

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-Second Legislature
State of Maine

Volume III

Second Regular Session

April 7, 2006 - May 24, 2006

Appendix
House Legislative Sentiments
Index

Pages 1488-2248

The SPEAKER: The Representative will defer for a minute. The Chair recognizes the Representative from Somerville, Representative Miller.

Representative MILLER: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask, Mr. Speaker, if this is germane to the issue at hand.

On POINT OF ORDER, Representative MILLER of Somerville asked the Chair if the remarks of Representative GLYNN of South Portland were germane to the pending question.

The Chair advised Representative MILLER of Somerville that the remarks of Representative GLYNN of South Portland were germane to the pending question.

The SPEAKER: The answer is in the affirmative. It is the adoption of Committee Amendment "A" that we are debating. The Chair recognizes the Representative from South Portland, Representative Glynn.

Representative GLYNN: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Thank you to the good Representative. Again, why this ties back to 1845 is the funding. The funding. Listen to what Mercy Hospital is going through. Their cash flow can no longer withstand these payments owed for Medicare and as we begin to draw down our line of credit, with a matter of weeks, to meet our payroll and vendor obligations. It goes on and states, point by point, the millions of dollars owed to our hospital by the State. Now, we have the Dirigo product. Under 1845 we are going to pay these claims owed to the hospitals now for the Dirigo product that Anthem has been paying. We have no plan for reserves. No cash. What's going to happen to our medical providers? Do we want to go to Mercy Hospital, to Maine Med and to all of our rural hospitals and show up and the first question is, "Do you have MaineCare or do you have Dirigo, because if you do, we're owed so much money we can't afford to treat you. This happens in other states. In other states, these Federal programs, run by the states that don't pay their bills, they send you to the county hospital. They won't take you at your local hospital because their states don't pay their bills. Maine is following that bad track record. This is serious stuff. If we are going to go down the road of looking at going self-insured, how about that financial model? How about that list of reserves? How about a plan showing how many Dirigo enrollees are going to enroll? If you vote for this, do you believe 10,000 more people are going to enroll in a Dirigo? Do you believe 2,000 more people will enroll in Dirigo? I know, right now from being on the Committee, less than 10,000 people are enrolled in Dirigo and thousands of people have dropped Dirigo. So then, the question becomes, "What are you buying with LD 1845 and how is 1845 going to save Dirigo?" I need those questions answered before I can vote for it. I hope you join with us in voting against Committee Amendment "A" and moving on to some other solutions which we think really, very much, will improve Dirigo.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Adoption of Committee Amendment "A" (H-1012). All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 582

YEA - Adams, Ash, Babbidge, Barstow, Beaudette, Blanchard, Blanchette, Bliss, Brannigan, Brautigam, Bryant, Burns, Cain, Canavan, Clark, Craven, Cummings, Driscoll, Duchesne, Dudley, Dugay, Dunn, Duplessie, Eberle, Eder, Faircloth, Farrington, Finch, Fischer, Fisher, Gerzofsky, Goldman, Grose, Hanley S, Harlow, Hogan, Hutton, Jackson, Jennings, Koffman, Lerman, Lundeen, Makas, Marley, Marraché, Mazurek, Miller, Moody, Norton, O'Brien, Paradis, Patrick, Percy,

Perry, Pilon, Pineau, Pingree, Piotti, Rines, Sampson, Schatz, Simpson, Smith N, Smith W, Thompson, Tuttle, Twomey, Valentino, Walcott, Watson, Webster, Wheeler, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Annis, Austin, Berube, Bierman, Bishop, Bowen, Bowles, Brown R, Browne W, Bryant-Deschenes, Campbell, Carr, Cebra, Churchill, Clough, Collins, Cressey, Crosthwaite, Curley, Curtis, Daigle, Davis G, Davis K, Duprey, Edgecomb, Fitts, Fletcher, Flood, Glynn, Greeley, Hall, Hamper, Hanley B, Hotham, Jacobsen, Jodrey, Joy, Lansley, Lewin, Lindell, Marean, McCormick, McKane, McKenney, McLeod, Merrill, Millett, Mills, Moore G, Moulton, Muse, Nass, Nutting, Ott, Pinkham, Plummer, Rector, Richardson D, Richardson E, Richardson M, Richardson W, Robinson, Rosen, Saviello, Seavey, Sherman, Shields, Sykes, Tardy, Thomas, Trahan, Vaughan, Woodbury.

