

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

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



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

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

Volume II

First Regular Session

May 27, 2003 – June 14, 2003

First Special Session

August 21, 2003 – August 23, 2003

Second Regular Session

January 7, 2004 - January 30, 2004

Second Special Session

February 3, 2004 - April 7, 2004

Pages 777-1562

On motion of Representative DUPLESSIE of Westbrook, **TABLED** pending **ADOPTION** of **Committee Amendment "A" (H-560)** and later today assigned.

SENATE PAPERS
Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act To Eliminate the Social Security Offset for Unemployment Benefits

(H.P. 657) (L.D. 880)
(C. "A" H-146)

PASSED TO BE ENACTED in the House on May 19, 2003.

Came from the Senate with the Bill and accompanying papers **COMMITTED** to the Committee on **LABOR** in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

On motion of Representative SMITH of Van Buren, the House voted to **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

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

The House recessed until 3:00 p.m.

(After Recess)

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The following item was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

CONSENT CALENDAR
First Day

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

(H.P. 152) (L.D. 193) Bill "An Act to Increase Funding for the Maine Dental Education Loan Program" Committee on **APPROPRIATIONS AND FINANCIAL AFFAIRS** reporting **Ought to Pass**

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

There being no objection, the House Paper was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED** and sent for concurrence. **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

The Chair laid before the House the following item which was **TABLED** earlier in today's session:

HOUSE REPORT - **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-560)** - Committee on **APPROPRIATIONS AND FINANCIAL AFFAIRS** on Bill "An Act To Make Supplemental Appropriations and Allocations for the Expenditures of State Government and To Change Certain Provisions of the Law Necessary to the Proper Operations of State Government for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 2003, June 30, 2004 and June 30, 2005" (EMERGENCY)

(H.P. 1190) (L.D. 1614)

Which was **TABLED** by Representative DUPLESSIE of Westbrook pending **ADOPTION** of **Committee Amendment "A" (H-560)**.

Subsequently, **Committee Amendment "A" (H-560)** was **ADOPTED**.

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

On motion of Representative BUNKER of Kossuth Township, the House **RECONSIDERED** its action whereby **Committee Amendment "A" (H-560)** was **ADOPTED**.

The same Representative **PRESENTED House Amendment "A" (H-562)** to **Committee Amendment "A" (H-560)** which was **READ** by the Clerk.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Kossuth Township, Representative Bunker.

Representative **BUNKER**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I again regret to be standing here holding you folks up on such a good piece of work as the budget before you. Unfortunately in all good budgets and I have never ever had to do this before and quite frankly, I wish I would never have to do this again. There is a long story to tell about this amendment and how this proposal has come to you. I beg your indulgence to allow me to explain how this amendment came before you and how it was put together.

There is supplementary information that still hasn't been distributed. Again, in deference to you folks, I am not going to wait for that either. I think once you get it you can peruse it at your own leisure and we have two amendments here. You will see the makeup that we are discussing and see what the committee of jurisdiction had tried to do in conjunction with the Legal and Veterans Affairs Committee.

This current amendment before you is the last piece of joint work between the Legal and Vets Committee and the Joint Standing Committee on Criminal Justice, which had 20 members out of 26 agreeing to the footprint that you will eventually see, which is the reinstatement of the Bureau of Liquor Enforcement. The footprint there is of my genesis even though as we moved along in the process here and I will describe this lengthy process in detail because you need to hear this story, because I hope it never happens again.

The ending of the process then became part of the executive proposal that was being made at a later date to the Legal and Vets Committee and claimed consolidation and an efficient product. All of those phrases were ones that I had coined earlier on and then was absorbed as a reason to present some alternative proposals. If anybody has read the paper anytime in the last three or four months we all know the people are screaming for the reinstatement of liquor enforcement. Channel 7 did a news poll a couple of nights ago and they put the question out to the members and out to the public and said, do you think it is the people's will of this body to reinstate liquor enforcement. The results of that the next night showed 95 percent of the people that responded to their on-line poll said that liquor enforcement was an essential service that should be reinstated. I agree with them. I think that all of my committee members agree that liquor enforcement is essential. I think all of the Legal and Vets Committee agree that liquor enforcement is an essential component and a necessary enforcement tool to be the first line of our defense against substance abuse.

It is really a shame when you get into this because when you look at all of the total budget and the great things that the great chair of Appropriations talked about with health care, prescription cards and all the other great things we did in getting restored into the budget. The real sad part of all this is most of this, whether it is the 2,000 people we have in our correctional systems or the overcrowding we have in our jails is we all have the same basic underlying problem and that is the addiction of substance abuse

or drugs. Eighty-two percent of everybody in the prison system have that underlying drug or alcohol problem and as many doctors will tell you, at least down in our area, much of the drugs that are being prescribed are driving health care costs through the sky has to do with some kind of addiction, whether it is alcohol or drugs.

All these things are tied together. We can throw more money at treatment of the medical insurance payment or we can throw more money at trying to solve the problem and prevent the problem. I think prevention is the proper and most efficient use of state resources. I am just totally appalled and I think everybody in this body was when the first Part I budget came out that completely eliminated our first line of defense for substance abuse. Nobody had to answer the question. As a matter of fact, I will ask that question and somebody at the end of my quite lengthy presentation today can answer to me, maybe, why did they completely eliminate a whole department that was so highly respected, was efficient, was ensured that all the people played on a level playing field and heard that the owners of the various bars competed fairly and evenly, required and really checked very diligently to make sure that all revenues were collected at the border. If anybody has checked with any of the southern chiefs, you know that they are coming over the border hand and fist and those revenues are not going into our nickel and dime coffers.

I dare say that the proposal in itself that originally started in Part I, it is still there, unchanged. It has zero law enforcement assigned to liquor enforcement, zero. The current budget before us, because of the prior Part I budget, there is nothing changed in Part II, there is a zero state effort of law enforcement for liquor enforcement. I think that is untenable. I think it is improper. The question that then keeps going back to, why do we have not liquor enforcement?

