

Journal of the House

Thursday, February 25, 2010

At one o'clock in the afternoon the Speaker called the House to order.

Devotional Exercises

Devotional exercises were conducted by Rev. Amelia Pitton of Bethany Church, Montpelier, Vt.

Senate Bill Referred

S. 272

Senate bill, entitled

An act relating to human trafficking

Was read and referred to the committee on Judiciary.

Third Reading; Bill Passed

H. 658

House bill, entitled

An act relating to the issuance of certificates of need for home health agencies and addressing patient transportation services in certificate of need applications

Was taken up, read the third time and passed with a title amendment to read as follows:

An act relating to the issuance of certificates of need for home health agencies and addressing patient transportation services in certificate of need applications

Bill Read Third Time and Passed in Concurrence with Proposal of Amendment

S. 77

Senate bill, entitled

An act relating to the disposal of electronic waste

Was taken up, read the third time and passed in concurrence with proposal of amendment.

Bill Amended; Third Reading Ordered**H. 488**

Rep. Krebs of South Hero, for the committee on Fish, Wildlife & Water Resources, to which had been referred House bill, entitled

An act relating to prohibiting the manufacture and sale of felt-soled boots and waders

Reported in favor of its passage when amended by striking all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 1. 10 V.S.A. § 4616 is added to read:

§ 4616. FELT-SOLED BOOTS AND WADERS; USE PROHIBITED

It is unlawful to use external felt-soled boots or external felt-soled waders in the waters of Vermont.

Sec. 2. 10 V.S.A. § 4572 is amended to read:

§ 4572. DEFINITIONS

(a) As used in this subchapter, a minor fish and game violation means:

(1) A violation of 10 V.S.A. § 4145 (violation of access and landing area rules);

(2) A violation of 10 V.S.A. § 4251 (taking wild animals and fish without a license);

(3) A violation of 10 V.S.A. § 4266 (failure to carry a license on person or failure to exhibit license);

(4) A violation of 10 V.S.A. § 4267 (false statements in license application; altering license; transferring license to another person; using another person's license; or guiding an unlicensed person); or

(5) A violation of 10 V.S.A. § 4713 (tree or ground stands or blinds); or

(6) A violation of 10 V.S.A. § 4616 (use of external felt-soled boots or external felt-soled waders).

(b) "Bureau" means the judicial bureau as created in 4 V.S.A. § 1102.

Sec. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE

This act shall take effect on January 1, 2012.

The bill, having appeared on the Calendar one day for notice, was taken up, read the second time, report of the committee on Fish, Wildlife & Water Resources agreed to and third reading ordered.

Bill Amended; Third Reading Ordered**H. 539**

Rep. Hubert of Milton, for the committee on Government Operations, to which had been referred House bill, entitled

An act relating to amending the charter of the town of Hartford

Reported in favor of its passage when amended by striking all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 1. CHARTER APPROVAL

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2645 of Title 17, the general assembly approves the amendment to the charter of the town of Hartford as provided in this act.

Sec. 2. 24 V.S.A. App. § 123A-401(e)(2) is amended to read:

(2) The charter shall be reviewed not less than three years after its initial adoption and subsequently every five years unless amended by a town meeting vote. However, the charter committee may, at any time prior to three years after the initial adoption of the charter, recommend amendments to the charter of a technical nature or that resolve conflicts between or among existing provisions of the charter.

Sec. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE

This act shall take effect upon passage.

The bill, having appeared on the Calendar one day for notice, was taken up, read the second time, report of the committee on Government Operations agreed to and third reading ordered.

Joint Resolution Amended; Third Reading Ordered**J.R.H. 35**

Rep. Kitzmiller of Montpelier, for the committee on Commerce and Economic Development, to which had been referred Joint resolution, entitled

Joint resolution urging Congress not to diminish any aspect of the existing state regulatory authority over the insurance industry or consumer protection policy with respect to national banks

Reported in favor of its passage when amended by striking all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

Whereas, in 1945, Congress enacted the McCarran-Ferguson Act,

59 Stat. 33, in which section one (15 U.S.C. § 1011) provided “that the continued regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance is in the public interest, and that silence on the part of the Congress shall not be constructed to impose any barrier to the regulation or taxation of such business by the several States,” and

