

# 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 Tenth  
Legislature***

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

***Volume II***

**FIRST REGULAR SESSION**

**MAY 4, 1981 to JUNE 19, 1981**

**INDEX**

**FIRST SPECIAL SESSION**

**AUGUST 3, 1981**

**INDEX**

**FIRST CONFIRMATION SESSION**

**AUGUST 28, 1981**

**INDEX**

**SECOND SPECIAL SESSION**

**SEPTEMBER 25, 1981**

**INDEX**

**THIRD SPECIAL SESSION**

**DECEMBER 9, 1981**

**INDEX**

care of the legal technicalities that have been raised now two times on the floor of the House. I am going to read something into the record and if you want to ask me some questions, you can, but I am going to make it clear on the record that I don't think there are any legal problems involved in applying a benefit cap to individuals who are presently receiving compensation.

The excerpt that was referred to involving the Cives case completely applies it out of context. The question before the law court in that case was basically one of the legislature's intent in enacting the automatic escalations in maximum benefits. That law, as I told you, became effective in 1975.

More specifically, the court, the law court in that case, was confronted with a question of whether an individual who was injured in 1976, when the maximum benefit was 100 percent of the average weekly wage, was entitled to the next scheduled increase in 1977 to 130 percent of the average weekly wage. It was on the question that the court ruled simply that it was the legislature's intent to allow individuals who were injured after the effective day of the statutory change to receive periodic benefit evaluations. That was the only question before the court, the intent of the legislature enacting the escalations.

Here, there is no question as to the legislature's intent. This bill repeals the next scheduled escalation of benefits to 200 percent of the average weekly wage. It is emergency legislation, it will become effective immediately. The 200 percent change, however, is not even scheduled to become effective until July 1.

As an emergency measure, this bill negates the next escalation before it even becomes effective law. It is as if the 200 percent escalation never existed if we pass this bill. The 200 percent maximum, therefore, will never become effective if we pass this bill, no employer will be required to pay benefits at that level either to employees now receiving benefits or to employees injured after the effective date of this bill. That is the clear intention of this legislation and I am certain that the courts will recognize this legislative intent.

I just want to go one step further. If we were to let the 200 percent measure become effective on July 1, and then we tried to repeal it and take away benefits that people were getting after July 1 at the 200 percent level, then there would be some serious problems because you would be taking away something that they would already be enjoying after July 1, but that is not the case. We are repealing the July 1 200 percent level measure today in emergency legislation if we enact this before anybody has ever gotten it. So you are not taking away something that they already have because they haven't gotten it yet, until July 1.

I just wanted to take care of those aspersions and clouds that have been cast over this debate on its merits. I think we ought to support it because I think it will be helpful.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Michaud.

Mr. MICHAUD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question through the Chair to the good gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Tarbell.

Do you have the figures on how much savings this would be if this passed?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Michaud, has posed a question through the Chair to anyone who may respond if they so desire.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Tarbell.

Mr. TARBELL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think we are acting on this measure as though it were the first bill on the first day of the legislature. We have got a lot of work to do. That issue has been debated, the gentleman from East Millinocket has talked about it already.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would suggest that the question posed was, how much money would be saved to the fund.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Auburn, Miss Lewis.

Miss LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The answer to that question is approximately one percent, or perhaps less.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. McHenry.

Mr. MCHENRY: Mr. Speaker, I finally got an answer to the question but, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I believe that the insurance industry has already received their increase in the premiums, they have already charged the employer with that 200 percent. As you know, this is going into effect in July. Do you honestly believe that the insurance companies are now going to give the employers the money that they have charged, that 200 percent? If it is one percent, I certainly hope that if this were to be enacted, the insurance industry would return to every employer in the state of Maine one percent of their premiums, which I don't believe they will and I honestly don't believe that anybody here believes that.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is on passage to be enacted. This being an emergency measure, it requires a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House. All those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Alopis, Armstrong, Austin, Beaulieu, Bell, Benoit, Berube, Bordeaux, Boyce, Brannigan, Brennerman, Brodeur, Brown, A.; Brown, K.L.; Cahill, Callahan, Carroll, Conary, Cox, Crowley, Cunningham, Curtis, Damren, Davis, Dexter, Diamond, G.W.; Diamond, J.N.; Dillenback, Drinkwater, Dudley, Foster, Fowlie, Gavett, Gillis, Gowen, Gwadnosky, Hanson, Hayden, Hickey, Higgins, H.C.; Higgins, L.M.; Holloway, Huber, Hunter, Hutchings, Ingraham, Jackson, Jacques, Jordan, Joyce, Kane, Kany, Ketover, Kiesman, Lancaster, LaPlante, Lewis, Lisnik, Livesay, Locke, Lund, MacBride, MacEachern, Macomber, Mahany, Manning, Martin, H.C.; Masterman, Masterton, Matthews, McCollister, McGowan, McKean, McPherson, McSweeney, Mitchell, E.H.; Moholland, Murphy, Nelson, A.; Nelson, M.; Norton, O'Rourke, Paradis, E.; Paul, Perkins, Peterson, Post, Pouliot, Prescott, Racine, Randall, Reeves, J.; Richard, Ridley, Roberts, Salsbury, Sherburne, Small, Smith, C.B.; Smith, C.W.; Soulas, Soule, Stevenson, Stover, Strout, Studley, Tarbell, Telow, Theriault, Thompson, Treadwell, Tuttle, Twitchell, Vose, Walker, Webster, Wentworth, The Speaker.