Let me back up then. The committee of jurisdiction I am very proud of them. Each and every member on my committee and many of the folks that came from the other committees, Transportation and Legal and Vets helped in some subcommittee meetings where we tried to wrestle with this. In the beginning our committee insisted, being the Committee on Criminal Justice and Public Safety, we said we are going to review all nine bureaus because you have a pretty big outfit there under the commissioner that we approved in our committee of jurisdiction and we heard a lot of discussions of how the budget process went around.

I did some investigation and we did dig into all nine bureaus even though some of them overlapped and what most of you people don't know is what tied all three committees of jurisdiction's hands here, Transportation, Legal and Vets and the Criminal Justice Committee is the crazy funding mechanism we have for State Police, which is divided now 66/34, between the highway fund and the general fund. Every time you ask them to put a cut here or put up a cut there, they jump up and say you need to cut three state troopers to get one general fund position. You can see I was working against the tide when it came to doing our real job of reviewing fiscally each and every individual section of public safety. I want you to know some people like Representatives Sykes, Churchill, Lessard, they dug into this very deeply and asked three pointed and straightforward questions. I just can't commend them enough.

We started and the initial question from all of us was why? We sent a letter to the commissioner of Public Safety and asked them to answer the underlying question of why they decided that they were eliminating the whole department. We have yet to receive a response to that question even though it has been asked repeatedly and repeatedly. I think that rung a bell with me.

That bothers me as a private investigator by trade. It bothers me when you don't get an answer. If you read through responsibilities of your various committees, your job is to go out there and dig into their files and dig into their fiscal stuff and to dig into the way they do business and to seriously do the oversight that we are responsible ever since we lost the Audit and Program Review Committee. I take that and our committee took that seriously.

Eventually down the road I figured out that under Commissioner Kelly, the prior commissioner, there were three budgets that were proposed. In those proposed budgets the first two come through and basically it said we can't in the day of homeland security and the dangers that are upon us in this country, cut anything in law enforcement. Although they offered up quite a bit of cuts, it wasn't rubber meets the road law enforcement, if you know what I mean.

He asked for a waiver and asked for permission not to be part of this, I gotta cut this stuff one-third, but needless to say, the administration came back and said, no, you gotta go to the table and they have to target how much money they had to cut and they had to meet. Sure enough, in the third budget put out by Commissioner Kelly to the Chief Executive, liquor enforcement was in that third budget round. Liquor enforcement was given a target of a one-third reduction in their department. They came to the table and they came forward and made those reductions and presented that proposal back to the commissioner and that third budget proposal by Commissioner Kelly to the Chief Executive showed liquor enforcement with a one-third cut in reduction and they did that. They still felt they could go out there and do their work.

Now, comes the directive that you start to look at where the cuts were coming to meet the overall cut for all of public safety. Suddenly we had to cut 80 or 100 state police personnel in one fashion or another. Suddenly the world came to an end. Commissioner Kelly backed out and didn't want to play anymore. Now the budgeting responsibilities fell on the shoulders on the Chief of the Maine State Police. All nine of these bureaus that were sitting at the table and helping to put this budget together suddenly weren't allowed to play anymore. It was really frustrating. They came out on the 29th of January with their fourth revision of the Public Safety budget and in the fourth revision anybody in the Department of the State Police ever had a problem with, mainly management, every one of those bureaus was eliminated including all of liquor enforcement. It was completely eliminated in the fourth budget proposal. All of the State Police proposed cuts to some extent were reinstated. No law enforcement officer in the State Police area of the world was cut.

All of the females in all of the troops were cut all over the state, Troop A, B, C, D and right down the road. All the clerical folks were cut. In the Department of Liquor Enforcement is Public Safety's only sexual harassment officer, Lt. Polly Pomerleau. Of course, her job was cut as well as the chief. These two folks, Chief Kayford and Lt. Pomerleau has really, during the time of deregulating, getting out of the liquor business, my God, they are the only two people in the whole state that have a handle on what the liquor business is in this state, who the players are, who plays fair, who plays dirty, who is the guys you have to keep an eye on and there is so much to it. I can pick up the books and show you the books that liquor enforcement officers are required to enforce and just to say that you eliminate them and some local police officer can take over the responsibilities of all of those very detailed administrative and law enforcement functions just doesn't make any sense.

That made us continue to ask, why, why, with no response. To this day there is no response. Many discussions with the Chief Executive and with no response. Here we are. We went through a long process and then we started working a little bit together. We asked, first of all, a subcommittee of my committee with Representative Churchill and Representative Sykes and Representative Lessard was on it. We had a subcommittee set up and we asked Public Safety to provide Lt. Dyer from the Beano Licensing Bureau and we asked them to send one of the liquor enforcement people and their fiscal people to our subcommittee so we could try to figure out a creative fiscal solution that may be general fund neutral and we could still provide a modicum of liquor enforcement in the state.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Commissioner of Public Safety refused to send anybody to those meetings. It is first time in the history of the Legislature that anybody from the Executive Branch refused to provide fiscal and knowledge to the policy-making committees of the Legislature. If any of you guys want to open up your Constitution like Representative Waterhouse used to love to do and look under Article 4, Subsection 6, it basically says that no one can obstruct the Legislature in the performance of its duties. That man did and he did it without a problem. He refused to send them. Time after time he refused to answer the questions we asked of him. As time went on we dealt with the bill now. We had the gaming responsibilities on us because in Part I, as you know, we passed Part I, which totally eliminated liquor enforcement and shifted the gaming responsibilities somehow deep down within the State Police structure. Again, we all wondered why does it have to be there? Why does liquor enforcement have to be eliminated and then what money making, license hanging people that are left? Why are they the only ones that are saved? It is because of money. We wanted to hang a license on the wall, but we don't want anybody out there enforcing it or making sure people are collecting all the revenues or something. I don't know. Nobody could understand it. We continued on in our quest for knowledge and were completely stonewalled at every turn.

Suddenly we worked on a bill during the interim, which raised \$402,000 if I am not mistaken to support the beano, bingo and licensing division of the State Police. It is a special fund, not a general fund, all born on the backs of VFWs, American Legions, non-profits, churches, beano, bingo and some certain licensed categories within the state. They wanted our committee to raise fees and \$400,000 and then we looked at the people that were in that division and in that division there were six or seven clerical staff that helped really do the selling and the hanging of the licenses and there was \$516,000 worth of highly trained detectives, sergeants and lieutenants of the State Police that were their investigative arm of that agency.

