirement by all agencies under our APA, Title 5, Section 805 - 8057A under preparation of adoption of rules, the various agencies when they promulgate rules and regulations are currently required to provide an impact statement when they promulgate those rules and regulations. That is currently in the law.

We can agree or disagree as to whether or not we think that is strong enough. In fact, if there are those individuals who are desirous of making stronger

changes as am I, I would draw your attention to a bill that we have already carried over this year, L.D. 1799. I believe it was sponsored by Representative Carroll, "An Act to Clarify Economic Impact Analysis." I think that that legislation will go a long way towards clarifying and giving the type of information we need. As I said, this is already on the books and the various agencies are supposed to be providing this when they promulgate rules and regulations.

Secondly, I want to talk about the fiscal impact of this particular legislation because we have heard discussed (a great deal this evening) that, despite the qualities of some of these bills, despite the greatest intention of some of these bills, given the fiscal crisis and, as you know, we are down a billion dollars in our deficit right now, some things, no matter how good they are, no matter how great they sound, we simply can't afford.

I would draw your attention to the fiscal note of this particular bill, L.D. 1310. As I read the Committee Amendment (I hope its accurate) for this bill, the fiscal note is \$200,000 over the next two years. This bill would create a \$40,000 bureaucrat within the Department of State Planning Office. It would create another \$40,000 bureaucrat within the Department of Economic and Community Development. That is a substantial amount of money to pay at a time when we are counting our pennies.

It is a great idea to some extent. I think we can all agree that we need to have this type of analysis but can we afford to be expending \$200,000 at a time when we are trying to find a billion dollars in our current fiscal year?

I also want to talk about this from the perspective of public policy. We in the legislature are members of a separate branch of government. If this bill were to be passed, we would become reliant on another branch of government, two separate agencies, the State Planning Office and the Department of Economic and Community Development to develop fiscal impact statements on our behalf. I would much rather prefer to have that expertise in-house. Keep in mind that the State Planning Office are the people who told us two years ago that we would have \$500 million extra in available revenues during the last two years and they were off by \$455 million. Are these the people we want to be making economic impact statements for the next two years at \$200,000 a pop?

There is a bill that is being carried over, Representative Carroll's. That bill will clarify our ability to get the type of information we need from the economic impact statements.

Representative Gray has another bill that is currently in a Committee of Conference dealing with allowing the legislature greater authority over rules. L.D. 66, An Act Relating to Mandates is in the other body and will at some point be in this chamber. I think there are several tools to use if we are really concerned about this issue of mandates and the best way to approach them. But, for this legislature and speaking as a Representative from Fairfield, at a time of tight economic conditions, I can't advocate spending \$200,000 when we are down a billion dollars to have economic impact statements produced by the State Planning Office and the Department of Community and Economic Development on our behalf.

I would hope down the road that we could move in

the direction that Don Carter set forth many years ago that the legislature get in the business of creating its own financial impact statements, independent of any other branch of government because I think that is the best route for us to take.

I appreciate the manner in which this bill has been brought forth. I know it is a sincere attempt to provide us with the information. I happen to think it is a flawed technique.

I would urge you to support the motion of Representative Joseph of Waterville to accept the Minority "Ought Not to Pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Waterville, Representative Joseph.

Representative JOSEPH: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I don't have a great deal to add because Representative Gwadosky actually said many of the things that I was planning to say.

The concerns about the Minority Report were the costs of doing this, the fact that bureaucrats would be creating these impact statements.

The question from one committee member was, the impact to whom? The impact to the developer? The impact to the municipality? The impact to the future of Maine? Where and whose economic impact are we talking about? In all of those cases, each of those persons would say that the economic impact would be different. There is no direction or definition as to what an impact statement actually would include. The current process, as you just heard, in the public hearing forum which can be requested, according to the the APA in the state if there is not one already scheduled, can be requested and persons who want to reflect the negative impact upon them, their business, their municipality, can be reflected at that time.

The State and Local Government Committee has supported a piece of legislation that Representative Gwadosky just referred to, L.D. 1854. It is in a Committee of Conference. But we too have serious concerns about the issues of promulgating rules and how in fact they do reflect legislative intent.

My personal response to this piece of legislation is that it seems to say that the legislative process is ineffective and that we are unresponsive. I do not see that occurring. If we feel that the process of promulgating rules which have the force of law needs to be changed, we can change that by a piece of legislation that is not quite as vague as this one is.

I, too, understand what the issues are surrounding this. I also understand that in the Energy Committee there is a bill that is being held over and I believe that may have been referred to. So, with all that in mind, I urge you to vote "Ought Not to Pass."

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Waterville, Representative Jacques.