ABSENT - Crosby, Emery, Kaelin, McFadden, Stedman.

Yes, 73; No, 73; Absent, 5; Excused, 0.

73 having voted in the affirmative and 73 voted in the negative, with 5 being absent, and accordingly **Committee Amendment "A" (H-1012) was FAILED ADOPTION.**

The Bill was assigned for **SECOND READING** later in today's session.

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

BILLS IN THE SECOND READING
House

Bill "An Act To Increase Access to Health Insurance Products"

(H.P. 1285) (L.D. 1845)

Reported by the Committee on **Bills in the Second Reading**, read the second time, the House Paper was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED** and sent for concurrence.

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The following matter, in the consideration of which the House was engaged at the time of adjournment yesterday, had preference in the Orders of the Day and continued with such preference until disposed of as provided by House Rule 502.

An Act To Implement Task Force Recommendations Relating to Parity and Portability of Benefits for Law Enforcement Officers and Firefighters

(H.P. 706) (L.D. 1021)

(S. "G" S-660 to C. "B" H-1007)

TABLED - May 23, 2006 (Till Later Today) by Representative CUMMINGS of Portland.

PENDING - Motion of same Representative to **RECONSIDER** whereby the Bill **FAILED OF PASSAGE TO BE ENACTED.**

Representative HALL of Holden **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **RECONSIDER** whereby the Bill **FAILED PASSAGE TO BE ENACTED.**

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Holden, Representative Hall.

Representative HALL: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I will try to keep my remarks here brief. It strikes me, in response to the Speaker's

remarks earlier, that a lot of these items are being debated over and over and over and over and over again. I would also like to make the point that the reason they're being debated over and over and over again is we keep having these reconsideration motions. Whenever a vote seems to go the wrong way, we have a motion to reconsider. I ask you, all of you who felt that this bill did not deserve passage when you voted before, please simply vote against the reconsideration motion. Thank you.

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

Representative CUMMINGS: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am sincere when I say I have no desire to prolong this legislative session. I did ask for reconsideration for several reasons. One is that a number of people in this body had been talking about various amendments to this bill, on both sides of the aisle. There was a desire to try to do something to help those in our firefighter capacity and police capacity. There was a sincere desire among all of us in this body. A number of discussions were going on. We did not, and I did not, feel that those discussions were complete. Members, even of the other party, had talked about amendments that were of interest to us. Therefore, we felt that this body was not in a position to let go of that bill last night. Your position on the policy issue, I respect that, but I ask, out of respect for the body and for those who are trying to do the right thing, to please support the reconsideration motion. Let us get into the details of what it means policy wise and let's move forward. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Reconsider whereby the Bill Failed Passage to be Enacted. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 583

YEA - Adams, Ash, Babbidge, Barstow, Beaudette, Blanchard, Blanchette, Bliss, Brannigan, Brautigam, Brown R, Bryant, Burns, Cain, Campbell, Canavan, Clark, Craven, Cummings, Curley, Daigle, Davis G, Davis K, Driscoll, Duchesne, Dudley, Dugay, Dunn, Duplessie, Eberle, Eder, Faircloth, Farrington, Finch, Fischer, Fisher, Fletcher, Gerzofsky, Glynn, Goldman, Greeley, Hanley S, Harlow, Hogan, Hutton, Jackson, Jennings, Koffman, Lerman, Lundeen, Makas, Marraché, Mazurek, McCormick, Miller, Moody, Moore G, Norton, O'Brien, Paradis, Patrick, Percy, Pilon, Pineau, Pingree, Piotti, Richardson D, Richardson E, Rines, Robinson, Schatz, Simpson, Smith N, Thompson, Tuttle, Valentino, Walcott, Watson, Webster, Wheeler, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Annis, Austin, Berube, Bierman, Bishop, Bowen, Bowles, Browne W, Bryant-Deschenes, Carr, Cebra, Churchill, Clough, Collins, Cressey, Crosthwaite, Curtis, Duprey, Edgcomb, Fitts, Flood, Grose, Hall, Hamper, Hanley B, Hotham, Jacobsen, Jodrey, Joy, Lansley, Lewin, Lindell, Marean, McKane, McKenney, McLeod, Merrill, Millett, Moulton, Muse, Nass, Nutting, Ott, Pinkham, Plummer, Rector, Richardson M, Richardson W, Rosen, Sampson, Saviello, Seavey, Sherman, Shields, Smith W, Sykes, Tardy, Thomas, Trahan, Twomey, Vaughan, Woodbury.