Ladies and gentlemen in all of last year not one single criminal complaint has ever been filed against gray haired old ladies on beano and bingo, not one single for \$516,000, you got zero in return. They asked the committee of jurisdiction to support that \$400,000 increase. I want you to know that it didn't go over very well with the committee of jurisdiction. Representative Churchill got a little excited when they talked about agricultural fairs and what have you. It was quite an interesting process. We voted that bill down. Ladies and gentlemen, unbeknownst to us during that same course of the week, because they had to put Part II together really fast and the pressure was on the good commissioner to keep his department fully funded, he got supposedly positioned from the presiding officers of both chambers permission to circumvent the committee of jurisdiction and move that bill right into Part II. It came in the Governor's package down to Appropriations in Part II

submission. Needless to say, there were a lot of upset folks. I am very pleased to say that as I stand here today, Appropriations decided and agreed with us that that was inappropriate and that those fees are no longer in the current budget before us. I do thank them.

Unfortunately that \$400,000 really is the number of money that we are missing to make any kind of enforcement action in the licensing and the liquor area that is kind of the dollar amount that is missing here. We met together with the different committee chairs. The State Police obviously had a little bit of a say in transportation because they approved the highway fund and they approved the general fund side of the State Police. We kept them informed. Legal and Vets, Representative Clark and us and met with the commissioner over a period of time and we started putting together a nice little package that would basically reinstate in some fashion a proactive first line of defense for substance abuse out there. We were moving along and felt pretty good, except at every stage of the way the commissioner basically says that we can't do that. We won't allow that. We have to have it under the thumb of the State Police. It can't be a stand-alone agency.

It has been stand alone since 1935, ladies and gentlemen, and doing a very highly professional job. You know how you can tell a law enforcement agency does a highly professional job is when people voluntarily comply with the laws. I used to have a liquor license. I used to own a bar. I didn't break the rules because I didn't want to see one of them guys come see me. If he comes into any one of your towns, the first bar that somebody in green comes into, they call every other bar in town and they are all complying immediately. It is a great tool. It is not happening today. There is no mechanism for that to happen in the future.

We are putting this all together and suddenly we have some movement. Let me back up a little bit. All our committees of jurisdiction all kind of worked on that Part I budget. Everybody started to see that it didn't make a lot of sense to take all of the secretarial positions out of all these troops. It just didn't make sense why they would want to terminate all the clerical positions. We got them back in. It didn't make sense why they wanted to eliminate 9-1-1, the directors and those people in charge. Utilities got a hold of that and got them moved over there and somewhat protected. They couldn't understand why they wanted to get rid of the chiefs of traffic safety who set up a whole program and gets all the OUI money to your localities and does all the seatbelt and car safety stuff within the Department of Highway Safety. These people were essential highest-level people, but they are all eliminated for some reason.

Through the collective work of our committees of jurisdiction, we reinstated most, almost all, of those folks to their proper stature and their proper position and found other ways of doing things. I applaud all the other committees of jurisdiction for what they did. I feel very sorry as I stand here today that during Part I when they did those things that I wasn't down with Appropriations at 12, 2 or 3 in the morning like Inland Fisheries or Marine Resources were. They have fees coming out of their departments, coming from their consumers saying that they want these officers. I will pay more. I want this coverage because they are the people that keep the fishermen over there following the rules the way I have to because I am honest.

That is the same thing that all of liquor enforcement people that came to the Legal and Vets and came to Appropriations, that whole room was right full of people saying we will fully fund liquor enforcement, \$2.1 million, right out of fees. Somebody computed that and it came out somewhere around 41 percent, if I am not mistaken. The industry was willing to pay it because they knew

how much and how important this entity was to them as an industry, never mind our children and our first line for substance abuse.

Again, why? Where are we? Why? Nothing makes sense here. Being the bad guy that I am, I started going around and digging a little bit. I went over and I asked the State Police, because you know they did this thing behind closed doors and the other nine girls weren't in charge. I asked Lt. Colonel Harmon. Lt. Colonel Harmon, how in the fourth budget proposal did you get all your hundred State Troopers back in place? Let me back up, I asked, Lt. Colonel Harmon, did you have anything to do with eliminating liquor enforcement? He said, "No, the State Police did not." We had a target. We met it and that is the way it is. You met your target Colonel without eliminating liquor enforcement? Yes. How did you do it? His answer to me was we changed the transportation fund from 60/40 to 66/34 and that got them all out of hot water. Anybody in Transportation here can add and you know darn well that wasn't enough money to reinstate 100 positions to the State Police and the Department of Public Safety.

The man lied to me, ladies and gentlemen. When somebody lies to me face to face.

The SPEAKER: Would the Representative please defer? The Representative knows the rules of debate. It is not proper to assign motives to other members, either of this body or in implication. The Representative is doing a great job with the debate. I just want to make sure you stay on track. The Representative may proceed.

The Chair reminded Representative BUNKER of Kossuth Township that it was inappropriate to question the motives of the Chief Executive.

Representative BUNKER: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just to be clear, I kind of reviewed the rules of the Constitution and I think I can refer to other members outside of this body as I feel necessary. It is against the rules to impugn the motives of anybody within this body or in the other chamber. I would certainly not want to do that.

The SPEAKER: Would the Representative defer? I believe the rules are members of this body or of the Executive as well, the motives of the Executive.

Representative BUNKER: Thank you Mr. Speaker, but

The SPEAKER: The Representative can continue to debate.

Representative BUNKER: Mr. Speaker, it is going to be difficult because there is a motive to why this budget came together. I would ask a little bit of allowance to be able to go through that.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will allow great leeway in this.

Representative BUNKER: Thank you Mr. Speaker. This is my one shot and my only shot I would guess.

I did some research, ladies and gentlemen, and this person misled me or misstated something. I don't know what word to use. I went and did some checking. I wanted to go out and defend the State Police. They are good friends of mine. I was Chair of Labor last year and we got them a 19 percent rate increase and that is why their budget was so inflated this year and that is why they had to go looking elsewhere to find money. I feel really guilty that I am part of the problem, but they got a reclass last year that came in and kicked in this fiscal budget and 19 percent of that huge department is a lot of money, let me tell you ladies and gentlemen.