NAY — Baker, Boisvert, Carrier, Chonko, Clark, Connolly, Davies, Erwin, Fitzgerald, Hall, Hobbins, Jalbert, Kelleher, Kilcoyne, McHenry, Michaud, Mitchell, J.; Nadeau, Paradis, P.; Pearson, Perry, Reeves, P.;

ABSENT — Brown, D.; Carter, Connors, Day, Laverriere, Martin, A.; Michael, Rolde, Swazey, Weymouth.

Yes, 118; No, 22; Absent, 10; Vacant, 1.

The SPEAKER: One hundred eighteen having voted in the affirmative and twenty-two in the negative, with ten being absent, the Bill is passed to be enacted.

Signed by the speaker and sent to the Senate.

By unanimous consent, ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

The Chair laid before the House the sixth item of Unfinished Business:

An Act Authorizing a Bond Issue in the Amount of \$29,300,000 for the Purposes of Fostering Agricultural and Economic Development in the State of Maine (Bond Issue) (S. P. 488) (L. D. 1428)

— In House, Passed to be Enacted on June 3 (Having previously been Passed to be Engrossed as Amended by Committee Amend-

ment "A" (S-297) as Amended by House Amendment "A" (H-508) thereto)

— In Senate, Passed to be Engrossed as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-297) as Amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-365) thereto in non-concurrence.

Tabled—June 10 (Till Later Today) by Representative Pearson of Old Town.

Pending—Further Consideration.

On motion of Mr. Pearson of Old Town, the House voted to recede.

Thereupon, Senate Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" was read by the Clerk.

On motion of Mr. Pearson of Old Town, Senate Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" was indefinitely postponed.

On motion of the same gentleman, House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" was indefinitely postponed.

The same gentleman offered House Amendment "B" to Committee Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "B" to Committee Amendment "A" (H-571) was read by the Clerk and adopted.

Committee Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "B" thereto was adopted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Town, Mr. Pearson.

Mr. PEARSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: What I am attempting to do is to amend the bond issue on potato marketing improvement. The amendment that I have replaced and am attempting to have enacted here would up the amount from \$4 million in the bond issue to \$5 million in the bond issue.

Originally, the bond issue called for \$6 million. It was amended downward in the other body to \$4 million, and I am amending it back up to \$5 million, and the reason for that is that we have agreed, leadership has agreed and the Governor has suggested, most everybody agrees, that we ought to float only 90 percent of the bonds that we retire. So, in an attempt to do that, there had to be some modifications made on the numbers of dollars that we were going to put out in bond issues. It has been agreed by leadership, and hopefully by this House, that this would be one of the adjustments that was necessary in order to reach that 90 percent figure, which we feel is a responsible way of funding bonds.

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

The Chair laid before the House the third item of Unfinished Business:

HOUSE DIVIDED REPORT — Majority (8) "Ought to Pass" as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-546) — Minority (5) "Ought to Pass" as Amended by Committee Amendment "B" (H-547) — Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act to Amend the Maine Tree Growth Tax Law" (H. P. 801) (L. D. 955)

Tabled — June 9 (Till Later Today) by Representative Post of Owl's Head.

Pending — Acceptance of Either Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Owl's Head, Mrs. Post.

Mrs. POST: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House accept the Minority "Ought to Pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Bethel, Miss Brown.

Miss BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I would like a division on the motion.

The item before us is L. D. 955, "An Act to Amend the Maine Tree Growth Tax Law." This is a very important piece of legislation to a lot of your districts.