ABSENT - Crosby, Emery, Kaelin, Marley, McFadden, Mills, Perry, Stedman.

Yes, 81; No, 62; Absent, 8; Excused, 0.

81 having voted in the affirmative and 62 voted in the negative, with 8 being absent, and accordingly the House **RECONSIDERED** its action whereby the Bill **FAILED PASSAGE TO BE ENACTED**.

Representative BOWLES of Sanford **REQUESTED** a roll call on **PASSAGE TO BE ENACTED**.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Waterford, Representative Millett.

Representative MILLETT: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First, I would like to comment as to my good feelings about the healthy debate that we had on this bill yesterday. I felt that the points made on both sides of the issue were both heartfelt, constructive and generally reflect the difficulty with this very significant piece of legislation. It was said during the course of the debate that it is not about money. Things were said both positively about the group of people in the hall and the important public service function they play. Some comments about what comes later and whether or not this a complete package. I would like to say the issue here, for me, falls back to three basic principles that I try to take as I look at issues of major consequence that are new to this legislative process. The first being, I try to analyze whether or not there is a legitimate role for State Government, not only in the terms of affordability or the detail of the particular issue, whether it be language or a program, but whether it denies freedoms that people have the right to expect and/or whether it imposes consistent expectations on the affected population that we're sent here to represent. That consistency leads me to try a test of fairness. What we do today, we ought to be prepared to do tomorrow, next year and down the road and look at our actions over the long-term lens of forward thinking as well as big picture consideration. Finally, I try to look at, and this uniqueness to my role in the Appropriations and Financial Affairs Committee, to try to see the financial consequences, large and small, short-term and long-term and particularly long-term. No one can deny that the importance of having third-party assistance to purchase and support health insurance for all is a critical factor in every family and every citizen's thinking about their mortality, their long-term health and their short-term needs for preventive health. That's clearly part of the debate that we had last evening and again this morning on LD 1845, and it will occur again on any and all health insurance products that come before us. I thought I'd try to compare, for my own thinking, and I won't try to bore you with this logic that I am driven by, but, we have three major health insurance programs currently. There are many more pending. We have, certainly, a MaineCare program in which we have identified and committed to, appropriately so, I might add, supporting the low-income population through the Federally assisted programs of both MaineCare and Medicare. We control our involvement in those programs by three basic rules. We determine eligibility, we determine the rates of care and how much we pay for care and we determine service utilization. We also impose cost of sharing in the form of co-pays and sometimes deductibles. But, we are committed to that population and we have a way, in our Statutes and our State plan with the Federal agency and in our rules that we authorize DHHS to adopt, to actually see that that program is on a pay as you go basis funded. If not, we fund it as we deal with our biannual budgets. We clearly have a program for State employees and it has a health insurance component that follows retirement that many of us think is generous to the point of needing to be looked at as we look down the road from the point of view of whether we can continue to support single subscriber healthcare for retirees for the long-term future. Then we have the program for teachers. I've struggled and tried to do something this session, and in the past, for teachers. They are unlike State employees, but they are, certainly, somewhat like State employees in that education is a State function, and in many cases, we treat them like State employees, witness only the State Retirement System and the