Whereas, section 2 of the act (15 U.S.C. § 1012) provided that “the business of insurance, and every person engaged therein, shall be subject to the laws of the several States,” and that “No Act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance,” and

Whereas, the exception to this broad grant of regulatory authority to the states was a proviso that those aspects of the business of insurance not regulated by state law would be subject to federal antitrust law, including the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act, and

Whereas, for over six decades, the McCarran-Ferguson Act has successfully continued as the law of the land, and the individual states have demonstrated great competence in regulating the insurance industry, and

Whereas, H.R. 1583, the “Insurance Industry Competition Act of 2009,” was introduced in the current Congress and referred to the House Committee on Financial Services, and

Whereas, this legislation would alter and impinge upon the scope of the states’ current exclusive authority over the insurance industry by amending federal law to modify federal jurisdiction with respect to insurance industry competition, and

Whereas, the House-passed version of H.R. 4173, “The Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2009,” establishes a federal insurance office which although not specifically intended to preempt state authority over the insurance industry does introduce a new federal regulatory mechanism over insurance that has not previously existed, and

Whereas, the states have fought to retain the authority to adopt consumer protection measures for national banks that are not directly related to the business of banking, and

Whereas, although H.R. 4173 does provide that states may adopt consumer protection policies related to national banks, and limits the argument that the U.S. Comptroller of the Currency has been asserting in recent years, the leeway granted to the states remains restricted, and

Whereas, the legislation grants preemption authority to the U.S. Comptroller of the Currency, with respect to a legally adopted state consumer

protection policy regarding national banks, that “prevents or significantly interferes with the ability of an insured depository institution chartered as a national bank to engage in the business of banking,” and

Whereas, the U.S. Comptroller of the Currency could interpret this language as a broad mandate to preempt state policies designed to protect consumers in their transactions with national banks, and

Whereas, with respect to comprehensive insurance regulation and to state consumer protection policies related to national banks, state regulators, such as the Vermont department of banking, insurance, securities, and health care administration, have a proven record of success, and their jurisdictional authority should not be diminished, now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives:

That the General Assembly urges Congress not to diminish any aspect of the states’ existing regulatory authority over the insurance industry or consumer protection policy with respect to national banks, and

Resolved: That the Secretary of State be directed to send a copy of this resolution to Paulette J. Thabault, Commissioner of Banking, Insurance, Securities, and Health Care Administration, and to the Vermont Congressional Delegation.

The bill, having appeared on the Calendar one day for notice, was taken up, read the second time, report of the committee on Commerce and Economic Development agreed to and third reading ordered.

Joint Resolution Amended; Third Reading Ordered

J.R.H. 39

Rep. Poirier of Barre City, for the committee on Health Care, to which had been referred House bill, entitled

Joint resolution urging Congress not to pursue legislation authorizing individuals to purchase health insurance across state lines

Reported in favor of its passage when amended by striking all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

Joint resolution urging Congress not to pursue legislation authorizing individuals to purchase health insurance across state lines

Whereas, Vermont law has required guaranteed issue of health insurance policies in the small group and individual markets since 1992, which means that an insurer cannot reject a Vermont resident’s application for health insurance based on the individual’s health status or medical conditions, and

Whereas, Vermont law has required community rating in the small group and individual markets since 1992, and

Whereas, most other states do not require guaranteed issue, community rating, or other consumer protections afforded to Vermont residents by law, and

Whereas, allowing the purchase of health insurance across state lines will likely result in many healthy people purchasing insurance out of state where their policies may be rescinded if they become sick, leading them to purchase guaranteed-issue health insurance policies in Vermont, which would create a very sick Vermont risk pool that would be expensive to insure and would increase the cost of health insurance in Vermont, and

Whereas, Vermont has had mental health parity laws in place since 1997 which provide greater protections than federal and many state laws, and

Whereas, out-of-state insurers are already authorized to sell policies in Vermont and across the United States but some have chosen not to offer health insurance in Vermont's small group and individual health insurance markets because of the requirements of guaranteed issue and community rating, now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives:

That the General Assembly urges Congress not to pursue legislation allowing individuals or small groups to purchase health insurance across state lines or permitting health insurance companies to offer individual or small group health insurance policies to residents of a state if the company is not authorized by that state to offer those policies, and be it further

Resolved: That the Secretary of State be directed to send a copy of this resolution to the Vermont Congressional Delegation.