The difference between Committee Report A and Committee Report B is that the Minority Report, Committee Report B, continues with the antiquated, unfair, terrible formula that is

on the books presently. Committee Report A helps adjust that formula and creates a situation where the communities and the municipalities who are most severely hurt are the ones that will be receiving the equitable reimbursement from the state.

I asked for a division on this and I hope that you support me so I can move the acceptance of the Majority Report, Committee Report A.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Owl's Head, Mrs. Post.

Mrs. POST: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: It is true, as the gentlelady said, that the primary difference in the two reports is the mechanism that is used for reimbursement for the tax loss due to tree growth. I think I would differ greatly from the gentlelady in saying exactly what is fair, and what is antiquated and what is unfair. Under the reimbursement fee that is in Report A, which is the Majority Report, which I am not moving, all the counties because of the system that has been set up, all the counties, Knox, Lincoln, Waldo, Sagadahoc, Androscoggin, Cumberland, York and Kennebec counties will not get one red cent of reimbursement. No towns in any of those counties gets any reimbursement at all, that is Knox, Lincoln, Waldo, Sagadahoc, Androscoggin, Cumberland, York and Kennebec, and it is very unlikely under that system that any town in any of those counties will "ever" get any reimbursement. So if you live in those counties and you have land in tree growth and you are concerned about the tax loss, then just know that unless you vote for Committee Report B, your towns are very likely to never ever get reimbursement.

In addition to that, there are a lot of towns who will lose more than \$1,000 unless we go for Committee Report B, and those are towns like Durham, Ashland, Dyer Brook, St. Francis, Wallagrass, Freeport, Harpswell, Haynesville, Masardis, New Canada, Castine, Deer Isle, Ellsworth, Hancock, Lamoine, Mt. Desert, Otis, Cushing, Hope, Rockport, Alna, Jefferson, Newcastle, Waterford, Woodstock, Brewer, Clinton, Edinburg, Garland, I am reading some of them, Brownville, Bowdoin, Arrowsic, Burnham, Wesley, Whiting, Arundel, Cornish, Kennebunkport, Lebanon, Limington, that is half of the computer printout. All those towns will lose more than \$1,000 apiece unless you vote for Committee Report B.

Essentially the situation that is set up presently is that you can either get reimbursement through assistance which is in effect, that measured your tax loss when tree growth went into effect, or you can get reimbursement at the rate of 11 cents an acre. The system that has been set up sets up a way of judging what your tax loss might be according to the difference between the tree growth value and the undeveloped acreage value that is used in state valuation. Unfortunately, that is not a true measure of tax loss in most of the communities in this state.

There is a lot that is unfair about tree growth. Unless we accept Committee Report B, it is going to be even more unfair particularly to just about any town in the entire first district.

We have worked on this and we have come up with a proposed amendment which Representative Hall will present, if we do accept Committee Report B, in which we will say the towns will no longer be able to get more than their tax loss and yet, at the same time —

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bethel, Miss Brown, and inquires for what purpose she rises?

Miss BROWN: A point of inquiry, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state her inquiry.

Miss BROWN: I don't believe Amendment A to Committee Report B is before us and I don't think it is up for debate at this time.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the

gentlewoman that she is stating her position. The gentleman from Owl's Head, Mrs. Post, may continue.

Mrs. POST: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Unless we do, in fact, adopt Committee Report B, an amendment which will allow reimbursement to go to 15 cents an acre, which will mean that most of these towns will get even more, instead of the reimbursement being 11 cents an acre will go up to 15 cents an acre, Representative Hall will not have a chance to present that particular amendment and it is on your desks if you would like to read it.

I do want to point out that also in the amendment what we are talking about is a system where there are some towns, because they are getting more now than what was defined as their tax loss, any tax loss, they may get a reduction in what they are getting presently, but unless we accept Committee Report B—they won't get anything. Again, I would just like to read off the towns, unless we accept Committee Report B or counties rather, won't get any reimbursement at all and are very unlikely to in the future — that is, Knox, Lincoln, Waldo, Sagadahoc, Androscoggin, Cumberland, York and Kennebec.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Milo, Mr. Masterman.

Mr. MASTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am rather amused this afternoon at what is transpiring. This particular L.D. 955, the prime sponsor of this bill is Mr. Hall, the cosponsor is Mr. Twitchell from Norway, Mr. Smith from Island Falls and myself, and I thought that all four of us, because of our concerns for our particular towns and the towns across the state, because these towns weren't having fair and equitable treatment, that we should attempt to do something for them. We have tried. This afternoon there is some surprise maneuvering going on and I don't see how anyone can argue that the 3 percent threshold approach is not the correct method.

