

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 Fifth

Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1971

KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Thursday, April 8, 1971

The House met according to adjournment and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Ondon Stairs of Augusta.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

Order Out of Order

Mr. Shaw of Chelsea presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that John H. Miller of Damariscotta, and Scott Oakley of Hallowell be appointed to serve as Honorary Pages for today.

The Order was received out of order by unanimous consent, read and passed.

Papers from the Senate

From the Senate:

Bill "An Act relating to Maine Department, The American Legion" (S. P. 536) (L. D. 1616)

Came from the Senate referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs.

In the House, referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs in concurrence.

Reports of Committees**Ought to Pass in New Draft**

Report of the Committee on Fisheries and Wildlife on Bill "An Act relating to Open Season on Sable (Marten) and Fisher" (S. P. 220) (L. D. 666) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 535) (L. D. 1579) under title of "An Act relating to Open Season on Fisher" and that it "Ought to pass".

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the New Draft passed to be engrossed.

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence, the New Draft read twice and tomorrow assigned.

Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment

Report of the Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act Increasing Compensation of Members of the Maine Insurance Advisory Board" (S. P. 131) (L. D. 343) reporting "Ought to pass"

as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence and the Bill read twice. Committee Amendment "A" (S-64) was read by the Clerk and adopted in concurrence, and tomorrow assigned for third reading of the Bill.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Fisheries and Wildlife reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to a Game Warden for the Penobscot Indian Reservation" (S. P. 349) (L. D. 1049)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. ANDERSON of Hancock
HOFFSES of Knox

— of the Senate.

Messrs. MANCHESTER

of Mechanic Falls

KELLEY of Southport

LEWIN of Augusta

LEWIS of Bristol

PARKS of Presque Isle

BOURGOIN of Fort Kent

PORTER of Lincoln

CALL of Lewiston

BUNKER of Gouldsboro

KELLEY of Machias

— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. BERNARD

of Androscoggin

— of the Senate.

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted.

In the House: Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Lewin of Augusta, the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted in concurrence.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Charitable Organiza-

tions' Immunity in Civil Actions" (S. P. 224) (L. D. 670)

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. QUINN of Penobscot
— of the Senate.
Messrs. HEWES of Cape Elizabeth
CARRIER of Westbrook
Mrs. BAKER of Orrington
Mrs. WHITE of Guilford
Mr. PAGE of Fryeburg
Mrs. WHEELER of Portland
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. TANOUS of Penobscot
HARDING of Aroostook
— of the Senate.
Messrs. LUND of Augusta
KELLEY of Caribou
HENLEY of Norway
ORESTIS of Lewiston
— of the House.

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted.

In the House: Reports were read. On motion of Mr. Hewes of Cape Elizabeth, the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted in concurrence.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Fisheries and Wildlife reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Use of Duck Blinds on Penobscot Reservation Lands" (S. P. 350) (L. D. 1050)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. ANDERSON of Hancock
HOFFSES of Knox
— of the Senate.
Messrs. MANCHESTER
of Mechanic Falls
KELLEY of Southport
LEWIS of Bristol
PARKS of Presque Isle
BOURGOIN of Fort Kent
PORTER of Lincoln
CALL of Lewiston
BUNKER of Gouldsboro
KELLEY of Machias
LEWIN of Augusta
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. BERNARD

of Androscoggin
— of the Senate.

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted.

In the House: Reports were read. On motion of Mr. Lewin of Augusta, the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted in concurrence.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Governmental Immunity in Civil Actions" (S. P. 225) (L. D. 671)

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. QUINN of Penobscot
— of the Senate.
Messrs. HEWES of Cape Elizabeth
CARRIER of Westbrook
Mrs. BAKER of Orrington
Mrs. WHITE of Guilford
Mr. PAGE of Fryeburg
Mrs. WHEELER of Portland
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. TANOUS of Penobscot
HARDING of Aroostook
— of the Senate.
Messrs. LUND of Augusta
KELLEY of Caribou
HENLEY of Norway
ORESTIS of Lewiston
— of the House.

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted.

In the House: Reports were read. On motion of Mr. Hewes of Cape Elizabeth, the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted in concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Authorize a Food Stamp Program for Piscataquis County" (H. P. 1143) (L. D. 1584) which was referred to the Committee on County Government in the House on March 17.

Came from the Senate referred to the Committee on Health and Institutional Services in non-concurrence.

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Reimbursements for Professional Credits of Teachers" (H. P. 1220) (L. D. 1411) which was indefinitely postponed in the House on April 2.