Representative JACQUES: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: Unfortunately, I haven't been paying much attention to this bill because the Energy Committee had 200 bills of its own. I would like to point out to the committee that the majority of the bills that we had this session was an effort to streamline the permitting process to spur the economy in the State of Maine where everyone from the Governor down to the janitors of this building agrees is the way we should go.

I would like to point out that if the Majority Report is passed — I would like to read something to

you that will give you a basic understanding of one of the problems we have in state government. This bill says, "Any group of 25 or more registered voters who may have a substantial interest in a rule or any person who may be directly, substantially and adversely affected by the application of a rule may file an application for review with the Executive Director. With respect to any application or petition for review pursuant to this section, the petition or application must be verified and certified in the same manner as provided in..."

I can tell you something, having looked over the environmental regulatory process this session, you pass this bill and tell your little businesses and your big businesses that are going to have to deal with rules that — don't worry about getting the rules, we had complaints about the mining rules, it took a year and a half. When you get something like this, you want to talk about getting delays in rules, don't count on getting those permit applications processed under the Administrators Procedures Act because if somebody wants to monkey with them, it will take you decades before you finally get some rules that you can deal with. It works both ways. I can tell you the pseudo environmentalists of this state are going to have a field day with this. Don't look to permit anything because those rules will be tied up long enough that we will probably be spending yen in this country by the time it is done instead of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question through the Chair if I may. I have the Majority Report here and the figures have been given by the Majority Floor Leader — am I safe to assume or believe that this fiscal note will stand on this bill, \$200,000 of the taxpayers money?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the Representative that the Chair does not set fiscal notes, it is set by the administration.

Representative JACQUES: Mr. Speaker, is it my understanding that unless the administration changes this, this fiscal note will indeed stand on this L.D?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would answer in the affirmative.

Representative Jacques of Waterville requested a roll call vote.

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

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Lewiston, Representative Boutilier.

Representative BOUTILIER: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I am going to make this very brief but I do want to talk about the issues encompassed in this bill. My first two sessions I had the pleasure of serving with the Representative from Fairfield on the State and Local Government Committee and this issue was an issue that I felt very frustrated about every single year and we did deal with it every single year I was on the committee.

The whole issue of how rules are promulgated by the agencies, what kind of enabling legislation they used, how clear-cut those rules are, how well they

are defined, whether they in fact meet the cause of the enabling legislation and what the fiscal impact of those are, are something I think this legislature better deal with at some point in time or we will never, ever, truly be honest about how we impact local government in the state.

Having said that, I am not so sure this particular legislation is the way to go. The reason, and there's basically only one reason that I think that is because of the issue that Representative Gwadosky mentioned and that is that we are going to have the Executive Branch do the fiscal impact. I think that is a mistake.

I also believe in what Representative Carter fought for. I think the legislature should be a lot more upfront about fiscal impact statements, should be a lot more involved in the process of determining revenues and costs and the effects to the local governments as well as state government. I think to do that would be the best thing we can do to effect property taxes in a positive way and the best thing to effect efficient government in the state.

I would be dismayed, if by voting on this bill in the negative, my constituents felt that I was not for having a much better understanding of the impact of rulemaking. It has a tremendous impact and I do not believe there is enough, nor will there ever be enough oversight on rulemaking in this state until we become serious about it oversight.

I would urge those who are involved in this issue, whether it be Representative Carroll with his bill being held over or any other member of any other committee that deals with this bill, if we can't pass some form of better criteria for rulemaking and fiscal impact statements to be provided openly so people could meet them and see them and deal with them appropriately, including this legislature and the executive branch, we are fooling ourselves that we are ever going to truly deal with property tax increases largely impacted by the rules promulgated based on laws you and I act on every day.

I am going to vote against this bill at this time because I don't think it is the right vehicle but I am certainly in favor of the idea. I would hope that before this 115th Legislature is over, we have a bill that we all can support and feel good about and go back to our constituents and say we have actually done something about how state government passes on costs.

Representative Whitcomb of Waldo requested that the Clerk read the Committee Report.

Subsequently, the Committee Report was read in its entirety by the Clerk.

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

ROLL CALL NO. 163

YEA - Adams, Aliberti, Anderson, Anthony, Bailey, H.; Bell, Boutilier, Cahill, M.; Cashman, Cathcart, Chonko, Clark, H.; Clark, M.; Coles, Constantine, Cote, Crowley, Daggett, DiPietro, Dore, Duffy, Dutremble, L.; Erwin, Farnsworth, Gean, Goodridge, Gould, R. A.; Graham, Gurney, Gwadosky, Hale, Handy, Hastings, Hichborn, Hoglund, Holt, Hussey, Jacques, Jalbert, Joseph, Ketover, Ketterer, Kontos, LaPointe, Larrivee, Lawrence, Lemke, Lord, Luther, Macomber,

Manning, Marsh, Martin, H.; Mayo, McHenry, McKeen, Melendy, Michaud, Mitchell, E.; Mitchell, J.; Nadeau, Nutting, O'Dea, O'Gara, Oliver, Paradis, J.; Paul, Pfeiffer, Pineau, Plourde, Poulin, Pouliot, Rand, Richards, Richardson, Ricker, Rotondi, Rydell, Saint Onge, Sheltra, Simpson, Stevens, P.; Swazey, Tamaro, Tardy, Townsend, Tracy, Treat, Vigue, Wentworth, The Speaker.