And by changing the title of the resolution to read "Joint resolution urging Congress not to pursue legislation allowing individuals or small groups to purchase health insurance across state lines or permitting health insurance companies to offer individual or small group health insurance policies to residents of a state if the company is not authorized by that state to offer those policies"

The bill, having appeared on the Calendar one day for notice, was taken up and read the second time.

Pending the question, Shall the House amend the resolution as recommended by the committee on Health Care? **Reps. Scheuermann of Stowe and Donahue of Northfield** moved to substitute an amendment for that offered by the committee on Health Care as follows:

By striking out all after the sponsor list and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

Whereas, Vermont law has required guaranteed issue of health insurance policies in the small group and individual markets since 1992, which means that an insurer cannot reject a Vermont resident's application for health insurance based on the individual's health status or medical conditions, and

Whereas, Vermont law has required community rating in the small group and individual markets since 1992, and

Whereas, many other states do not currently require guaranteed issue, community rating, or other consumer protections afforded to Vermont residents by law, and

Whereas, Vermont has had mental health parity laws in place since 1997 which provide greater protections than federal and many state laws, and

Whereas, allowing individuals and small groups to purchase health insurance across state lines and permitting health insurance companies to offer individual and small group health insurance policies to residents of states in which the company is not domiciled would provide consumers with a wider variety of health plans from which to choose and make the health insurance market more competitive, thus reducing the cost of health insurance and making it more affordable for Vermont residents and residents of other states, and

Whereas, many out-of-state insurers are already authorized to sell policies in Vermont and across the United States but some have chosen not to offer health insurance in Vermont's small group and individual health insurance markets because the requirements of guaranteed issue and community rating have not applied nationwide, now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives:

That the General Assembly urges Congress to pursue legislation directing all states to require community rating, guaranteed issue, mental health parity, and other consumer protections found in Vermont's laws regulating the individual and small group health insurance markets, and be it further

Resolved: That the General Assembly urges Congress, after it enacts legislation directing states to follow Vermont's lead in adopting consumer protections, to pursue legislation allowing individuals and small groups to purchase health insurance across state lines and permitting health insurance companies to offer individual and small group health insurance policies to residents of states in which the company is not domiciled, and be it further

Resolved: That the Secretary of State be directed to send a copy of this

resolution to the Vermont Congressional Delegation.

and by changing the title of the resolution to read “Joint resolution urging Congress to pursue legislation enhancing consumer protections in the individual and small group health insurance markets and allowing the purchase and sale of health insurance across state lines”

Pending the question, Shall the House substitute the amendment as offered by Reps. Scheuermann of Stowe and Donahue of Northfield for the recommendation of amendment of the Committee on Health Care? **Rep. Komline of Dorset** demanded the Yeas and Nays, which demand was sustained by the Constitutional number. The Clerk proceeded to call the roll and the question, Shall the House substitute the amendment as offered by Reps. Scheuermann of Stowe and Donahue of Northfield for the recommendation of amendment of the Committee on Health Care? was decided in the negative. Yeas, 49. Nays, 86.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Acinapura of Brandon	Hubert of Milton	O'Donnell of Vernon
Adams of Hartland	Johnson of Canaan	Olsen of Jamaica
Branagan of Georgia	Kilmartin of Newport City	Pearce of Richford
Brennan of Colchester	Koch of Barre Town	Peaslee of Guildhall
Canfield of Fair Haven	Komline of Dorset	Perley of Enosburg
Clark of Vergennes	Krawczyk of Bennington	Reis of St. Johnsbury
Clerkin of Hartford	Larocque of Barnet	Savage of Swanton
Corcoran of Bennington	Lawrence of Lyndon	Scheuermann of Stowe
Devereux of Mount Holly	Lewis of Derby	Shaw of Pittsford
Dickinson of St. Albans Town	Marcotte of Coventry	Townsend of Randolph
Donaghy of Poultney *	McAllister of Highgate	Turner of Milton
Donahue of Northfield	McDonald of Berlin	Waite-Simpson of Essex
Fagan of Rutland City	McFaun of Barre Town	Wheeler of Derby
Greshin of Warren	McNeil of Rutland Town	Winters of Williamstown
Higley of Lowell	Morley of Barton	Wright of Burlington
Howard of Cambridge	Morrissey of Bennington	Zuckerman of Burlington *
	Myers of Essex	