Came from the Senate passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognize the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson.

Mr. SIMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson moves that we recede and concur.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Speaking in my individual capacity as a legislator I hope that you will defeat the motion to recede and concur. As you recall, earlier this week, or at the end of last week, we defeated the bill by 100 votes to some 20 votes, and I would hope that if this motion is defeated that the motion to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference would be made so that perhaps the problems with this bill could be worked out and then we could perhaps get the bill finally passed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will order a vote. All in favor or receding and concurring will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

24 having voted in the affirmative and 90 having voted in the negative, the motion to recede and concur did not prevail.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Martin of Eagle Lake, the House voted to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

Orders

Mrs. Payson of Falmouth presented the following Joint Order and moved its passage:

WHEREAS, the provision and availability of health care is obviously dependent on health manpower and manpower licensure affects the problems of supply, quality, geographic distribution, and use of personnel; and

WHEREAS, the shortage of health manpower, coupled with in-

creased requirements for health care services, has resulted in a galaxy of new occupational titles; and

WHEREAS, it is estimated that nearly 200 such health occupations now exist and that there will be 20 to 25 supportive personnel for each physician in 1975; and

WHEREAS, it is recognized that needs exist to foster the growth and contribution of the various allied health personnel, to ensure high quality patient care and safety through careful employee preparation and performance and to allow employers to flexibly utilize existing manpower; and

WHEREAS, it appears that the licensing of additional health care occupations may fractionalize further the provision of health services, impede job advancement for employees and hinder management in utilizing new knowledge and technological advances; and

WHEREAS, the furtherance of health care services depends on a more unified approach for preparing, developing and using manpower in a safe and flexible manner; and

WHEREAS, no objective study of licensure and regulatory laws having an effect on health manpower utilization in Maine has ever been conducted by the Legislative Research Committee or by any other objective group representing the welfare of the people; and

WHEREAS, it is the responsibility of the Maine Legislature through the passage of legislation to protect the welfare of its citizens and to protect and promote the effective and safe utilization of health care personnel; now, therefore, be it

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee is directed to conduct a detailed review of all state laws and regulations that relate to utilization of health manpower; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Legislative Research Committee shall report its findings and conclusions, together with any proposed legislation bearing upon the subject of this Order to the next regular session of the Legislature. (H. P. 1262)

The Joint Order received passage and was sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dixmont, Mr. Millett.

Mr. MILLETT: Mr. Speaker, I would inquire if the House is in possession of Senate Paper 420, L. D. 1235, Bill "An Act relating to Discrimination under the Personnel Law Because of Age."

The SPEAKER: The answer is in the affirmative.

Mr. MILLETT: Mr. Speaker, I move that we reconsider our action of yesterday whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Dixmont, Mr. Millett now moves that the House reconsider its action of yesterday whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed. Is it the pleasure of the House to reconsider?

(Cry of "No")

All in favor of reconsideration will answer aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being doubted by the Chair, a vote of the House was taken.

80 having voted in the affirmative and 47 having voted in the negative, the motion to reconsider did prevail.

Whereupon, on motion of Mr. Millett of Dixmont, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and tomorrow assigned.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Marsh.

Mr. MARSH: Mr. Speaker, is the House in possession of L. D. 728?

The SPEAKER: The answer is in the affirmative, House Paper 552, L. D. 728, Bill "An Act Revising the Laws Relating to Licensed Small Loan Agencies, which was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" as of yesterday, is in possession of the House.

Mr. MARSH: Mr. Speaker, I move that we reconsider our action of yesterday whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Marsh, now moves that the House reconsider its action of yesterday whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am opposed to the reconsideration motion. We have all heard of sad cases of people who got in trouble with certain small loan companies; as a matter of fact, one of my sons once did. But there are also very reputable companies that fulfill a need in the state and action which was taken four years ago forced 77 of these offices to be closed.

Now even granting the fact that there has been a great increase in credit unions, if we are really interested in the poor people who don't have the security to borrow money from regular banking institutions we would support this bill, because its defeat would encourage loan sharking, which would really then be a disaster financially to people in need.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. O'BRIEN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in opposition to this motion for reconsideration and I concur with Mr. Ross of Bath. I appreciate his remarks.

After the long debate yesterday I don't want to continue this and debate it again today. I just want to point out that after the debate yesterday many people came to me and said that, "Jack, I just don't like the small loan companies." But this is not the question that is before the House. We are not debating the like or dislike of the small loan company.

