

# MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

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



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

**LEGISLATIVE RECORD**

OF THE

**One Hundred And Sixteenth Legislature**

OF THE

**State Of Maine**

**VOLUME V**

**SECOND REGULAR SESSION**

**House of Representatives**  
January 5, 1994 to April 14, 1994

asked me to be a cosponsor on this bill several weeks ago and I gladly cosigned. I know it is a Minority Report, I understand the direction it is going but I want to explain why. Last year, eighth grade, Auburn Middle School, a kid came to school with a gun. We all got to read about it in the paper because I guess they didn't have time to call 300 families and say you are going to find out there was a kid at school with a gun this year. I sent my kid to school, like everybody else does and you don't think a lot about what might happen at school. There is some trouble and there are some physical altercations and things like that that go on at school but a gun changed everything. It just changed your sense that school was a safe place to send you kid.

Now, I want to address the other aspect of it because I think Representative Aliberti came up with a very reasonable alternative. The first reason it is reasonable is because it has worked well in tax policy and child support collections. The truth of the matter is we have gotten in a lot of money since we have taken away license to practice whatever your profession is and we have gotten in a lot of money since you have taken in your drivers license.

Now, we can't take away your drivers license if you are not paying child support and you don't have a drivers license. We can't take away your license to practice medicine if you are not paying income tax and you don't have a license to practice medicine. But, if you do — so, we are already discriminating in that case. We do pretty well in collections.

The one thing I know teen-agers really care about is getting a license to drive. I wish they didn't, I wish I didn't have to think about my kid behind a wheel of a car until they were 43, a reasonable age. The truth is what they really do care about is getting the freedom of wheels. They don't know what a Class E crime is and it never registers in their mind what so ever what the crime is or what it will mean if because I need a little attention I brought a gun to school on Tuesday morning. In my house when somebody needs a little attention the kid says, "Mom, I need a little attention, take the phone off the hook." But, some kid at my daughters school last year decided a way to convey the need for a little attention was to bring a gun to school. Nothing happened to anybody, but something could have and every parent now thinks about what goes on in the school.

So, all I am going to suggest to you is that I think Representative Aliberti has come up with something reasonable. I know it is a Minority Report, I know the direction it is probably heading in but I will tell you something, kids think about drivers licenses and maybe they will decide that to get attention they ought to swallow a gold fish.

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

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

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is the motion of Representative Daggett of Augusta that the House accept the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report. Those in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 258

YEA - Anderson, Bailey, H.; Bailey, R.; Barth, Bennett, Bowers, Brennan, Campbell, Carleton, Caron, Carr, Carroll, Cashman, Chase, Clark, Cloutier, Clukey, Constantine, Daggett, Dexter, Donnelly, Driscoll, Erwin, Faircloth, Farnum, Farren, Fitzpatrick, Gean, Gould, R. A.; Gray, Greenlaw, Hatch, Heesch, Heino, Hichborn, Hogle, Holt, Hussey, Jacques, Johnson, Kerr, Ketterer, Kilkelly, Kneeland, Kontos, Larrivee, Lemke, Lemont, Libby, James, Lindahl, Lipman, Lord, MacBride, Marsh, Marshall, Martin, J.; Michael, Michaud, Mitchell, E.; Mitchell, J.; Morrison, Nadeau, Nickerson, Norton, O'Gara, Paradis, P.; Pendleton, Pineau, Plowman, Poulin, Reed, G.; Robichaud, Rowe, Ruhlin, Saint Onge, Saxl, Spear, Stevens, A.; Stevens, K.; Strout, Sullivan, Swazey, Tardy, Taylor, Townsend, E.; Townsend, G.; Tracy, Vigue, Walker, Wentworth, Young, Zirkilton.

NAY - Adams, Ahearne, Aikman, Aliberti, Ault, Bruno, Cameron, Cathcart, Chonko, Coffman, Coles, Cote, Cross, Dipietro, Dore, Dutremble, L.; Foss, Gamache, Hale, Jalbert, Joseph, Joy, Libby Jack, Look, Murphy, Nash, Oliver, Pendexter, Pfeiffer, Plourde, Pouliot, Rand, Richardson, Ricker, Rydell, Simonds, Simoneau, Skoglund, Small, Thompson, Townsend, L.; True, Tufts, Whitcomb, Winn.

ABSENT - Beam, Birney, Clement, Farnsworth, Hillock, Kutasi, Martin, H.; Melendy, Ott, Pinette, Reed, W.; Rotondi, Treat, The Speaker.