Those who voted in the negative are:

Andrews of Rutland City	Consejo of Sheldon	French of Shrewsbury
Aswad of Burlington	Copeland-Hanzas of Bradford	French of Randolph
Atkins of Winooski	Courcelle of Rutland City	Gilbert of Fairfax
Bissonnette of Winooski	Deen of Westminster	Grad of Moretown
Bohi of Hartford	Donovan of Burlington	Haas of Rochester
Botzow of Pownal	Edwards of Brattleboro	Head of South Burlington
Bray of New Haven	Emmons of Springfield	Heath of Westford
Browning of Arlington	Evans of Essex	Helm of Castleton
Burke of Brattleboro	Fisher of Lincoln	Hooper of Montpelier
Cheney of Norwich	Frank of Underhill	Howard of Rutland City
Clarkson of Woodstock		Howrigan of Fairfield

Jerman of Essex	Martin of Springfield	Poirier of Barre City
Jewett of Ripton	Martin of Wolcott	Potter of Clarendon
Johnson of South Hero	Masland of Thetford	Pugh of South Burlington
Keenan of St. Albans City	McCullough of Williston	Ram of Burlington
Kitzmiller of Montpelier	Milkey of Brattleboro	Rodgers of Glover
Klein of East Montpelier	Miller of Shaftsbury	Shand of Weathersfield
Krebs of South Hero	Minter of Waterbury	Sharpe of Bristol
Lanpher of Vergennes	Mitchell of Barnard	Smith of Mendon
Larson of Burlington	Mook of Bennington	South of St. Johnsbury
Lenes of Shelburne	Moran of Wardsboro	Stevens of Waterbury
Leriche of Hardwick	Mrowicki of Putney	Sweaney of Windsor
Lippert of Hinesburg	Nease of Johnson	Taylor of Barre City
Lorber of Burlington	Nuovo of Middlebury	Till of Jericho *
Macaig of Williston	O'Brien of Richmond	Toll of Danville
Maier of Middlebury	Obuchowski of Rockingham	Webb of Shelburne
Malcolm of Pawlet	Partridge of Windham	Weston of Burlington
Manwaring of Wilmington	Pellett of Chester	Wilson of Manchester
Marek of Newfane *	Peltz of Woodbury	Young of St. Albans City

Those members absent with leave of the House and not voting are:

Ainsworth of Royalton	Conquest of Newbury	Spengler of Colchester
Ancel of Calais	Crawford of Burke	Stevens of Shoreham
Audette of South Burlington	Davis of Washington	Wizowaty of Burlington
Baker of West Rutland	Geier of South Burlington	Zenie of Colchester
Condon of Colchester	Orr of Charlotte	

Rep. Donaghy of Poultney explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

Thanks but, I don’t like either version.”

Rep. Marek of Newfane explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

Having other states become as progressive as Vermont is a laudable aim. Delegating away our control over Vermont’s health care future unfortunately is not the way to attain that goal. My “no” vote will be followed by a “yes” on adopting the best approach to helping other states become more like us.”

Rep. Till of Jericho explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

I vote no on this amendment to J.R.H. 39 because this amendment would undermine health care reform, the Vermont blueprint for health and long-term control of health care spending in our state. It does nothing to control our overall health care spending and cripples our tools to do so.”

Rep. Zuckerman of Burlington explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

I vote yes due to the resolved clauses while I disagree with the fifth whereas clause. If all other states adopted the good consumer protections that Vermont offers then the economy of scale would help everyone.

Once we are all in together there would be every reason for the feds to go the final step and make it a universal plan across the country.”