Now someone presented me with some information this morning and said that in Maine there is a decrease in the bankruptcies. I agree with this. In Maine there is a decrease in the bankruptcy cases. But there is a decrease all over the country. Every state in the union has a decrease in bankruptcies. So they can't attribute it to the fact that they put this terrible restriction on the small loan companies; they can't say this is why there is a decrease in bankruptcies in the State of Maine.

I hope that you will defeat this motion to reconsider and continue in support of the committee that

unanimously voted ought to pass. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: One of the reasons why we have asked for reconsideration of this measure this morning is that yesterday as you recall we had a very close vote on it. There was also a snowstorm yesterday morning and several people couldn't make it up here, several people that I think ought to be voting on this issue, an issue as important to the people of the State of Maine as this one is. And we also had several people that were doing other things, were just unable to make it.

The basic issue here in the state is not whether we like small loan companies or don't like small loan companies. The basic issue is, are we going to allow this State of Maine to be subject once again to the practice of what we call flipping? We explained this term yesterday, but it simply amounts to allowing endless loans refinanced at very very high interest rates, in excess of 25 or 30 per cent. If we eliminate the flipping clause and we sustain the action of the 103rd Legislature and say that three years are enough to soak the people of Maine at 25 or 30 per cent interest, I think we will have done a service to the people of the State of Maine.

But I would also like to point out that I believe that the arguments that are being presented here on the opposite side are somewhat misleading. Because this was voted in the 103rd Legislature, the loans that were then in effect, only in 1970, are now out of effect and the small loan companies were coming back before full effect of this measure was felt on them, asking for repeals. As a matter of fact someone told me the other day — and I couldn't verify it, I didn't try, that they were back in the same session of the Legislature asking for repealing of this 36 month rule.

So I just hope that this Legislature today will vote to sustain the good work and the hard work of past legislatures. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. McTeague.

Mr. McTEAGUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It strikes me that there have been many things said on both sides regarding this question of flipping in the bill before us, and there are two things that I thought stood out among all the others.

The first is a statement from our Banking Commissioner indicating — and this is a quotation from him, "indicating that the reduction of their loans is catastrophic"; that is the reduction of the loans of small loan companies. He says, "It is true that there is a large reduction in the total of their loans but that does not necessarily indicate that the public is suffering from an inability to obtain loans. Other sources are available and it is amazing to see the great increase in credit union loans in comparative periods.

"From December 31, 1966 to December 31, 1969 loans of small loan companies decreased \$11,000,000.

"During this same period credit unions in Maine increased their loans by \$29,750,000.

"During 1970 it is estimated that credit unions increased their loans by an additional \$13,000,000.

"These figures seem to prove that consumers are properly provided with credit even with the decrease in small loan companies and the consumer has the advantage of much lower interest rates."

I also would like to bring to the attention of the members of the House a letter from Richard E. Poulos, who is the Referee in Bankruptcy in the United States District Court, regarding his experience on the flipping problem and the effect of doing away with flipping.

This is a letter from Referee Poulos to another member of the legislature and that member was kind enough to provide me with a copy of the letter.

"UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MAINE
PORTLAND, MAINE

April 6, 1971

This letter is in response to your inquiry as to whether the 1967 revisions to the Maine Small Loan Law have had a noticeable impact on the volume of cases filed by consumers under the Federal Bankruptcy Act. Based upon a comparison of current statistics to our past experience, both statewide and nationally, there can be no doubt about the beneficial effect of this historic legislation.

A review of the statistics discloses that the volume of bankruptcy proceedings in Maine is 20 per cent less today than it was in 1967. A comparison with our national experience is even more impressive. Prior to 1967, Maine was consistently 6 per cent to 8 per cent ahead of the national average of new proceedings. Since then, Maine has been consistently lower. More significantly, our volume for the last 8 months is down 13 per cent in comparison to the corresponding period last year, at a time when the national volume has increased by over 10 per cent because of the current business slump.

This is a very encouraging change in direction, to the benefit of both Maine debtors and their creditors. It is significant that it occurred immediately after the enactment of legislation designed to protect consumers against excessive costs and other abuses committed by small loan lenders. Obviously, for this reason, this legislation must be considered as being one of the principal contributing factors to this remarkable development.

As you know, one of the key provisions of this legislation requires the reduction of interest to 8 per cent if a small loan is not completely paid after the expiration of 36 months from the date of the original transaction. In my opinion, the retention of this provision as originally enacted will assure a continuance of the favorable trend in the reduction of bankruptcy proceedings. For this reason alone, I think it would be a serious error to nullify this meritorious provision by passing L.