I started with inquiring because I wanted to go out and defend these guys and tell the other nine public safety bureaus that the State Police were not the bad guys in this scenario. It was just the way cutting had to be. You heard the rumors about other places of people's motives. Rumors went all over the place.

Somebody down in the Chief Executive's Office and we didn't think that was true either, but unfortunately he went out and vocalized it to several members of this body and other people. That wasn't really smart on his behalf, but that just kept the rumor mill going that this was a vindictive and retaliatory action. I didn't want to believe any of this. I didn't want to believe any of this stuff. The State Police are our most respected law enforcement agency in the state and I am out there trying to defend these folks.

We came a little bit further down the road and they came into the committee of jurisdiction and we have the budget process and we are asking them about a whole bunch of things. Can you cut here? Can you cut there? We were running into roadblocks as they indicated because it is really controlled by another committee and if you take one of these, you lose three of those. We go through all of this stuff, but I think Representative Churchill was kind enough to ask the Chief of the State Police, can you at least stop and have your officers when they are running around the state to stop and check inspection stations once in a while. If I am not mistaken, I think he indicated to the Representative that they have so many overtime duties and they are stretched so thin that on any given day there might be only 17 troopers working on any shift at any one point in the state at any day. They could not do one more thing. We were kind of flabbergasted. Afterwards I learned that there are 337 troopers in the State Police and we were later told that there are only 147 of them out on the road doing the work that you and I think they are supposed to be doing, which is an admission. The rest are off filling administrative positions. I can give you one good example, the head of SBI used to be a lady, Dorothy Morang, that probably got paid \$50,000. Now there is a Lieutenant in charge and he gets \$120,000 plus benefits, plus other benefits. Representative Sykes started asking questions about where we visited many of these sights. We did tours.

This committee of jurisdiction did its work. I am very, very, very proud of them. I wish every committee would do it. We went up to the academy and found seven full-time positions sitting up there just waiting for the two troopers that are going to graduate out of the current academy, so they can give them five weeks of ongoing special training to make them something different than regular fully licensed police officers. It didn't make sense. We kept asking those kinds of questions, but we were stone walled. We couldn't do anything about it. We finally caved in and gave up on trying to cut any more positions. The next step was to do this combining.

I looked at the liquor enforcement thing. I looked at a \$402,000 increase on the backs of beanos and bingos and what have you. I then looked at the total money that came in through the licensure part and also how much money that the Governor already put into Part I for the existing, how do I want to say it, the clerical personnel that are hanging liquor licenses across the state as we speak, starting last Saturday. That is all they have funded within the State Police, are clerical revenue collecting people and a couple Public Safety ones that go out and make sure that the room is big enough and the doors are in the right place to hang the sign.

We worked on this and started to put together a pretty good package and found that we came up short. When you take \$829,000 in one hand and you take \$890,000 in the other hand without their \$400,000 increase and you put them together, we devised a system of cross training, believe it or not. God, what a novel thing. We are going to take \$120,000 worth of troopers and put them back out investigating murders, arsenic and whatever because these are all detectives, sergeants or lieutenants. They are former homicide detectives. We are going

to put them back over there in existing positions. They don't lose their job and then we are going to cross train the current liquor enforcement officers we have to do beano and bingo because they are in the same buildings anyhow. My God, what a simple solution to a very difficult problem.

We started walking down that road and we ran into roadblock after roadblock after roadblock. We gotta have this under the State Police. We have to have a Lieutenant in charge. We have to have it under the State Police. Why? We all know the architect that I talked about before. It eliminated EMS and eliminated the director of Highway Safety and tried to eliminate, tried to get all of that EMS database into the State Police because of the federal money coming down the road possibly. There is a whole bunch of things coming together here, but at every juncture the State Police had to be in charge and it didn't make any sense. Right now the Bureau of Liquor Enforcement in our proposal, the Bureau of Liquor Licensing and Gaming is under the Department of Public Safety and reports directly to the commissioner as it always has. It didn't seem like any reason to have to put them deep down inside of a hierarchy that only right now out of their 337 officers or whatever they have, there is only one assigned to drug enforcement in the whole State of Maine.

They can't handle drug enforcement and they can't handle inspection stations, how the heck are they going to handle liquor enforcement, ladies and gentlemen. This came out time after time after time in all the questioning. Nobody to this day has the answer.

We continued on and I thought there has to be more to this. It started to focus a little bit. I love Transportation. They have all those secretaries back in place and that troubled me. We can leave them troopers out there on the road doing their job and the rubber meets the road. When we started putting personnel and they started offering a little bit of license sworn Public Safety personnel, the commissioner was willing, if we could get wide partisan support from all four corners, they were willing to come up almost to eight sworn law enforcement personnel in the budget. Evidentially all four corners didn't come together and this Part II budget failed to get anything in. I know many folks tried, including myself.

It still insisted on the State Police being in charge. I went over and I did some checking and I hear all this stuff. All those liquor enforcement agents that were in the hall during Part I, they were all going crazy and spreading rumors. They all liked to tell me that stuff. They e-mailed me and told me all kinds of different scenarios. One of them was that they thought that they were targeting their department because their department has the only sexual harassment officer in the whole Department of Public Safety. If you are sitting here as a woman, you would probably wonder, why would the Department of Public Safety with over 638 personnel, not have one within the sworn ranks of the State Police when so many of those troopers are females. I would respectfully submit to you, folks, when and if I can get the materials being distributed, you will see that they probably don't dare to be a sexual harassment officer, I don't know. The internal workings of the State Police with their internal affairs mechanism, does all the work behind closed doors and it does not open up to the sunshine and the light of day.

When you get the materials being passed around, you will see on the beginning of it, the proposal and my diagram of what I think the stand-alone bureau outside of the State Police should look like. You will see a 14 percent funding mechanism and you will see another amendment there that talks about another funding mechanism. The one before us on this is the 14 percent increase in fees that both committees, 20 of us agreed on, generally speaking.