Yes, 92; No, 45; Absent, 14; Paired, 0; Excused, 0.  
92 having voted in the affirmative and 45 in the negative, with 14 being absent, the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs reporting "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-881) on Bill "An Act to Promote Integrity in the Citizens Petition Process" (H.P. 1417) (L.D. 1931)

Signed:

Senators: HANDY of Androscoggin  
CAREY of Kennebec

Representatives: DAGGETT of Augusta  
LEMKE of Westbrook  
BOWERS of Washington  
GAMACHE of Lewiston  
STEVENS of Sabattus  
NASH of Camden

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "B" (H-882) on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator: HALL of Piscataquis

Representatives: BENNETT of Norway  
ROBICHAUD of Caribou

TRUE of Fryeburg

Reports were read.

Representative DAGGETT of Augusta moved that the House accept the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report.

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

Representative BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I urge you to reject the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report and to take a close look at the Minority "Ought to Pass" Report which I think deals in a constitutional and more appropriate and functional way with the problem that the bill seeks to address.

There has been a lot made recently of a petition drive in this state that was recently conducted where the people organizing the petition drive paid their folks that were out on the street soliciting signatures, they actually paid them per signature. Apparently some people don't like that process.

It became clear in the Committee discussion on this bill, however, that there are serious constitutional questions with prohibiting that method of paying people to get signatures.

What the Minority Report, the Minority "Ought to Pass" Report does, the alternative to the pending motion is that it would require disclosure of the method of payment of petition signature gathers and thereby stepping around the constitutional question allowing the citizens themselves, the voters, to determine what they like and don't like.

It also requires in that disclosure what the rate of pay per signature would be so that people will know that if they sign it the guy that is collecting their signature may be getting \$5 or 50 cents or 2 cents or whatever it may be. It seems a lot more logical to me and to the other signers of the Minority Report to pursue it as a disclosure issue rather than outright prohibition.

The other interesting thing that came up in the Committee work session was that it is in fact not illegal for a person to pay another person to sign their petition. In other words, if I were collecting signatures for a petition I could pay actually the person who signed it, which is very close in my opinion to paying somebody for their vote. But, this bill doesn't seek to address that problem which seems to me to be a heck of a lot more significant than paying somebody for the labor involved in collecting signatures.

The Minority Report, that alternative, addresses that problem while addressing the first issue with a disclosure requirement. I think it is a good bill. I think it addresses the problem much more effectively than the broad-handed approach in the Majority Report.

I encourage you to vote against the pending motion and take a hard look at the Minority Report because I think it is a much better solution to the problem that was brought before the Legal Affairs Committee and debated extensively.

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

Representative KILKELLY: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I chose to present this particular piece of legislation because I read in the newspaper about a recent citizen petition process in which people were paid up to \$1.40 for each signature

that they gathered. I felt that was wrong. When I was circulating a sign-on sheet for this bill 70+ of you agreed with me that it was wrong. What amazed me was that there was almost no discussion. As soon as I brought up the topic people said, "Yes, where do I sign?" I was pleased about that.

I would urge all of you to accept the current report.

There are other problems in the citizen initiated process. I believe that the Legal Affairs Committee should come back next year with more time in order to have a public hearing on other issues around the citizen initiated process. There was a public hearing on this issue, that's the issue that is passed and included in the Majority Report and I hope it stays that way.

The issue of constitutionality has been brought up. It was brought up in the hearing and it has been brought up in other discussions. I would like to address that. The constitutionality of a provision in Colorado was challenged and the provision was struck down. That provision said there can be no method of payment for a person circulating a petition for a citizen initiated referendum. The Supreme Court felt that that was an infringement on freedom of speech particularly political free speech and they struck it down. They said it is very difficult to get a ballot question on and to limit the circulation to volunteers is a problem. So, that was struck down.

This bill does not eliminate every possibility for paying people. It only eliminates the bounty-hunting aspect of payment per signature.

There was a case in 1980 which was a political free speech case from Pennsylvania. I would like to read to you a statement from the justices on that case. "Governmental interest in insuring that the electorate is fully informed and in preventing corruption of the political process may, in limited instances, be sufficiently compelling to justify narrowly tailored laws necessary to further those interests even though such legislation may have incidental impact on first amendment freedom but such interests will not justify any law placing a substantial burden on protected political speech."

This bill was crafted to take a look at one particular problem and address that problem as narrowly as possible in order to fit a constitutional test, it may, it may not. That is not our job today. Our job today is to say is it okay to allow people to bounty-hunt for signatures on a per-signature basis or is it not okay.

I believe that people should sign petitions for one of two reasons, either first of all they support the issue that is on the petition or second, they support the fact that people should vote on that. You should not sign a petition because somebody comes to you and says look, I have been out of work for six weeks and I will get \$1.50 if you sign this and you do ahead and do it. That is a violation of the citizen initiated process and it is a process that I respect and a process that I support.