D. 728 as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

Very truly yours,
Richard E. Poulos
Referee in Bankruptcy"

Mr. Speaker, when the vote is taken I ask that it be by roll call.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is reconsideration. The yeas and nays have been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All members desiring a roll call vote on this matter 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 pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Marsh, that the House reconsider its action of yesterday where Bill "An Act Revising the Laws Relating to Licensed Small Loan Agencies," House Paper 552, L. D. 728, was passed to be engrossed. If you are in favor of reconsideration you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Albert, Baker, Bernier, Berry, P. P.; Berube, Bourgoin, Bunker, Bustin, Call, Carrier, Carter, Churchill, Collins, Conley, Cooney, Curren, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Cyr, Dow, Emery, D. F.; Farrington, Finemore, Fraser, Gauthier, Genest, Goodwin, Haskell, Herrick, Hewes, Jutras, Kelley, P. S.; Kilroy, Lawry, Lebel, Lucas, Lund, Lynch, MacLeod, Mahany, Manchester, Marsh, Marsteller, Martin, McCloskey, McNally, McTeague, Millett, Mills, Morrell, Mosher, Murray, Orestis, Page, Parks, Simpson, T. R.; Smith, D. M.; Susi, Tyndale, Vincent, Webber, Wheeler, White, Whitson, Wood, M. E.

NAY — Ault, Bailey, Barnes, Bartlett, Bedard, Berry, G. W.; Binnette, Birt, Bither, Boudreau, Bragdon, Brawn, Brown, Carey, Clark, Clemente, Cote, Cottrell, Crosby, Curtis, A. P.; Donaghy, Drigotas, Dudley, Emery, E. M.; Evans, Fecteau, Gagnon, Gill, Hall,

Hancock, Hardy, Hawkens, Hayes, Henley, Hodgdon, Immonen, JAlbert, Kelleher, Kelley, K. F.; Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Lee, Lessard, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Littlefield, Lizotte, Maddox, McCormick, McKinnon, Norris, O'Brien, Payson, Pontbriand, Porter, Pratt, Rand, Rocheleau, Rollins, Ross, Santoro, Scott, Shaw, Shute, Simpson, L. E.; Slane, Stillings, Tanguay, Theriault, Trask, Williams, Wood, M. W.; Woodbury.

ABSENT — Cummings, Dam, Doyle, Dyar, Faucher, Good, Hanson, Sheltra, Silverman, Smith, E. H.; Starbird, Wight.

Yes, 64; No, 74; Absent, 12.

The SPEAKER: Sixty-four having voted in the affirmative, seventy-four in the negative, with twelve being absent, the motion does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gouldsboro, Mr. Bunker.

Mr. BUNKER: Mr. Speaker, is the House in possession of L. D. 65, the Election Laws bill?

The SPEAKER: Senate Paper 32, L. D. 65, Report of the Committee on Election Laws on Bill "An Act relating to the Number of Signatures Required on Nomination Papers," reporting Leave to Withdraw, accepted as of yesterday, is in the possession of the House.

Mr. BUNKER: Mr. Speaker, I would ask reconsideration whereby we accepted the Committee Report of Leave to Withdraw.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Gouldsboro, Mr. Bunker moves that the House reconsider its action of yesterday.

Whereupon, on motion of Mr. Bunker of Gouldsboro, tabled pending his motion to reconsider and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 13.

On motion of Mr. Porter of Lincoln, it was

ORDERED, that Mr. Smith of Waterville be excused from attendance for the duration of the week because of illness in the family.

House Reports of Committees Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Lessard from the Committee on Health and Institutional Ser-

vices reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Involuntary Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill" (H. P. 649) (L. D. 880)

In accordance with Joint Rule 17-A, was placed in the legislative files and sent to the Senate.

Referred to Committee on Legal Affairs

Mrs. Brown from the Committee on Natural Resources on Bill "An Act Creating the Cobbossee-Annabessacook Authority" (H. P. 786) (L. D. 1062) reported that it be referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs.

Report was read and accepted, the Bill referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs and sent up for concurrence.

Ought to Pass in New Draft New Draft Printed Passed to Be Engrossed

Mr. Kelleher from the Committee on County Government on Bill "An Act Increasing Funds for Lincoln County Court House Capital Improvements" (H. P. 555) (L. D. 731) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1261) (L. D. 1644) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was read and accepted and the New Draft read twice.