It kept bothering me so on vacation week, I know many of us stayed here, but I came down on Thursday and Friday during vacation week because I am just that kind of guy and I wandered around and I went in and told the Chief of Staff that I thought there was something more to this. It was really bothering me. You know that female intuition or that investigative intuition thing. Some people blew in my ear and told me different things that they are targeting their sexual harassment officer because of some involvement. I didn't know what was going on. I go down to the Human Rights Commission and I go in there and say let me see what you have on your books. Sure enough, that is public information, if you are not aware of it. We need to educate some people in Public Safety about that, but that is coming later.

I went through and pulled the whole list of Public Safety and the complaints that were filed against them at the Human Rights Commission. Sure enough, just recently, just adjudicated on March 1 of this year that was being fought from June of last year all the way through this budget process were two females that were filing complaints against a certain sergeant within the State Police. This certain sergeant happens to be very close and best friend of the colonel. You don't know what is going on. IA and the way Internal Affairs works, if you guys don't know, is they do the investigation and they find a finding, they give it to the light colonel and they make the decision on whether the person is disciplined in any way, shape or form or not. We have the chicken watching the hen house in this situation here. He is the architect of the budget, but he is also embroiled in this big battle right now that is really close to home and close to heart. I continue to investigate that.

You will have the documents on your desk shortly and you will be sickened when you read them. I tried to do all this stuff behind closed doors, people. I fixed eight of these similar situations behind closed doors in my eight years down here and never once had to speak on the floor or go to the press and tell them what is going on. This is one of the reasons why today is so difficult for me. It really is.

I read through that and there is not one person on my committee that did get a chance to read it that just went, I can't believe this. It starts at the academy with two senior supervisors saying, don't send this female there, because that guy is a sexual problem. What happens, the Lieutenant talks to the Lieutenant and they send him down there and from reading the complaint, you will find that the female complainant says I really think that Sergeant in particular lobbied to get me underneath him, personally as field training officer.

Many of you folks don't know, but when you come out of the academy as a male or a female, you are under direct supervision of a field training officer and they can fire you at any moment for any reason basically. You are on your sections probation period. It is a special probationary period for law enforcement folks. Her whole destiny was at the hands of this sergeant. Please read it when you get it. You will see what I mean. If you go down through there, you will see that a whole bunch of people in charge were warned not to allow this to happen and they all facilitated it. Here is this female putting up with months and months and months of stuff that I wouldn't speak about on the floor of various acts. She finally couldn't take it anymore and she reported it. They investigated it and at one point during this investigation evidentially this sergeant was suspended for a period of time. As it went on, this lady finally did graduate, by the way, at her graduation ceremony many of the high-level instructors were there and sergeants and there were people making comments like she pulled the woman card. She was just trying to get out of this thing that the sergeant was putting on her, disciplinary things, she did all these inappropriate things. She

was just getting even. She was all frustrated about that. She had a meeting with the Colonel and the Light Colonel and the Light Colonel said you just have to understand that that Sergeant really liked that Sergeant and those comments are going to happen and you have to learn to accept that. It is sickening, ladies and gentlemen. It is sickening in the way it was handled.

You read the second one. The second one is in the same place with the same individual. She, when you read down through this, it is really interesting because once the word got around that this one lady had filed a complaint, they were going to interview a whole bunch of females. That is rightfully so. I think it is only proper procedure. Well, the head of the Maine State Troopers Association goes in quietly, shuts the door to speak to one of the secretaries and says that if the Lieutenant comes in, pretend we are talking about something else. He goes on to basically tell her that she has a big mouth and that she will be investigated, interviewed. If he touched you in a place that was inappropriate, then say that it wasn't offensive.

The SPEAKER: Would the Representative please defer?

The Chair recognizes the Representative from Cherryfield, Representative Dugay. For what purpose does the Representative from Cherryfield rise?

Representative DUGAY: Point of order. I am not sure where this is going as it pertains to the supplemental budget. I would like to get on to the scope of the original intent of the amendment.

On **POINT OF ORDER**, Representative DUGAY of Cherryfield asked the Chair if the remarks of Representative BUNKER of Kossuth Township were germane to the pending question.

The SPEAKER: The Representative has expressed a point of order to the Chair. Although I have given great leeway, the Chair is perplexed at the germaneness of the Representative's testimony. I would please encourage the Representative to try to address the question at hand, which is adoption of the House Amendment, House Amendment "A." The Representative may proceed.

The Chair reminded Representative BUNKER of Kossuth Township to stay as close as possible to the pending question.

Representative BUNKER: Mr. Speaker, I will continue to explain how this House Amendment came before you and will explain to you the rational that I believe liquor enforcement was completely eliminated. It won't take very much longer to finish that if you would indulge me.

You have the documents on your desk on what really happened here, ladies and gentlemen, is after a short period of time this lady was interviewed and she told what she was told. No, she didn't say anything at all. She kept quiet. She was afraid and then she saw this certain individual being put back on the roster, the 28-day roster. After all this investigation, he was being put back to work. This lady came out, reported it and they had to go outside of the department, ladies and gentlemen. This couldn't be fixed within the department. They had to go to the Human Rights Commission to get this fixed. During that whole process, and you can read the documents, you will find that the only person that can put somebody back on the roster is the Light Colonel.

As things went along, I learned through gossip that this same architect of this budget that eliminated this whole department made some comments that made him the focus of an investigation. I slyly went to the Commissioner of Public Safety and said, I know Lt. Colonel so and so was being investigated and what are you doing about it? He didn't know it. He confirmed that he was being investigated for some facilitation of this kind of abuse. I asked him what he was going to do about it? He said, "It really didn't have anything to do with the budget, I'm

not going to do anything about it." I was quite concerned about that, very concerned about that.

I went on and continued to debate the merits of the budget and I felt that these were actions that systemically over all the various departments of jurisdiction that had to take corrective action to put their key people back in place, that this was just a huge systemic problem that was being facilitated upon and quite frankly rewarding the department that was causing the inequities.