Pending the question, Shall the resolution be amended as recommended by the committee on Health Care? **Rep. Komline of Dorset** demanded the Yeas and Nays, which demand was sustained by the Constitutional number. The Clerk proceeded to call the roll and the question, Shall the resolution be amended as recommended by the committee on Health Care was decided in the affirmative. Yeas, 92. Nays, 45.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Ancel of Calais	Head of South Burlington	Moran of Wardsboro
Andrews of Rutland City	Heath of Westford	Mrowicki of Putney
Aswad of Burlington	Hooper of Montpelier	Nease of Johnson
Atkins of Winooski	Howard of Rutland City	Nuovo of Middlebury
Bissonnette of Winooski	Jerman of Essex	O'Brien of Richmond
Bohi of Hartford	Jewett of Ripton	Obuchowski of Rockingham
Botzow of Pownal	Johnson of South Hero	Partridge of Windham
Bray of New Haven	Keenan of St. Albans City	Pellett of Chester
Browning of Arlington	Kitzmillier of Montpelier	Peltz of Woodbury
Burke of Brattleboro	Klein of East Montpelier	Poirier of Barre City
Cheney of Norwich	Krebs of South Hero	Potter of Clarendon
Clarkson of Woodstock	Lanpher of Vergennes	Pugh of South Burlington
Consejo of Sheldon	Larson of Burlington	Ram of Burlington
Copeland-Hanzas of Bradford	Lenes of Shelburne	Rodgers of Glover
Corcoran of Bennington	Leriche of Hardwick	Shand of Weathersfield
Courcelle of Rutland City	Lippert of Hinesburg	Sharpe of Bristol
Deen of Westminster	Lorber of Burlington	Smith of Mendon
Donahue of Northfield *	Macaig of Williston	South of St. Johnsbury
Donovan of Burlington	Maier of Middlebury	Stevens of Waterbury
Edwards of Brattleboro	Malcolm of Pawlet	Stevens of Shoreham
Emmons of Springfield	Manwaring of Wilmington	Sweaney of Windsor
Evans of Essex	Marek of Newfane	Taylor of Barre City
Fisher of Lincoln	Martin of Springfield	Till of Jericho
Frank of Underhill	Martin of Wolcott	Toll of Danville
French of Shrewsbury	Masland of Thetford	Townsend of Randolph
French of Randolph	McCullough of Williston	Webb of Shelburne
Gilbert of Fairfax	Milkey of Brattleboro	Weston of Burlington
Grad of Moretown	Miller of Shaftsbury	Wheeler of Derby
Greshin of Warren	Minter of Waterbury	Wilson of Manchester
Haas of Rochester	Mitchell of Barnard	Young of St. Albans City
	Mook of Bennington	Zuckerman of Burlington *

Those who voted in the negative are:

Acinapura of Brandon	Hubert of Milton	Myers of Essex
Adams of Hartland	Johnson of Canaan	O'Donnell of Vernon
Baker of West Rutland	Kilmartin of Newport City *	Olsen of Jamaica
Branagan of Georgia	Koch of Barre Town *	Pearce of Richford
Brennan of Colchester	Komline of Dorset	Peaslee of Guildhall
Canfield of Fair Haven	Krawczyk of Bennington	Perley of Enosburg
Clerkin of Hartford	Larocque of Barnet	Reis of St. Johnsbury
Devereux of Mount Holly	Lawrence of Lyndon	Savage of Swanton
Dickinson of St. Albans Town	Lewis of Derby	Scheuermann of Stowe *
Donaghy of Poultney	Marcotte of Coventry	Shaw of Pittsford
Fagan of Rutland City	McAllister of Highgate	Turner of Milton
Helm of Castleton	McDonald of Berlin	Waite-Simpson of Essex
Higley of Lowell	McFaun of Barre Town *	Winters of Williamstown
Howard of Cambridge	McNeil of Rutland Town	Wright of Burlington *
Howrigan of Fairfield	Morley of Barton	
	Morrissey of Bennington	

Those members absent with leave of the House and not voting are:

Ainsworth of Royalton	Conquest of Newbury	Orr of Charlotte
Audette of South Burlington	Crawford of Burke	Spengler of Colchester
Clark of Vergennes	Davis of Washington	Wizowaty of Burlington
Condon of Colchester	Geier of South Burlington	Zenie of Colchester

Rep. Donahue of Northfield explained her vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

If we cannot be assured of safeguarding even our most fundamental consumer protections, then we should not be silent on federal law that may offer only some of those protections through pre-emption of Vermont law.”