Under suspension of the rules, the New Draft was given its third reading, passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

Ought to Pass Printed Bill

Mr. Bernier from the Committee on County Government reported "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Uniforms for Full-time Deputy Sheriffs" (H. P. 839) (L. D. 1151)

Report was read and accepted, the Bill read twice and tomorrow assigned.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Health and Institutional Services reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Holding Examinations to Practice Barbering" (H. P. 266) (L. D. 355)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. MINKOWSKY
of Androscoggin
GREELEY of Waldo
HICHENS of York
— of the Senate.

Mrs. PAYSON of Falmouth
Mrs. McCORMICK of Union
Messrs. CLEMENTE of Portland
LEWIS of Bristol
Mrs. BERRY of Madison
Mr. SANTORO of Portland
Mrs. CUMMINGS of Newport
Messrs. LESSARD of Lisbon
DYAR of Strong
— of the House.

Minority Report of same
Committee reporting "Ought not to
pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the follow-
ing member:

Mrs. DOYLE of Bangor
— of the House.

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair
recognizes the gentlewoman from
Falmouth, Mrs. Payson.

Mrs. PAYSON: Mr. Speaker, I
move that the Majority Report of
the Committee "Ought not to pass"
be accepted.

Whereupon, Mr. Emery of Rock-
land requested a division.

The SPEAKER: A vote has been
requested on the motion. All in
favor of accepting the Majority
"Ought not to pass" Report will
vote yes; those opposed will vote
no.

A vote of the House was taken.

82 having voted in the affirmative
and 9 having voted in the
negative the motion did prevail.

Sent up for concurrence.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Commit-
tee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act
relating to Interest Allowed in Civil
Actions" (H. P. 197) (L. D. 253)
reporting same in a new draft (H.
P. 1260) (L. D. 1643) under same
title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the follow-
ing members:

Messrs. QUINN of Penobscot
HARDING of Aroostook
TANOUS of Penobscot
— of the Senate.
Mrs. WHEELER of Portland
Messrs. PAGE of Fryeburg
KELLEY of Caribou
Mrs. WHITE of Guilford
Mr. ORESTIS of Lewiston

Mrs. BAKER of Orrington
Messrs. LUND of Augusta
CARRIER of Westbrook
HENLEY of Norway
— of the House.

Minority Report of same
Committee reporting "Ought not to
pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the follow-
ing member:

Mr. HEWES
of Cape Elizabeth
— of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Orestis of
Lewiston, the Majority "Ought to
pass" Report was accepted.

The New Draft was read twice
and tomorrow assigned.

Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Commit-
tee on Judiciary reporting "Ought
not to pass" on Bill "An Act
Providing for Records of Sales of
Used Merchandise" (H. P. 490) (L.
D. 631)

Report was signed by the follow-
ing members:

Messrs. TANOUS of Penobscot
HARDING of Aroostook
QUINN of Penobscot
— of the Senate.

Mrs. WHEELER of Portland
Messrs. HENLEY of Norway
HEWES of Cape Elizabeth
CARRIER of Westbrook
Mrs. WHITE of Guilford
Messrs. KELLEY of Caribou
ORESTIS of Lewiston
— of the House.

Minority Report of same
Committee on same Bill reporting
"Ought to pass" as amended by
Committee Amendment "A"
submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the follow-
ing members:

Mr. LUND of Augusta
Mrs. BAKER of Orrington
Mr. PAGE of Fryeburg
— of the House.

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair
recognizes the gentleman from
Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Hewes.

Mr. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, I
move that we accept the Majority
"Ought not to pass" Report.

Whereupon, on motion of Mr.
Carter of Winslow, tabled pending
the motion of Mr. Hewes of Cape

Elizabeth to accept the Majority Report and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 13.

Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Providing for Law Research Clerks for the Judiciary" (H. P. 768) (L. D. 1034)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. TANOUS of Penobscot
QUINN of Penobscot
— of the Senate.
Mrs. WHEELER of Portland
Messrs. HENLEY of Norway
PAGE of Fryeburg
Mrs. WHITE of Guilford
Messrs. LUND of Augusta
CARRIER of Westbrook
Mrs. BAKER of Orrington
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee on same Bill reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. HARDING of Aroostook
— of the Senate.
Messrs. ORESTIS of Lewiston
HEWES of Cape Elizabeth
KELLEY of Caribou
— of the House.

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Orrington, Mrs. Baker.

Mrs. BAKER: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report.