I turned around and asked the Chief of Staff if they were going to fix it? No response. I went back and gave up on that, ladies and gentlemen. I just couldn't do anymore at this time. It is before you. I think it is the underlying problem here. Then I worked diligently in putting together this proposal that is before you in good effort knowing that I am running into roadblocks at every time. We did get to the proposal with 20 of 26 people agreeing to the footprint. Where we fell apart was a 14 percent fee increase. You all know that originally the industry in both the committees and in Appropriations said we will pay the whole nine yards. We are talking about \$400,000. I think the 14 percent increase is only appropriate. It just didn't seem to make it through the system for some reason, even with both committees of jurisdiction requesting support for it. That was bipartisan.

I have to talk about myself here for at least a second folks because there is something you all heard rumors about and I have to clear the air on the floor here. That document that you have in your hand that is being passed out in some fashion, I hope. Nobody has one yet? Mr. Speaker, there was some material that I asked to have passed out with my name on it. I am just inquiring if that has been passed out.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is actually looking at that to make sure it is pertinent or not. Material is distributed at the Chair's discretion. It is a lengthy document and I am trying to wade my way through it. The Representative may proceed.

Representative BUNKER: Yes sir, I did redact the victim's names, even though by law they are public, but I redacted them myself because I felt it was only appropriate. If that is the question at hand, I did have great concern.

There was one period, ladies and gentlemen, the night before we were reporting back to Appropriations with this proposal, we had a pretty lengthy hearing and we had to come up here to vote and we had to stop. At the last moment, I said, as our good Majority Leader asked me to do with Corrections and Appropriations, I asked Corrections for a million dollars. Show me where you find a million dollars and we will make a decision on where to take it. I asked for \$800,000 to make my old plan work. There was some concern that that meant 24 troopers were gone and all heck hit the floor the next morning. On Friday morning I was yelled at three or four times by various committees thinking I was trying to cut 24 troopers, which I would never do in a hundred years. I went down to speak in Appropriations and the next thing you know I am yarded out of Appropriations and up to the Speaker's Office. I was prevented to speak in Appropriations. The good Speaker relayed to me that the Commissioner of Public Safety was accusing me of criminal conduct of being in possession of criminal internal affairs documentation. Afterwards I took those documents up to the AG's Office immediately to prove to him that these documents were all available through freedom of access and they were all public documents. He should have known that. His major people should have known that, who I showed them too. The other folks should have known that, but they used that threat, the Speaker relayed to me, to intimidate me. That is against the Constitution, ladies and gentlemen. It is against the law. I think that is very inappropriate. In addition to that, as I researched for tonight's speech, his failure to provide people to us, fiscal people and the information to us

during those subcommittees is also against the law because when we request them, they must send them or they are in violation of Title 5, Section 22 through whatever. There is even a section of that law that says an employee may come and testify and help us make our decisions on their own time and they can't be retaliated against. The liquor enforcement people were told and ordered by the Commissioner of Public Safety not to respond and not to come into this building and not to provide us information. That is against the law, ladies and gentlemen.

I don't know how the committee of jurisdiction can do its job. I was threatened. I took it very seriously. I was threatened before in a prior job as a Sheriff by my head Sheriff. I know what it feels like. It hit me to the core. I took it very seriously. I laid low for two weeks worrying about what was happening.

One reporter came up to me the next week and said that I know you made a phone call to such and such on Friday night. How did he know? They are after three big fish and you are one of them. That is scary, ladies and gentlemen. I am trying to do my job and this is what happens. I think there is more to this story here. I ask you to vote in favor of this proposal. Let's not reward the folks that think that they are above the law. Let's put the professional enforcement people back in the positions that you and I and 95 percent of our constituents asked us to do. I thank you for your indulgence Mr. Speaker. I know it was way outside the latitude that normally is given, but this has been very difficult.

Representative BRANNIGAN of Portland moved that **House Amendment "A" (H-562) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-560) be INDEFINITELY POSTPONED.**

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

Representative BRANNIGAN: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. When I spoke this morning introducing this budget, I neglected to mention the committee's of jurisdiction. I don't know at a time when the committee's of jurisdiction have been so involved in creating a budget. We appreciated that greatly and that was many of the committees. The committees that deal with public safety, there are three, worked diligently also. They didn't always reach, as many other committees did not always reach, what they wished to have happen. This has been an issue that has been very difficult for them. It has been very difficult for us, but I remind you, as was reminded by the previous speaker, that we have voted on this bill before, unanimously from the committee and we are voting on a unanimous committee report again.

We have agreed to the way that liquor enforcement will be done as presented in the budget and this budget is before you in a unanimous report. Anything we were given to change this would have required fees from 10 to 14 percent. That was not acceptable and other areas were not acceptable. I hope you will join me in the indefinite Postponement so we can on to pass the budget.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Bangor, Representative Blanchette.

Representative BLANCHETTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is probably going to be the hardest thing that I have ever done in my political career. Having served on two of the committee's of jurisdiction that reviewed this whole process, having been involved with what has gone on, I don't believe there was anybody, including the good Representative from Kossuth Township, Representative Bunker, that fought any harder to retain liquor enforcement in the State of Maine than I did. I have talked one on one to the Chief Executive about this. This is a political body. Political decisions are made every day that we are not comfortable with, but there is a reason.

I apologize profusely to this body that this airing of dirty linen of the Chief Law Enforcement Agency that we have in the State of Maine, what I lovingly refer to as the cream of the crop, had to come before this body.

I don't believe it was necessary. I don't believe it is going to serve any good purpose, but to bring them down to a level that I don't believe wholeheartedly that they ever deserved. There are internal investigations that go on within the State Police Department that we don't know about and, quite frankly, is none of our business. That is why they are internal investigations. I have been told by the Chief Executive's Office that there is an investigation going on to some of these alleged charges. I am telling you they are alleged charges.

The Chief Executive has given permission for this investigation to go forth. Let's let them do their job as they are charged to do without a Legislature of a 180 odd individuals saying, let's get the State Police. They are not our enemies. There is nobody in that bureau that is our enemy. They are there to serve us and they will, at any given time, put their life on the line to save ours or any citizen in this state. I am very, very embarrassed at this dirty linen that should have remained in the basket until it could go to the washer and be cleaned. The bill that is before you that I am going to encourage you wholeheartedly to Indefinitely Postpone this amendment has a 14 percent increase that will not fly. We knew it wouldn't fly. This is an executive decision.