way in which we have recently been raising our level of participation. I recall when there was no cost sharing on teacher health insurance for retired teachers. It's now up to 45%. I believe the 45% factor is what leads to the choice of the "parity" in the title of the bill before us. Of course we have other folks who we have a concern for at the local government level, at the county government level, at the non-profit provider level and on and on and on. We have, obviously concerns about the big picture on health insurance in terms of access affordability and cost sharing and the ability to fund those programs going forward. Now, in any good insurance program, and I listened to the debate last night and this morning on 1845 and I learned a lot, but I'm still not anywhere near expert on what health insurance products ought to contain. It seems to me they ought to start with a clear and direct relationship between the payer and the insured population. There ought to be a clear distinction and connection between the role of the paying party and the party of coverage, namely the affected employee group. I'm struggling to find a connection here other than the fact that we are representing State Government, we appreciate the work that our first responders do and clearly we want to do what we can to address at least the portability issue and many of us would like to address the issue of a good affordable product. But we would become the payer and we would become the payer with, ostensible, the big pockets, the deep pockets which we are severely challenged as having at the moment and for the long-term future that I am seeing. Secondly, there ought to be employer/employee participation both in the paying in and the reserving for the product. There ought to be a shared voice over the elements of the product, the content of the insurance package and the way in which its cost is controlled. Finally, and most importantly, it ought to be fully paid for and properly reserved. It is these last few elements of my own lay interpretation of what an insurance product ought to contain that trouble me greatly. We have absolutely no clarity in terms of the ability to control the product and the ability to see it fully funded and properly reserved. We have before us a fiscal note which is nebulous, at best, and lacking detail as to reserving in any capacity and in terms of the future cost. Well, let's apply the consistency test one more time. If we do it for this group of people, and we all love and respect them, where do we stop. We've seen the communications, we've seen them in distributed fashion earlier when we discussed this in late April, it said, for the record in writing that this is the first step to bring on board dispatchers and EMS personnel, that the Chief Executive has promised that that would be part of the next budget, that if you'd just be patient we'll add more, a little bit at a time, and I'm quoting communications that have been shared with all of you. I won't reread what I said in late April, but GASB 45, which is the Government Accounting Standards Board, directs all entities of government to identify their liability for post-employment benefits and how much it will cost to pay down that number each year. It requires that we make some effort to reserve that, and we haven't even talked about that today. We haven't talked about it yesterday and we haven't talked about it in the recent past. We know from a statement that was read into the record in late April that the original report would have required, at 45%, the reserving of approximately \$100 million. No mention here because this product, this amendment, came through a process that didn't have committee vetting and therefore, consequently, not a lot of time to do an actuarial study. I'm left with a question. Where are we headed? Where are we headed with this issue of both parity and portability knowing that portability is, to me, and I think a lot of people have said, an ideal goal? State Government can, and should, be thinking about how to assure that critical local employees, town employees and

perhaps other groups ought to have portability so they never have to go, even for a short time, without insurance coverage. But, where is the parity and where is the complete picture? It looks to me like we're headed down a road with no view of the destination or the trials and tribulations that lie ahead of us. I would love to be able to vote for something if I knew it would meet two basic tests. Is it properly the role of State Government to do this? Is it, at this point, properly funded and fully reserved? I can't make that conclusion on either count. I cannot see any way, in my mind, that I can go back home and say, "I made a decision that for the long haul was the right thing to do given the information that's now before me." I ask you all to seriously think about the slippery slope which we are about to tread upon.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Westbrook, Representative Duplessie.