Whereupon, on motion of Mr. Martin of Eagle Lake, tabled pending the motion of Mrs. Baker of Orrington to accept the Majority Report and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 13.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to Mental Illness as a Ground for Divorce" (H. P. 883) (L. D. 1204) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. HARDING of Aroostook
— of the Senate.
Mr. HEWES of Cape Elizabeth
Mrs. BAKER of Orrington
Mr. ORESTIS of Lewiston
Mrs. WHITE of Guilford
Messrs. LUND of Augusta
KELLEY of Caribou
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought not to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. TANOUS of Penobscot
QUINN of Penobscot
— of the Senate.
Messrs. CARRIER of Westbrook
HENLEY of Norway
PAGE of Fryeburg
Mrs. WHEELER of Portland
— of the House.

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Hewes.

Mr. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, I move that we accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

Mr. Gauthier of Sanford moved that the matter be tabled for two legislative days.

Whereupon, Mr. Finemore of Bridgewater requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Gauthier, moves that L. D. 1204 be tabled and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 13, pending the motion of the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Hewes, that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

A division has been requested on the tabling motion. All in favor of this matter being tabled will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

51 having voted in the affirmative and 75 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted and the Bill was read twice.

Committee Amendment "A" (H-117) was read by the Clerk and adopted and the Bill assigned for third reading tomorrow.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to Provide for Forfeiture of Vehicles Used to Transport Narcotics" (H. P. 911) (L. D. 1256)

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. HARDING of Aroostook
— of the Senate.
Messrs. CARRIER of Westbrook
LUND of Augusta
ORESTIS of Lewiston
HENLEY of Norway
Mrs. WHEELER of Portland
Mr. KELLEY of Caribou
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee on same Bill reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. TANOUS of Penobscot
QUINN of Penobscot
— of the Senate.
Mr. HEWES of Cape Elizabeth
Mrs. BAKER of Orrington
Mrs. WHITE of Guilford
Mr. PAGE of Fryeburg
— of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Lund of Augusta, the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

**Divided Report
Tabled and Assigned**

Majority Report of the Committee on Labor reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Size and Construction of Railroad Caboose Cars" (H. P. 348) (L. D. 457)

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. TANOUS of Penobscot
— of the Senate.
Mr. GOOD of Westfield
Mrs. LINCOLN of Bethel
Messrs. LEE of Albion
KELLEY of Machias
ROLLINS of Dixfield
SIMPSON of Millinocket
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee on same Bill reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. MARCOTTE of York
LEVINE of Kennebec
— of the Senate.
Messrs. McTEAGUE of Brunswick
BUSTIN of Augusta
BEDARD of Saco
GENEST of Waterville
— of the House.

Reports were read.

(On motion of Mr. Good of Westfield, tabled pending acceptance of either Report and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 13.)

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act to Amend the Municipal Public Employees Labor Relations Law" (H. P. 420) (L. D. 547) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. TANOUS of Penobscot
MARCOTTE of York
LEVINE of Kennebec
— of the Senate.
Messrs. GOOD of Westfield
SIMPSON of Millinocket
BEDARD of Saco
GENEST of Waterville
McTEAGUE of Brunswick
BUSTIN of Augusta
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee on same Bill reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "B" submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. KELLEY of Machias
LEE of Albion
ROLLINS of Dixfield
Mrs. LINCOLN of Bethel
— of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Good of Westfield, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted.

The Bill was given its two several readings.

Committee Amendment "A" (H-120) was read by the Clerk and adopted and the Bill assigned for third reading tomorrow.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act relating to Proof of Financial Responsibility under

Financial Responsibility Law" (S. P. 402) (L. D. 1176)

Bill "An Act relating to Return of Deposit for Security under Financial Responsibility Law" (S. P. 403) (L. D. 1177)

Bill "An Act relating to Disturbing Schools" (S. P. 530) (L. D. 1547)

Bill "An Act relating to Criminal Trespass in Buildings and on Premises" (S. P. 532) (L. D. 1568)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, read the third time, passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

Third Reader Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act relating to the Rendering of Treatment and Services to Minors for Drug Abuse Without Parental Consent" (H. P. 391) (L. D. 506)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading and read the third time.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Union, Mrs. McCormick.

Mrs. McCORMICK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table L. D. 506 for two legislative days, please.

Whereupon, Mr. Gill of South Portland requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Union, Mrs. McCormick moves that L. D. 506 be tabled and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 13, pending passage to be engrossed. A division has been requested. All in favor of this matter being tabled until Tuesday, April 13 will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken. 51 having voted in the affirmative and 69 having voted in the negative, the motion to table did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Union, Mrs. McCormick.