I urge your support of the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Old Town, Representative Coffman.

Representative COFFMAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would just like to clarify one thing. Since we know where this bill came from, the amount that was paid for signatures — I had volunteered myself to gather signatures and I had

people in my district that were volunteers on Election Day that got paid nothing that actually cost us to go out and gather signatures.

I am also aware that in the beginning that the amount of money that was given for a signature was considerably less than this growing amount that keeps being talked about. Now we are talking about \$1.50, I think the average that was given out, with all the signatures considered, is somewhere around 40 cents. So, when we keep stretching this you would have -- I believe the figure was and somebody else might get specific on this but you would have had to collect something like 1700 signatures in one week in order to qualify for \$1.40 a signature. I don't think there were very many that did that so most of the signatures that were collected were collected for, like I said before, the average was around 40 cents.

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

Representative MICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: First of all I would like to say that I also voted for the Minority Report but for some reason was not given an opportunity to sign on that so technically my name is not on this calendar today but I am a voter of the Minority Report.

As you know this is a well publicized bill which from its very start and quite openly (I am thankful for that) was about the term limit petition drive. So, first of all let me explain to you what happened in that petition drive to clear up a few misconceptions, no one including the sponsor having every spoken to me about this bill, perhaps you will learn a few things as well. We began collecting signatures on our petition drive effectively on election day. As Representative Coffman said he and a several other people, including other people in this body and in this legislature, including the other body, helped us as volunteers gather as many as we could on election day.

Now, this is an interesting petition drive, unlike many others in the past, because this drive sought to gather the signatures in the off year which thereby would place the question on the ballot during the election year when the politicians are also up for election and that was our specific strategy specifically to put it on at the same time that George Mitchell was on because we thought he had the capacity to raise a lot of money against us in 1995 if there was no way to neutralize him. So, if you really want to know, our strategy all along was to put it on the ballot with the politicians. So, doing it in the off year when very few people come out to vote you don't get as many signatures at the election.

So, you are faced at that point as virtually every petitioning organization has been faced with during the off year in the last ten years to go out and pay money. The ones that I can think of, the Sunday Sales group, Workers' Comp group tried to get something on the ballot and other, I believe they all paid per signature to help get that on the ballot. What happens is you are faced with winter coming and people, even though they may be committed as many were, don't really want to go out in 20 degree below weather. So, you pay them some money and say look, you can give up some of your job or whatever, go put some time in, help us out. We call the same people that volunteer first and gave them the opportunity to work.

Mr. Coffman is also right, we started out at 35 cents, called everybody and asked them if they wanted

to do that and worked it up and in the last week when we were looking at coming up with a little bit more dough to get us over the top or having to start over again we raised the amount to \$1.00 so the \$1.40 is really a myth which some people just love to perpetuate because a few people, I am talking literally a hand full of people out of 200 petitioners qualified for one week for that bonus which kicked a few of them to \$1.40.

That figure itself is interesting because for one week in their lives regular Maine people, most of whom were committed to the issue because they are the only ones that got the signatures really, you have to have it in your heart, they kept calling and saying, "How are we doing, are we going to get the signatures?" It wasn't just for the money. Some people would like to believe that but for one week in their life some of these people made \$400 or \$500 a week less than Ton Andrews makes every week, that is what you are talking about here in terms of the money.

The difference here in what is at stake is whether or not we want to take a socialist approach to petition paying or an incentive approach. Most of the Democrats, I guess, don't believe in an incentive relationship with production approach they would rather say no, you have to set up a bureaucracy, pay everybody by the hour so on and so forth.

By the way, just if you are ever thinking of doing a petition drive, if you are collecting at the polls it is more efficient to pay by the hour. But, if it is after election day and you need to go out into the field it is wiser to pay people by signature. Why? First of all how can you keep track of these people, they come back and say gee, I put 12 hours in today, how many signatures did you get? Ten.

You go out, say you are a contractor, take your petitions, go talk to people give them an opportunity to sign and bring back whatever you bring back and we pay you for what you produce. That is how business is supposed to work.

I know it is a hard concept for the Democrats to understand but the idea of incentive and producing is the way this country should be working.

Lastly, I am a bit offended that this bill was not put in a broader form. I am not going to talk about it at any length but I would like to see real campaign finance reform brought before this legislature and passed, not this nit-picking stuff which is essentially, in my opinion, and you can speak your own opinion, a harassment for the term limit petition. You may be.....