We can pass it and the other body can pass it and it will go to the Chief Executive on the second floor and he has line-item veto power. I would like this airing of dirty linen to stop in this House. It is not necessary that it go any further. It is not necessary that we degrade the thousands of people that are involved with the State Police in the State of Maine. Every time you throw a mud ball at any State Trooper, you are also throwing it at their family. They don't deserve this. They need to be proud and they are proud of the men and women that serve this state to the best of their ability, always have and always will.

This decision was made to eliminate, as we have known for many years, the Bureau of Liquor Enforcement. So be it. It is done. It is an executive decision. Change happens. We knew when we elected John Alias Baldacci as the Chief Executive of the State of Maine that the cuts were going to come and the cuts were going to be painful. This has to happen because the State of Maine government has continued to grow and mushroom to the point where the taxpayers that own the house on the street where you live can't afford to live there anymore, because their property taxes are running them out of town. The Chief Executive made a decision that we will curtail and we will condense and we will consolidate state government, not only to run better, but to run more efficiently. We are not asking people to work harder, we are asking them to work smarter. This is one of the many steps that the Chief Executive and his administration will be taking. I fully expect this Legislature and the next Legislature that comes after us to fully support this. The time for change is here. It is now. If we don't do it, who will? I am asking you please to vote to Indefinitely Postpone this amendment that is before you and all of its accompanying papers and let's bring some dignity back to this body that I feel has been very, very tainted by the previous testimony. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Topsham, Representative Lessard.

Representative LESSARD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am very, very concerned and upset that this has come to this. If you had sat on the Criminal Justice Committee, I think, to some extent you would feel the same. You ask any members of that committee how they feel. Dealing with

the Maine State Police, those are my idols. I come from the State Police for 24 years and respect them and respect the job that they have to do for our citizens. There is no question about it. There are times when things come up that have to be addressed. They have been addressed and we will leave it at that. I know the working intricacies of departments, especially that department. I hope they will be addressed.

Going back to the amendment and what is on the floor now, I don't intend to change anybody's mind. You know what, enforcement is the key here that we are talking about. We are talking about people who will be involved in the liquor business. There is a lot of money in the liquor business. The liquor industry takes pride in policing themselves with a little nudge here. They do a good job and they want that to continue. They know it is place. They know what to expect and they do it. There is some enforcement, local and State Police highly enforce the liquor laws unless they are called to a brawl or something of that nature and fines are put out and that is where the money has come in that you can see what the revenues have been.

I can tell you that we eliminate that, what we know as liquor enforcement. We are going to be blindsided in the future because the stability of that bureau, as we know it, is gone. I worked on the state issue side of these problems and also the municipal side, 18 years as chief in Topsham. I can tell you that what is going on now with the chiefs that have talked to me, what is happening in Kittery and across the border, what is coming into Maine, is not being taxed correctly, if you will. We will experience more of that in the future.

Getting back to the committee work, I was appalled and really, really upset with the information that we needed to work with, how we could compromise and work these things out. As for the revenues and the financing of certain programs that were within the Public Safety Division, that was not forthcoming. I left it up to chair, as well as all the committees. I am of the old school. You have a leader. You follow the leader and you hope they do well. You support that leader. Perhaps I would have used different tactics, different approaches, different people. I blame myself for that for not getting involved more so. I hope to keep some semblance of that enforcement we need out there. I am very disappointed and very discouraged. I will vote for this amendment. Hopefully it is not turned down. We need something in place. We need something to build on it in the future, also. Even with this amendment it is watered down to some extent. I can tell you the local police and your State Police that I have talked to are very disappointed.

I guess this is all I have to say in regards to that. I have listened to many speakers on the floor and I respect them. We have people that deal with chemistry and I respect Representative Berry when he speaks, the education people when they speak. They have the knowledge and the background. I hope somebody listens to me because I have kids and grandkids also. We need to address our adults in this liquor business as forcefully as we can through education enforcement so that those kids out there find a way to get the liquor. Sometimes you can't stop them, but you can educate and stop our grownups that are involved in this. That is what I am getting at. With all that said, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

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

Representative **SYKES**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. This issue has been particularly difficult for me. It has been difficult because I have had to weigh a tax fee increase, which I oppose, against the need and the importance of the Bureau of Liquor Enforcement. I have come to the conclusion that there is a huge need for Liquor Enforcement. I have come to

that conclusion because of my professional experience for the past 36 or 37 years. I spent two years as the assistant principal at Cape Elizabeth High School and 12 years as principal at Lake Region High School in Bridgton and 15 years as the high school principal at Lewiston High School. In each of these assignments on a regular basis, the information came to me about the gravel pit Saturday night, the parent-enabled supported and even purchased drinking party on the weekend, where the young people could buy their beer for the weekend. We are not talking about a six-pack party. We are talking about hundreds of kids on a regular basis, keg parties. If your high school principal tells you there is not a drinking problem in your community, they have their blinders on. It is a huge problem. It is an every weekend problem.

When I got that information I first started to call the local police department and I got an okay response. What I got was a situation where they couldn't spend a lot of time dealing with the information that I gave them. They would get called away to a 10-55, a traffic accident, domestic abuse or some other violation that they got called away from. I then turned and called the Liquor Enforcement Bureau. I got what I would call a dedicated response, a very good response. I can give you a specific example. I remember finding out about a party at a person's house, sponsored by the parents. There were 200 kids to be involved. They were going to make it safe. They were going to take the keys away. They were going to make the kids stay there all night. I passed that on to the Liquor Bureau. They visited that house and those parents and explained to them what was going to happen if they did that. They then stationed two officers outside that house and checked every car that went in and out of that house. I don't think they ever found out who turned them in. The next week there was quite a fury in the community amongst the parents that I heard. They were never going to do something like that. It was a huge deterrent.