NAY - Aikman, Ault, Barth, Bennett, Bowers, Carleton, Carroll, D.; Carroll, J.; Donnelly, Duplessis, Farnum, Farren, Foss, Garland, Gray, Greenlaw, Hanley, Heino, Hepburn, Hichens, Kerr, Kilkelly, Kutasi, Lebowitz, Libby, Lipman, Look, MacBride, Marsano, Merrill, Morrison, Murphy, Nash, Norton, Ott, Parent, Pendexter, Pendleton, Pines, Powers, Reed, G.; Reed, W.; Ruhlin, Salisbury, Savage, Skoglund, Small, Spear, Stevens, A.; Stevenson, Tupper, Waterman, Whitcomb.

ABSENT - Bailey, R.; Butland, Heeschen, Mahany, Paradis, P.; Simonds, Strout.

Yes, 91; No, 53; Absent, 7; Paired, 0; Excused, 0.

91 having voted in the affirmative and 53 in the negative with 7 absent, the Minority "Ought Not to Pass" Report was accepted. Sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the following matter: An Act to Increase Fees for Licenses Issued by the Department of Marine Resources (H.P. 1148) (L.D. 1673) H. "A" H-626 to C. "A" H-567) which was tabled earlier in the day and later today assigned pending passage to be enacted.

On motion of Representative Mitchell of Freeport, under suspension of the rules, the House reconsidered its action whereby L.D. 1673 was passed to be engrossed.

On further motion of the same Representative, under suspension of the rules, the House reconsidered its action whereby Committee Amendment "A" (H-567) as amended by House Amendment "A" (H-626) thereto was adopted.

On motion of the same Representative, House Amendment "A" (H-626) was indefinitely postponed.

The same Representative offered House Amendment "B" (H-669) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-567) and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "B" (H-669) was read by the Clerk.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Freeport, Representative Mitchell.

Representative **MITCHELL**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: House Amendment "B" clarifies some problems that the Speaker's legal counsel had with the bill.

Subsequently, House Amendment "B" (H-669) was adopted.

Committee Amendment "A" (H-567) as amended by House Amendment "B" (H-669) thereto was adopted.

The Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-567) as amended by House Amendment "B" (H-669) thereto in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the following matter: An Act to Annex the Town of Richmond to Lincoln County (S.P. 683) (L.D. 1811) (C. "A" S-280;

H. "A" H-549 and S. "A" S-346) which was tabled earlier in the day and later today assigned pending passage to be enacted.

On motion of Representative Holt of Bath, the House reconsidered its action whereby L.D. 1811 was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-280); H. "A" (H-549) and S. "A" (S-346).

On motion of the same Representative, the House reconsidered its action whereby Committee Amendment "A" (S-280) was adopted.

The same Representative offered House Amendment "A" (H-671) to Committee Amendment "A" (S-280) and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" (H-671) to Committee Amendment "A" (S-280) was read by the Clerk and adopted.

Committee Amendment "A" (S-280) as amended by House Amendment "A" (H-671) thereto was adopted.

The Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-280) as amended by House Amendment "A" (H-671) thereto and House Amendment "A" (H-549) and Senate Amendment "A" (S-346) in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the following matter: An Act to Require the Use of People First Language in the Maine Revised Statutes and to Authorize Administrative Implementation of Associated Changes in Terminology (H.P. 1274) (L.D. 1845) (C. "A" H-536) which was tabled earlier in the day and later today assigned pending the motion of Representative Skoglund of St. George that L.D. 1845 and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed and later today assigned.

Representative Skoglund of Portland withdrew his motion to indefinitely postpone the Bill and all accompanying papers.

On motion of Representative Joseph of Waterville, L.D. 1845 was recommitted to the Committee on State and Local Government. Sent up for concurrence.

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 1 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

ENACTOR

(Reconsidered)

An Act to Clarify the Solid Waste Landfill Remediation and Closure Program (S.P. 639) (L.D. 1687) (S. "A" S-309 to C. "A" S-296)

Was reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed.

On motion of Representative Jacques of Waterville, the House reconsidered its action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed.

The Same Representative offered House Amendment "A" (H-668) and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" (H-668) was read by the Clerk and adopted.

The Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-296) as amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-309) thereto and House Amendment "A" (H-668) in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.