The SPEAKER: The Chair would recognize the Representative from Harpswell, Representative Coles, and ask for what purpose the Representative rises.

Representative COLES: Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Don't the rules of the House require that the speaker address the Speaker and not the people behind him or her?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the Representative that in fact that would be appropriate and would caution Representative Michael of Auburn to confine his comments to the pending question which is acceptance of the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report.

The Chair apologizes for interrupting the Representative, the Representative may continue.

Representative MICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to address the Speaker and I apologize for making the mistake of following tradition rather than the technical rules.

I am just about done — I just want to say that if you really want to help the citizen process, the initiative process, then why don't we make it a little bit easier for the citizens of Maine to get on the ballot. How about reducing the number of signatures to five percent instead of ten percent especially in the off year when it is so difficult to get them.

Let me give you an example. Massachusetts, our parent state, where we came from originally, requires three percent, three percent signatures to get on the ballot, not ten percent and you can be from China and six years old and petition if you want. And, by the way, they can amend their state constitution, we can't. I say let's get some meat into this bill, where is the beef? Let's bring campaign finance in here and vote for it instead of hiding behind this phony bill.

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

Representative PFEIFFER: Mr. Speaker, I would pose a question through the Chair. I would like to inquire of those who were involved in the petition drive where the money came from to pay those who gathered the signatures?

The SPEAKER: Representative Pfeiffer has posed a question through the Chair to any member who may respond if they so desire.

The Chair recognizes the Representative from Auburn, Representative Michael.

Representative MICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: Some of the money came from money we raised in Maine, most of it came from U.S. Term Limits a Washington based outfit which is essentially a political party, effectively, which does nothing but term limits. That is their issue, that is what they raise money for, that is what they contribute to.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Lisbon, Representative Jalbert.

Representative JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I would pose a question through the Chair. In response to the last speaker when he answered the question of the gentlelady from Brunswick, I heard the gentleman from Old Town mention that there were a lot of volunteers, I would like to know what happened to that quarter of a million dollars which came out in the paper that some rich person on the coast donated to this cause?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would remind members to please confine their comments and questions and remarks to the issue at hand which is acceptance of the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report before us.

Representative Jalbert of Lisbon has posed a question through the Chair to any member who may respond if they so desire.

The Chair recognizes the Representative from Auburn, Representative Michael.

Representative MICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It is my delight that \$250,000 got donated to the state term limit group, it had nothing to do with us and much of that went into the pockets of the organizers as opposed to the petitioners who did the work. I am also told one of those guys got a good job for Mitchell but I haven't been able to qualify that yet.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Rome, Representative Tracy.

Representative TRACY: Mr. Speaker, I would pose a question through the Chair. To Representative

Michael of Auburn, during your previous previous talk when you were saying about signatures versus hours, you don't know if it was ten or twelve hours or whatever but with the signatures you could apparently tell the productivity. Are you implying that if they came back and said they worked 12 hours that you really didn't know if they worked 12 or if they didn't work 10 hours and are you not implying that these people aren't honest or what?

The SPEAKER: Representative Tracy of Rome has posed a question through the Chair to Representative Michael of Auburn who may respond if he so desires.

The Chair recognizes that Representative.

Representative MICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: To answer Representative Tracy's question, the problem is that when you have a lot of people out in the field, say up to 200, petitioning all around the state, I don't know of any way of managing them unless you are going to hire 200 more people to follow them and keep track of their hours. The easiest way to do that is to say, look, bring back some bread and we will pay you for that. And, I believe I can answer a question to a person that asked the question.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Lisbon, Representative Jalbert.

Representative JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The last speaker, the gentleman from Auburn, keeps talking about it is perfectly all right to go out and pay someone to get petitions and signatures and so on. In the 115th I think I was on the Legal Affairs Committee because of some ballot tampering and so on, we passed legislation which forbids the candidate from obtaining absentee ballots. I remember one of the gentlemen that is now in the other body got up in the back, the good gentleman from Eastport, said if Aunt Mary is in a nursing home and wants me to get her absentee ballot I can't do it. A candidate for office cannot obtain absentee ballots. Even had a gentleman from Auburn who is in the other body who could not even use his secretary to get absentee ballots for himself because she was working for him. Now, it is perfectly all right for the gentleman from Auburn to say that we should pay someone to get petitions and pay them so much a signature. Now, he should be the one being on that committee and talked about election reform — we did have election reforms but apparently we should have stopped not at that time and kept on going.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will order a vote. The pending question before the House is the motion of Representative Daggett of Augusta that the House accept the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report. Those in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

Representative Kilkelly of Wiscasset requested a roll call vote.