Miss Brown is absolutely correct when she says that we are reverting to the antiquated method that we have been using.

I did all that I could since I have been here to help correct the tax situation regarding tree growth. I believe in tree growth, the concept, but because the law was made in 1972, I believe it was, and because of the change in valuation, it no longer does the job that we expected it to do.

Representative Post mentioned Brownville — that happens to be one of my towns and I have checked that too, and under the 3 percent threshold, we will be, I don't have the figures in front of me, I believe we were going to be \$2,000 better off. I don't think there is any way that you are going to, under any method, insure that you have corrected every single inequity. I don't think it is possible because the towns haven't lived up to their commitment and I think it is about time the Tax Division did something about it. The towns are not up to the level of valuation that they should be and that is where some of the problem lies.

Committee Amendment B, which is on the floor at the present time, and I want to tell you the differences between A and B. First, I am going to tell you where they compare. Both amendments, A and B, eliminate the provision requiring parcels over 500 acres to be in tree growth. Both A and B require annual setting of stumpage values rather than the present biennial approach. A and B both allow tree growth values to be set by region or by counties. A and B both provide for the first time eligibility criteria in terms of how the land is managed. Both A and B require municipalities to report penalties incurred. A and B differ on setting the discount factor and on reimbursement, and the big issue is reimbursement.

The Majority Report, which is not before us at the moment but I hope we defeat the Report B so we can then get to Report A, the Majority

Report, and the Majority Report reimburses those towns whose tax losses exceed 3 percent of their tax commitment. This approach sends the available money to the towns that are hurt the worst and treats all towns equally.

I am surprised that Mr. Hall didn't mention this because Shirley is one of his towns and under Report A, if we can get to it, suppose the town of Shirley raises \$100,000 in property taxes, Shirley would be reimbursed for tax losses which would exceed 3 percent of \$100,000, or \$3,000. If Shirley's loss is \$5,000, they would be reimbursed \$2,000.

The Minority Report leaves the reimbursement procedure the way it is presently in the law. This procedure is bad for three reasons: it wastes money on towns that have no significant loss to tree growth; surprisingly enough like South Portland, which has only 35 acres in tree growth. The current procedure perpetuates the inequity and when we move to the 17 cents proposed in Report B, you have the same situation, 11 cents an acre, while some towns, due to a quirk in the law, did you know this — some town would get as much as \$8 per acre and that certainly is not fair because they should go beyond that point of their actual tax loss.

The most sparsely populated towns in Maine are bearing the burden of this current tax law. The Majority Report, which I am on, helps most towns which carry the heaviest burden and I think if you agree with me you will vote to defeat Committee Report B.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sangerville, Mr. Hall.

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is unfortunate that you only have \$600,000 to take the place of \$2 million, but that is what you are talking about. What you are trying to do is take a stick and stir it up to give what you can back to each town.

Another thing that is unfortunate is that tree growth hurts every town that has some tree growth in it, regardless. As I looked over Amendment "A", I was very much in favor of it at first because I looked at Piscataquis County which is going to get back 8 percent of the money involved. Miss Brown, she gets back 10 percent; yet, when I look at Somerset County, which half of my district is in, they get zero. This isn't fair. The entire assessment of the tree growth has been unfair from the beginning. You have heard me speak about this, some of you old timers have, about how I have been adamant about the inequities in tree growth anyway.

Mr. Masterman's town of Greenville would get nothing, but under my amendment, they would get \$2,000. I am very surprised that he would want to go with Amendment "A" and having some towns in his district get nothing.

I would hope you would adopt Amendment "B" so I can put my amendment on it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bethel, Miss Brown.

Miss BROWN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Just for the record, I would like to correct a few things.

First of all, out of all the wonderful towns that my chairman read into the record, that's great, that's impressive, but the fact is that those towns do not receive more or in excess of a 3 percent tax shift. The thing that I am concerned about are the towns that do receive in excess of a 3 percent tax shift. When I went down to look over how many acres some people in this House had in their districts, I can see why the Speaker of the House and some people are very concerned about it, but I will tell you why I am concerned about it, because I have 211,000 acres of tree growth in my district, there are only 260,000 in Oxford County in tree growth, the majority is in my district. They are little towns that are severely hurt because of this.