I am absolutely convinced that to eliminate the Bureau of Liquor Enforcement, the local police, as Representative Lessard has stated, and the State Police are just not going to be able to give that dedicated response.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I cannot let this elimination of the Bureau of Liquor Enforcement go by without expressing my sincere concern and my experiences as a professional educator, professional administrator over the past 30 years, approximately, that if you do this, this possibly will have some life or death consequences for our children. Quite frankly, the amendment doesn't go far enough. It gives us a limited response. It is a much reduced Bureau of Liquor Enforcement, but at least it is something. I am really concerned about the safety of our children with the elimination of the Bureau of Liquor Enforcement. I hope you are. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Bucksport, Representative Rosen.

Representative **ROSEN**: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would ask that you support the motion that is before us, the motion to Indefinitely Postpone this amendment. I would ask you to do so for two reasons. The budget that is before you and the Part I budget that we have passed, both include several proposals that were advanced by the administration in consideration of the budget constraints that we faced. There were some creative proposals in a variety of different departments that involved consolidations, involved reorganizations and that do involve disruption of personnel, a couple come to mind. One, in this Part II budget are changes around the accounts and control mechanism in state government. It is very much needed, supported by the committee, even though it does involve some position elimination and some transfers of

other positions. We adopted the proposal in the Part I budget to merge the bureaus of Behavioral and Developmental Services and DHS. That certainly will result in a major reorganization that undoubtedly will have impact on personnel services and on positions currently in state government. The point is that we were willing to accept a proposal from this administration, this being one of them, to address the delivery of service within constrained budgets.

The Executive presented to the committee and the Commissioner of Public Safety provided us with a compelling argument of their rationale for proposing this and their conviction that it will, in fact, be successful. I think we owe them the opportunity to allow this plan to go forward.

The second reason is the funding mechanism that appears in this amendment. This amendment calls for a 14 percent increase in license fees. If you look at the current level of liquor license fees and the money that is generated, licensees already pay through current license levels, twice the amount of money necessary to fund the Liquor Enforcement Bureau. We are now proposing in this amendment another 14 percent increase on top of what they currently pay. I think that is unfair. I think it is too great a burden to expect the licensees to carry.

For those two reasons, I ask you to support the motion to Indefinitely Postpone this amendment.

Representative COLWELL of Gardiner **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **INDEFINITELY POSTPONE House Amendment "A" (H-562) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-560)**.

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 Indefinite Postponement of House Amendment "A" (H-562) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-560). All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 226

YEA - Austin, Barstow, Bennett, Berry, Bierman, Blanchette, Bliss, Bowen, Bowles, Brannigan, Brown R, Browne W, Bruno, Bull, Campbell, Canavan, Carr, Churchill E, Clough, Collins, Cowger, Craven, Cressey, Cummings, Curley, Daigle, Dudley, Dugay, Dunlap, Duplessie, Duprey B, Earle, Finch, Fischer, Fletcher, Gagne-Friel, Gerzofsky, Glynn, Honey, Jennings, Jodrey, Joy, Kaelin, Kane, Ketterer, Koffman, Laverriere-Boucher, Ledwin, Lemoine, Lerman, Lewin, Lundeen, Mailhot, Makas, Marraché, McCormick, McGlocklin, McGowan, McKenney, McLaughlin, Millett, Mills J, Mills S, Moody, Moore, Murphy, Muse, Norbert, Norton, Nutting, O'Brien J, O'Brien L, O'Neil, Peavey-Haskell, Perry A, Perry J, Pineau, Pingree, Piotti, Richardson E, Richardson J, Rogers, Rosen, Saviello, Smith W, Snowe-Mello, Stone, Suslovic, Tardy, Thomas, Thompson, Tobin D, Trahan, Vaughan, Woodbury, Wotton, Young, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Andrews, Annis, Ash, Berube, Breault, Bryant-Deschenes, Bunker, Churchill J, Crosthwaite, Davis, Duprey G, Eder, Goodwin, Grose, Hatch, Heidrich, Hotham, Hutton, Jackson, Jacobsen, Lessard, Maietta, Marley, McKee, McNeil, Paradis, Patrick, Pellon, Percy, Rector, Richardson M, Rines, Sampson, Sherman, Shields, Simpson, Smith N, Sukeforth, Sullivan, Sykes, Tobin J, Treadwell, Twomey, Walcott, Watson, Wheeler.

ABSENT - Clark, Courtney, Faircloth, Greeley, Landry, Usher. Yes, 98; No, 47; Absent, 6; Excused, 0.

98 having voted in the affirmative and 47 voted in the negative, with 6 being absent, and accordingly **House Amendment "A" (H-562) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-560) was INDEFINITELY POSTPONED.**

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Bath, Representative Watson.

Representative **WATSON**: Mr. Speaker, May I pose a question through the Chair?

The SPEAKER: The Representative may pose his question.

Representative **WATSON**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. For anyone who might answer, please, perhaps a member of the committee can tell me, on Page 187, Part MM of this document, the Fund for a Healthy Maine is tapped for \$300,000. It is transferred to the general fund and on Page 247 of this document Part RR, the Fund for a Healthy Maine is again tapped for \$450,000, essentially for the purchase of adult vaccines. I would appreciate some explanation on how those funds are to be spent. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Representative from Bath, Representative Watson has posed a question through the Chair to anyone who may care to respond. The Chair recognizes the Representative from North Haven, Representative Pingree.

Representative **PINGREE**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I need to check on all the exact details, but the \$450,000 amount was an amount going for elderly flu vaccines, a regular expenditure of the Fund for a Healthy Maine was left out of the Part I budget by the Department of Health. The fund and a number of physicians came forward and asked us to put it back in so they can appropriate funds expenditures. The \$300,000 amount, I believe, has something to do with study measures. I need to check in on that, but I do know the Fund for Healthy Maine folks negotiated with the Governor's Office and did agree on that amount.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Augusta, Representative O'Brien.

Representative **O'BRIEN**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. If I am remembering correctly and I missed the page number that was mentioned, but what I think the \$300,000 for the Fund for Healthy Maine was the home visiting program, home visitations to new parents and new mothers. Again, that is an approved expenditure from the Fund for a Healthy Maine.

Subsequently, **Committee Amendment "A" (H-560) was ADOPTED.**

The Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-560)** and sent for concurrence.

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

The House recessed until the Sound of the Bell.

(After Recess)

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

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

**ENACTORS
Emergency Measure**