Mrs. McCORMICK: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As a mother of seven children, four are teenagers, I would like to oppose this bill. I was one of the committee who signed the Minority Report and as many of you know yesterday one of my daughters sat in the gallery during the session and listened to the debate on this bill. Driving home last night I asked her how she felt

about a bill of this kind, knowing that she and her friends had talked about drugs and young people on them today. She said if the members of this House wanted to help the young people on drugs they have got to notify the parents; in this way both parents and teenagers can be counseled in order to combat the drug problem.

I realize the drug problem is with us, but I do not feel that L. D. 506 as it is written is the answer to the problem, as was pointed out by the Attorney General's letter read by Mr. Dyar yesterday. Therefore, at this time then, I would like to make a motion that this bill and all of its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentlewoman from Union, that L. D. 506 be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Gill.

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This document was debated yesterday to quite an extent. I would like to concur with the lady, but I have no question but what in her own family that her children would be more than pleased to go and talk over their problems with their mother. I would like to think that my children would be.

But the crux of this matter is that this primarily is for emergency treatment of these things. This is the time when a child's life can be determined, whether he live or die. This is not a situation by which a physician is going to continually keep the knowledge from the parent because they are wise enough to know that in the majority of these cases these problems are related to the parent.

Let us just imagine a young person has been experimenting with drugs. He has a bad reaction. He has a choice of what to do. He isn't able to think in a rational manner, number one. So therefore he doesn't want to go home and tell his mother and father, particularly at the age we are. We are apt to fly off the handle. I never did a thing like that when I was a youngster, only because we didn't think of it. What we did perhaps was

worse. But this primary thing, this is going to save some lives at a time when it has got to be determined, the action has got to be taken right away. I did not get the connotation from the statement of Courtland Perry that he did not think his bill would accomplish what we intended it to.

So, therefore, I would appreciate it if you would continue to support this legislative document. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Mills.

Mr. MILLS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: I was not too familiar with this the other day, but last night I made some phone calls. Now this bill of rendering service to minors for drug abuse without parental control was called to my attention. This applies to people who would be less than eighteen years of age under our new changes of responsibility.

I could say a lot more on this thing, but I am going to support the lady from Union, Mrs. McCormick.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Santoro.

Mr. SANTORO: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I don't go along with the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Gill in regard to emergency treatments. Emergency treatment is on the books now, and people can be treated regardless of parents' consent or not as far as an emergency is concerned. This bill is a delicate bill, something on which we have to make a decision, not in a jam but with plenty of time for consideration.

I voted for the bill to protect the medical doctors when they treat some of these cases in a hurry without getting hold of the family to which these children belong. But I hope in a day or two to put an amendment on this bill which will make the bill very palatable for everybody. So I wish that someone would table the bill for a couple of days.

Whereupon, Mr. Hancock of Casco moved that the matter be tabled for two legislative days.

Mr. Carrier of Westbrook requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Casco, Mr. Hancock moves that L. D. 506 be tabled and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 13, pending the motion of the gentlewoman from Union, Mrs. McCormick that it be indefinitely postponed. A division has been requested. All in favor of this matter being tabled will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

109 having voted in the affirmative and 22 having voted in the negative, the motion to table did prevail.

Third Reader Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act Reclassifying the Waters of Lake Auburn and Little Wilson Pond, Androscoggin County" (H. P. 606) (L. D. 808)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading and read the third time.

Mr. Vincent of Portland offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" (H-122) was read by the Clerk.

Whereupon, Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston moved that the matter be tabled for two legislative days.

Mr. Mosher of Gorham requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, moves that L. D. 808 be tabled and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 13, pending the adoption of House Amendment "A". A division has been requested. All in favor of the motion to table will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

73 having voted in the affirmative and 44 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

Bill "An Act to Authorize Pollution-control Facilities to Be Financed by the Issue of Revenue Obligation Securities under the Municipal Industrial and Recreation Obligations Act" (H. P. 1259) (L. D. 1618)

Resolve Appropriating Funds to Prevent Sawdust Pollution at South Branch Lake and Saponac Pond in Penobscot County (H. P. 894) (L. D. 1214)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, Bills read the third time, Resolve read the second time, all passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

Amended Bills

Bill "An Act to Create the Maine Historic Preservation Commission" (S. P. 159) (L. D. 428)

Bill "An Act Increasing Fees of Witnesses in the Courts and Relating to Expert Witness Fees as Court Costs" (S. P. 228) (L. D. 674)