For Mr. Hall's information, it is "Miss" Brown, and I get less than 10 percent of the reimbursement for my district. That figure of 10

percent was thrown around in the hallway and it is not accurate.

Something else I would like to point out to you is that the Maine Municipal Association and the Maine Forest Products went around this state this fall in a lot of districts all over the state and they held forums. Your constituents and mine went to those forums and they expressed their concerns about tree growth. The Committee Amendment "A" is a compromise that was endorsed by the people that went to those forums. I am talking about Maine Municipal Association, selectmen, environmentalists and landowners. Those are the people that endorsed Committee Report "A". This is the first time since I have been here in five years working on tree growth that we have gotten that group together to endorse one proposal. I would urge you to support Committee Amendment "A".

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Corinth, Mr. Strout.

Mr. STROUT: Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a roll call.

The SPEAKER: For the Chair to order a roll call, it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All those desiring a roll call vote 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 gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Vose.

Mr. VOSE: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the gentlelady in the other corner about what it would do to some of the towns, so I would like to read off what Committee Amendment "A" would do to my towns in my district. In Dennysville, where they would normally get \$503, they would get nothing; in Whiting, where they would normally get \$1742, they would get \$241; in Lubec, \$80 to nothing, in Cutler, \$1406 to nothing; in Northfield, \$2304 to \$255; and Wesley, \$2256 to \$1504. Under the amendment that Mrs. Post is going to present, I will remain the same. Therefore, I urge you to support this motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Owl's Head, Mrs. Post.

Mrs. POST: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to respond to a couple of things here. Representative Masterman mentioned that there are some towns that are actually getting \$8 an acre, which is much more than their tax loss, and that is true, and under the amendment that will be presented by Representative Hall, if we ever get around to accepting Committee Report "B", that issue will be taken care of and towns will, in fact, not be able to get more money than what they have actually lost because of a tax loss.

I got a note from the gentleman from Androscoggin County asking me about Minot, and I am afraid it might not get back to you since the Speaker is particularly interested in getting \$1240, and under Report A, they will get absolutely nothing, as will any other town in Androscoggin County.

In terms of the tax shift, the 3 percent tax shift, the difficulty is that the way the tax shift is measured, when you start talking about that threshold, you compare apples and oranges, you compare the tree growth value to the state value for undeveloped land when in fact much, particularly the grown up areas of our state, the real tax loss, the tree growth value which may be \$120 versus what would be \$100 an acre for road frontage, so that the reimbursement formula with the threshold, under Committee Report A does not really reflect the actual tax loss to the more urban areas, suburban areas of our state, and that is where the heavy development pressures are, and let me tell you, they feel that tax loss just as much as some of the less organized areas.

I would also like to say that the agreement

we have reached late this afternoon has the endorsement of MMA, although I can't say that it has the endorsement of the Maine Forest Products Council, and as far as I am concerned, that makes it all the better.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Milo, Mr. Masterman.

Mr. MASTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: The town of Greenville was mentioned. This is one of the towns that hasn't been kicking on the tree growth for the simple reason that some of these towns make out very well under the tree growth concept in education subsidy.

The other thing that I wanted to say, the amount we keep throwing around, there is a part in that amendment that I like that no town could receive more than their actual tax loss. That amendment could be put on either one of these reports, if we could get to it.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Owl's Head, Mrs. Post, that the Minority "Ought to Pass" Report be accepted. All those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Baker, Beaulieu, Benoit, Berube, Boisvert, Bordeaux, Boyce, Brannigan, Brennerman, Brodeur, Brown, A.; Cahill, Callahan, Carrier, Carroll, Chonko, Clark, Connolly, Crowley, Cunningham, Curtis, Davies, Diamond, G. W.; Diamond, J. N.; Drinkwater, Fitzgerald, Foster, Fowlie, Gavett, Gillis, Gowen, Gwadosky, Hall, Hanson, Hayden, Hickey, Higgins, H. C.; Hobbins, Holloway, Hutchings, Jackson, Jacques, Jalbert, Joyce, Kane, Kelleher, Ketover, Kilcoyne, LaPlante, Lewis, Lisnik, Livesay, Locke, MacEachern, Macomber, Mahany, Manning, Martin, H. C.; Matthews, McGowan, McHenry, McKean, McSweeney, Michaud, Mitchell, E. H.; Mitchell, J.; Moholland, Murphy, Nadeau, Nelson, M.; Norton, Paradis, P.; Paul, Pearson, Perkins, Peterson, Post, Pouliot, Racine, Randall, Reeves, P.; Richard, Ridley, Salsbury, Small, Smith, C. B.; Smith, C. W.; Soulas, Soule, Stevenson, Stover, Strout, Telow, Theriault, Thompson, Tuttle, Vose, Walker, Webster, Wentworth, Mr. Speaker.