Rep. Kilmartin of Newport City explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

No, this resolution would deny me fundamental liberty over the control of my own body and health choices. It proposes economic and personal enslavement to the government plantation of slavery. I want to choose my health care and the means of paying for it. I will not violate that right for myself, but most of all for my fellow citizens for who, I have taken an oath to protect and defend their fundamental rights and liberties.”

Rep. Koch of Barre Town explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

We've just spent an hour proving what we already knew. Republicans favor interstate sale of health insurance, and Democrats don't. Unfortunately,

they're probably not making any greater progress at today's gabfest in Washington.”

Rep. McFaun of Barre Town explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

I voted no because I want to preserve my right and the right of all residents of Vermont to purchase health insurance from wherever we want to. We just passed a resolution urging Congress not to allow me and all residents of the State of Vermont to purchase health insurance from another state if I so choose.”

Rep. Scheuermann of Stowe explained her vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

The answer here is not to isolate ourselves from the rest of the nation. That will only serve up poorly. My hope is that the federal government will allow the purchase of health insurance across state lines while maintaining the integrity of our system with regard to consumer protections, and extending those nationwide.”

Rep. Wright of Burlington explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

This resolution was the wrong message at the wrong time. Just as the President and Congress try to find common ground, we pass a divided resolution along party lines. A resolution that was unable to gain support from across the political spectrum, was clearly the wrong message to send.”

Rep. Zuckerman of Burlington explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

I would rather we pass a resolution in the affirmative for a national public option bill. But, at least we could have merged the best of both versions; the previous amendments resolved clauses and the committee amendments whereas clauses, but we let partisanship get in the way.”

Joint Resolution Adopted

J.R.S. 51

Joint resolution, entitled

Joint resolution providing for a Joint Assembly to vote on the retention of two Superior Judges and one Environmental Judge.

Was taken up and adopted on the part of the House.

**Committee Relieved of Consideration
and Bill Placed on Calendar for Notice**

H. 578

Rep. Heath of Westford moved that the committee on Appropriations be relieved of House bill entitled

An act relating to requiring all state law enforcement officers to serve under the direction and control of the commissioner of public safety

Which was agreed to. Thereupon, under the rule, the bill was placed on the Calendar for notice tomorrow.

Message from the Senate No. 17

A message was received from the Senate by Mr. Marshall, its Assistant Secretary, as follows:

Mr. Speaker:

I am directed to inform the House that:

The Senate has on its part passed Senate bills of the following titles:

S. 150. An act relating to parking reserved for disabled persons.

S. 255. An act relating to an amendment to the charter of the Chittenden County Transportation Authority.

S. 268. An act relating to the building bright futures council.

In the passage of which the concurrence of the House is requested.

The Senate has considered a bill originating in the House of the following title:

H. 517. An act relating to approval of an amendment to the charter of the Village of Enosburg Falls.

And has passed the same in concurrence.

The Senate has on its part adopted joint resolution of the following title:

J.R.S. 50. Joint resolution urging expedited federal initiation of the National Environmental Policy Act process relating to the proposed federal acquisition of Eagle Point Farm in Derby, Vermont.

In the adoption of which the concurrence of the House is requested.

The Governor has informed the Senate that on February 24, 2010, he approved and signed a bill originating in the Senate of the following title:

S. 163. An act relating to technical corrections to 2009 sex offender legislation.

The Governor has informed the Senate that on February 25, 2010, he approved and signed a bill originating in the Senate of the following title:

S. 286. An act relating to challenges for change.

Message from Governor

A message was received from His Excellency, the Governor, by Mr. David M. Coriell, Secretary of Civil and Military Affairs, as follows:

Mr. Speaker:

I am directed by the Governor to inform the House that on the twenty-fifth day of February, 2010, he approved and signed a bill originating in the House of the following title:

H. 534 An act relating to fiscal year 2010 budget adjustment

Adjournment

At three o'clock and five minutes in the afternoon, on motion of **Rep. Komline of Dorset**, the House adjourned until tomorrow at nine o'clock and thirty minutes in the forenoon.