Representative DUPLESSIE: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As the good Majority Leader from Portland said, I also do not want to belabor this issue. I do want to make a couple clarifying points and read something into the Record of the intent of this legislation. Before I do that, I want to back up a little bit. Previously, when this was debated a month ago, there were various concerns that were raised. Many of those concerns have been taken care of, seriously addressed in the current legislation that is before us. Senate Amendment "G" that is before us addressed some of those concerns having to do with a minimum age on participation for retirees. A pay-in by current retirees so they just would not start into the system, that has been addressed very clearly, that they will have to pay in five years of a subsidy, and a higher subsidy, than what the actives will be paying in. The percentage of the monthly final compensation payment for current retirees ranges from 2% for those who are at least 50 years old to 1.5% for retirees who are at least 60 years old. Pay-in towards the subsidy and the trust has been addressed. It also has been clear, and it has not been clear to some people, so I want to read this into the Record. The intent of this is someone cannot try to game the system, be an active employee today and decide not to get into the plan. After this is effective, they have to enroll within 60 days, the active employees. They cannot wait until they have 17, 20 or 21 years of employment and then decide to enroll for the last five years to be eligible. That option is not there. There was some concern that that's the way the language read in the Senate Amendment. When you read Committee Amendment "B" with Senate Amendment "G" it is clear. That is not the intent, so they cannot do that. That has been addressed. There's another concern as far as one minor piece in Senate Amendment "G" having to do with an exemption from the tax cap language we passed in LD 1. That piece will be addressed before we leave the end of this session today with other language. I've already been working with legal to address that. That piece will be deleted, having to exempt this from the tax cap language. So, that issue will be addressed as soon as we get this bill enacted and down to the other body, then that bill will be going through a legal process that we will have today. I please ask you to support this effort. We worked very hard to try to address the concerns that have been raised. I realize all of them have not been raised, but I just want to give you one quick one as far as the long-term financial cost. Yes, we hear something about this so-called "Wall Street GASB 45 Reserves." It talks about reserves out 30 years. I would like to ask many in this chamber, in your own lives, if you applied this type of standard? How many have three to six months worth of liquid assets right now, if you had to pay all of your bills and your liabilities that you have? That's what that type of standard is doing. How many people have that right available today? Many of us have liabilities in our daily lives with our

families. That's what that type of standard is trying to do. Thank you and I ask for your support.

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

Representative **BLANCHETTE**: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I do promise to be brief, but I'm going to talk fast, so listen fast. This bill, I'm going to plead with you for enactment on this bill for any number reasons. You know I have fought long and hard for this, but I also want to walk back through a page in history that mankind will never forget, especially if you're a resident and a US citizen. On September 11th they took down the twin towers in New York City. We had, as American citizens, 343 firefighters report to duty to fight this terror against America on American soil. Unasked for terrorism and they never went home. This scares you. I live in the City of Bangor and we routinely, with the Guard up there, the fire department, the police and the Sheriff's department perform drills, mock disaster drills so that we're ready in the event of this uncalled for disaster and horror that nobody ever wants to live through. But, when you chose to be a firefighter or you choose to be a police officer, you will answer the call if it comes. It doesn't matter whether your knees are going to give out when you have to jump down off that truck, grab that hose that has 300 pounds of pressure on it, haul it out and try to put out a burning fire that is going to resist the water that you're pumping onto it. This is what they do day in and day out. They put their lives on the line so you have the privilege and the honor to sit in the Maine State House of Representatives. All they are asking is a chance to live a life with some sort of security that when they get to the age of 50, as this amendment proposes, that they can survive and have health insurance. Now, in a perfect world under perfect conditions with more money than Bill Gates has in his checking account, I think we should move, as a country, towards universal healthcare. But, that isn't going to happen today and it won't happen tomorrow and it probably won't happen in my lifetime because I'm getting old and standing here, I'm getting older by the minute. But, it needs to start somewhere. We've covered our State employees. Our teachers have 45% of their retirement insurance paid now. We do a lot. As Legislators, count your blessings and pat yourself on the back because you've got the best coverage there is going because this is hazardous duty. It really truly is. I put my life on the line every day I come into this building and I know it. I'm going to ask you to support this enactment. They're going to feed into the fund. This isn't a, "Give-me, give-me, give-me." This is, "I'm going to pay as we go along." I can't say the same for some of the other things that we fund. They don't pay. You don't have a dime, not one dime deducted from your paycheck to cover you under BlueCross BlueShield when you stick your hand up and you're sworn in as a Legislator. Think about it. Vote your conscience, vote your head and remember, they will save your live even if you vote against them.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Wells, Representative Collins.