NAY — Aloupis, Armstrong, Austin, Bell, Brown, K. L.; Carter, Conary, Cox, Damren, Davis, Dexter, Dillenback, Erwin, Hunter, Ingraham, Jordan, Kany, Kiesman, Lancaster, Lund, MacBride, Masterman, Masterton, McCollister, McPherson, Nelson, A.; O'Rourke, Paradis, E.; Perry, Prescott, Reeves, J.; Roberts, Sherburne, Studley, Tarbell, Treadwell, Twitchell.

ABSENT — Brown, D.; Connors, Day, Dudley, Higgins, L. M.; Huber, Laverriere, Martin, A.; Michael, Rolde, Swazey, Weymouth.

Yes, 101; No, 37; Absent, 12; Vacant, 1.

The SPEAKER: One hundred one having voted in the affirmative and thirty-seven in the negative, with twelve being absent, the motion does prevail.

Thereupon, the Bill was read once. Committee Amendment "B" (H-527) was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Hall of Sangerville offered House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "B" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "B" (H-569) was read by the Clerk and adopted.

Committee Amendment "B" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto was adopted.

Under suspension of the rules, the Bill was read a second time, passed to be engrossed as amended and sent up for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

The following papers appearing on Supplement No. 11 were taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

#### Special Sentiment Calendar

##### Recognizing:

Kenneth F. Baily of Harpswell, for distinguished service to the Legislature and the people of the State of Maine; (H. P. 1686) by Representative Mitchell of Vassalboro. (Cosponsors: Representatives Diamond of Windham and Martin of Eagle Lake)

JoAnne M. D'Arcangelo of Augusta, for distinguished service to the Legislature and the people of the State of Maine; (H. P. 1687) by Representative Mitchell of Vassalboro. (Cosponsors: Representatives Diamond of Windham and Martin of Eagle Lake)

Dorothy Hall, of Sangerville, for distinguished service to the Legislature and the people of the State of Maine; (H. P. 1688) by Representative Mitchell of Vassalboro. (Cosponsors: Representatives Diamond of Windham and Martin of Eagle Lake)

Kathleen Watson Goodwin, of Bath, for distinguished service to the Legislature and the people of the State of Maine; (H. P. 1689) by Representative Mitchell of Vassalboro. (Cosponsors: Representatives Diamond of Windham and Martin of Eagle Lake)

Kenneth Allen, of Sidney, for distinguished service to the Legislature and the people of the State of Maine; (H. P. 1690) by Representative Mitchell of Vassalboro. (Cosponsors: Representatives Diamond of Windham and Martin of Eagle Lake)

There being no objections, the above items were considered passed and sent up for concurrence.

The following papers appearing on Supplement No. 12 were taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

#### Special Sentiment Calendar

##### Recognizing:

Phyllis Stafford of Augusta, for distinguished service to the Legislature and the people of the State of Maine; (H. P. 1691) by Representative Mitchell of Vassalboro. (Cosponsors: Representatives Diamond of Windham and Martin of Eagle Lake)

Pamela E. Lovley, of Whitefield, for distinguished service to the Legislature and the people of the State of Maine; (H. P. 1692) by Representative Mitchell of Vassalboro. (Cosponsors: Representatives Diamond of Windham and Martin of Eagle Lake)

The K. J. Printing Company, a Division of the Guy Gannett Publishing Company for their dedicated service printing documents for the 110th Maine Legislature; (S. P. 698)

There being no objections, the above items were considered passed and sent up for concurrence.

The following papers appearing on Supplement No. 27 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

#### Passed to Be Enacted

An Act to Amend the Workers' Compensation Law (H. P. 685) (L. D. 799) (H. "A" H-516)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed, passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

By unanimous consent, ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

The following papers appearing on Supplement No. 13 were taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

#### Non-Concurrent Matters

An Act Establishing the Women's Training and Employment Program (H. P. 568) (L. D. 644) which was Passed to be Enacted in the House on May 26, 1981. (Having previously been Passed to be Engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" (H-443))

Came from the Senate passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" (H-443) as amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-370) thereto in non-concurrence.