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

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

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

Representative MICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: A couple of points I want to have on the Record. First of all there are other petitioning groups that are very concerned about this bill. I can see that it is likely to pass but I want you to know that they have understood also that their well being depends on being able to pay people to petition from time to time.

Secondly, I think it was the Myers Grant case quoted — in fact that is the case which declared a Colorado law unconstitutional, that same case makes it very clear that this bill also will be unconstitutional. That is my opinion on it and the opinion of people around the country. So, even when this passes groups will still be able to collect signatures and pay by whatever means they want to pay.

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

Representative KILKELLY: Mr. Speaker, I would pose a question through the Chair. To the Representative from Auburn, has this particular option been tested in the courts to your knowledge?

The SPEAKER: Representative Kilkelly of Wiscasset has posed a question through the Chair to Representative Michael of Auburn who may respond if he so desires.

The Chair recognizes that Representative.

Representative MICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I can tell the Representative from Wiscasset that since the Myers Grant case there have been literally hundreds of organizations around the country that have continued to pay by signature. I don't think anybody cares to challenge it because the ruling is quite clear, except for a few people.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is the motion of Representative Daggett of Augusta that the House accept the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 259

YEA - Adams, Ahearne, Aikman, Aliberti, Anderson, Ault, Bailey, H.; Bailey, R.; Bowers, Brennan, Bruno, Cameron, Campbell, Carleton, Caron, Carroll, Cashman, Cathcart, Chase, Chonko, Clark, Clement, Cloutier, Coles, Constantine, Cote, Cross, Daggett, Dexter, Dipietro, Donnelly, Dore, Driscoll, Dutremble, L.; Erwin, Farnsworth, Farnum, Farren, Fitzpatrick, Foss, Gamache, Gean, Gould, R. A.; Greenlaw, Hale, Hatch, Heesch, Heino, Hichborn, Hogle, Holt, Hussey, Jacques, Jalbert, Johnson, Joseph, Joy, Kerr, Ketterer, Kilkelly, Kneeland, Kontos, Larrivee, Lemke, Lemont, Libby Jack, Libby James, Lindahl, Look, Lord, MacBride, Marsh, Martin, J.; Michaud, Mitchell, E.; Mitchell, J.; Morrison, Murphy, Nadeau, Nash, Norton, O'Gara, Oliver, Paradis, P.; Pendexter, Pendleton, Pfeiffer, Pinette, Plourde, Plowman, Poulin, Pouliot, Rand, Reed, G.; Richardson, Ricker, Rowe, Ruhlin, Rydell, Saint Onge, Saxl, Simonds, Simoneau, Skoglund, Small, Spear, Stevens, A.; Stevens, K.; Strout, Sullivan, Swazey, Tardy, Thompson, Townsend, E.; Townsend, G.; Townsend, L.; Tracy, Tufts, Vigue, Walker, Winn, Zirkilton, The Speaker.

NAY - Barth, Bennett, Birney, Carr, Clukey, Coffman, Gray, Lipman, Marshall, Michael, Nickerson, Robichaud, Taylor, True, Wentworth, Whitcomb, Young.

ABSENT - Beam, Faircloth, Hillock, Kutasi, Martin, H.; Melendy, Ott, Pineau, Reed, W.; Rotondi, Treat. Yes, 123; No, 17; Absent, 11; Paired, 0; Excused, 0.

123 having voted in the affirmative and 17 in the negative, with 11 being absent, the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report was accepted.

The Bill read once. Committee Amendment "A" (H-881) was read by the Clerk and adopted. The Bill assigned for second reading later in today's session.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs reporting "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-885) on Bill "An Act to Reestablish a Mechanism for Review of Disputed Elections" (H.P. 1418) (L.D. 1932)

Signed:

Senators: HALL of Piscataquis  
CAREY of Kennebec

Representatives: LEMKE of Westbrook  
MICHAEL of Auburn  
STEVENS of Sabattus  
BENNETT of Norway  
NASH of Camden  
ROBICHAUD of Caribou  
TRUE of Fryeburg

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

Signed:

Senator: HANDY of Androscoggin

Representatives: DAGGETT of Augusta  
BOWERS of Washington  
GAMACHE of Lewiston

Reports were read.

Representative DAGGETT of Augusta moved that the House accept the Minority "Ought Not to Pass" Report.

On further motion of the same Representative, tabled pending her motion to accept the Minority "Ought Not to Pass" Report and later today assigned.

CONSENT CALENDAR

First Day

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

(H.P. 1291) (L.D. 1739) Bill "An Act Regarding the Workers' Compensation Residual Market Mechanism" (EMERGENCY) Committee on Banking & Insurance reporting "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-887)