Representative **COLLINS**: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I question sometimes what this bill is doing here, for these employees, these firefighters and law enforcement officers, for the most part are municipal employees. If they want a benefit such as this they should negotiate, part of the collective bargaining process, with their municipalities. The good Speaker, Speaker Richardson, in his other life, he does that kind of work. He negotiates union contracts for benefits for police officers. That's where this question belongs. Now, when the time comes, if this bill does pass, somebody is going to pay for it. We'll pay for it. The

taxpayers of Maine will pay for it, whether it's at the municipal level or State level. We'll pay for it. That kind of benefit should be negotiated at the municipal level. That's where it belongs. They are municipal employees, not State employees. It always bothered me, ever since this whole issue came up, why is it here? It belongs back home. Home rule dictates at home. That's where this belongs. Let them decide. Let them negotiate. Sit down with their municipal employees and let them decide. It doesn't belong here Ladies and Gentlemen. It belongs back home. I can't understand how we can sit here and start dictating municipal employees, what benefits they're going to get. That starts back in your hometown and your city. That where that belongs. That's where that discussion belongs. It's part of the collective bargaining process. When you want to get an increased benefit, you need to talk with your union stewards, you get together and you hammer it out. This is what our objectives are this year. This is what we want, to increase our benefits. We're going to negotiate for it through the collective bargaining process and we're going to demand we get it. You don't take the other route, come back around and go, "Well, we're going to try and convince the Legislature to dictate policy to our towns to pay for it." It comes down to a question of paying for it. We don't really know where the money's going to come from. It was said, a month or so ago, the last time we were here, "Well, when the time comes we'll find the money." That's not a good answer for me. I need some kind of mechanism that explains it to me, we're going to collect this money through whatever means and it's going to pay for that benefit package. That hasn't been demonstrated to me. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Passage to be Enacted. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 584

YEA - Adams, Ash, Babbidge, Barstow, Blanchard, Blanchette, Bliss, Brannigan, Brautigam, Brown R, Bryant, Burns, Cain, Campbell, Canavan, Clark, Craven, Crosby, Cummings, Curley, Davis G, Davis K, Driscoll, Duchesne, Dudley, Dugay, Dunn, Duplessie, Eberle, Eder, Faircloth, Farrington, Finch, Fisher, Fletcher, Gerzofsky, Glynn, Greeley, Hanley S, Harlow, Hutton, Jackson, Jennings, Lerman, Lundeen, Makas, Marraché, Mazurek, McCormick, Miller, Moore G, Norton, O'Brien, Paradis, Percy, Pilon, Pineau, Pingree, Piotti, Richardson E, Rines, Robinson, Schatz, Simpson, Smith N, Tuttle, Valentino, Walcott, Watson, Webster, Wheeler, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Annis, Austin, Beaudette, Berube, Bierman, Bishop, Bowen, Bowles, Browne W, Bryant-Deschenes, Carr, Cebra, Churchill, Clough, Collins, Cressey, Crosthwaite, Curtis, Daigle, Duprey, Edgecomb, Fitts, Flood, Goldman, Grose, Hall, Hamper, Hanley B, Hogan, Hotham, Jacobsen, Jodrey, Joy, Koffman, Lansley, Lewin, Lindell, Marean, McKane, McKenney, McLeod, Merrill, Millett, Mills, Moulton, Muse, Nass, Nutting, Ott, Patrick, Pinkham, Plummer, Rector, Richardson D, Richardson M, Richardson W, Rosen, Sampson, Saviello, Seavey, Sherman, Shields, Smith W, Sykes, Tardy, Thomas, Thompson, Trahan, Twomey, Vaughan, Woodbury.

ABSENT - Emery, Fischer, Kaelin, Marley, McFadden, Moody, Perry, Stedman.

Yes, 72; No, 71; Absent, 8; Excused, 0.

72 having voted in the affirmative and 71 voted in the negative, with 8 being absent, and accordingly the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.