Bill "An Act relating to Meetings, Chairman and Employees of Board of Commissioners of the Profession of Pharmacy" (H. P. 454) (L. D. 609)

Bill "An Act to Provide for Administrative Enforcement of the Municipal Public Employees Labor Relations Law" (H. P. 600) (L. D. 801)

Bill "An Act relating to Sale Price of Liquor" (H. P. 856) (L. D. 1181)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, read the third time, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

Bill "An Act relating to Disposition of Portion of Fees Collected by Maine State Park and Recreation Commission" (S. P. 20) (L. D. 48)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, read the third time, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and Senate Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

Passed to Be Enacted Emergency Measure

An Act relating to Trapping Muskrats (S. P. 174) (L. D. 526)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 124 voted in favor of same and 4 against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act relating to Payment of Expenses of Supreme Judicial Court and the Superior Court by the State (S. P. 524) (L. D. 1519)

An Act relating to Retirement Benefits for Forest Rangers under State Retirement System (H. P. 318) (L. D. 418)

An Act relating to Reimbursement Rates for Transportation and Special Educational Expenditures (H. P. 587) (L. D. 782)

An Act relating to a Transfer of Municipalities from One School Administrative District to Another (H. P. 1235) (L. D. 1521)

An Act relating to Approval of Schools Enrolling Out-of-State Students (H. P. 1236) (L. D. 1522)

Finally Passed

Resolve Designating Part of Route 219 as a State Highway (H. P. 283) (L. D. 372)

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

Orders of the Day

The Chair laid before the House the first tabled and today assigned matter:

An Act Continuing the Maine Cultural Building Authority (S. P. 348) (L. D. 1016)

Tabled — April 6, by Mr. Birt of East Millinocket.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Curtis of Bowdoinham to reconsider failure of passage to be enacted.

Mr. Birt of East Millinocket moved that the matter be tabled for two legislative days.

Whereupon, Mr. Finemore of Bridgewater requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt moves that L. D. 1016 be tabled and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 13, pending the motion of the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis to reconsider its failure of passage to be enacted. A division has been requested. All in favor of the motion to table will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

87 having voted in the affirmative and 46 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

The Chair laid before the House the second tabled and today assigned matter:

HOUSE DIVIDED REPORT — Majority (9) "Ought not to pass" — Minority (4) "Ought to pass"— Committee on Liquor Control on Bill "An Act relating to Sale of Liquor Not to be Consumed on the Premises" (H. P. 426) (L. D. 560)

Tabled—April 6 by Mr. Stillings of Berwick.

Pending—Acceptance of either Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Stillings.

Mr. STILLINGS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Stillings moves that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Cote.

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in opposition to accepting the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report. This is my bill. I am not going to make a federal case out of it. The only thing I am going to say is this. The purpose for which the bill was introduced was to keep non-licensees from selling liquor; in other words, the bootlegger. It is a well known fact in this state that the minute the liquor store closes the bootleggers take over, and that is what I am trying to stop; not to increase sales of liquor or anything like that.

I think it is about time that we took some progressive steps in trying to stop the bootleggers from profiteering. Selling liquors that are not even bought in this state, they go out of state for the liquor, bring it in, and sell it at exorbitant prices to people that are willing to pay for it. This is a service we are trying to give the people as far as selling these bottle goods. Hotels are already doing it now, if you know what the prices are

and some of you have bought some here you know what you are paying. This only costs a modest increase for the service over what the State Liquor Commission sells its liquors for, and I won't speak any more on this bill. I hope that the "Ought not to pass" Report does not prevail and if you want to keep the bootlegger in business then vote for the "Ought not to pass" Report. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Scarborough, Mr. Gagnon.

Mr. GAGNON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: To give you a few viewpoints on the majority signers on this bill. Mr. Bragdon mentioned something yesterday about the hard liquor sales coming into other stores and I think this is a little bit of it a little sooner than he expected. This would allow take-out sales in hotels, clubs, Class A restaurants; and part-time hotels, clubs and restaurants that operate on a half full-time fee.

I and the members of the majority signers felt that either the State is going to operate its state liquor stores or it should get out of the business altogether. This is simply a further encroachment and we did not feel it was necessary.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Woolwich, Mr. Bailey.

Mr. BAILEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would also like to bring to your attention the problem of enforcement. I feel that if this bill were about to become law that these clubs, hotels and other places which would be allowed to sell after hours in remote areas of the state would present a problem to the enforcement of the sales. I would hope that we could go along with the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report and, Mr. Speaker, when the vote is taken I ask that it be taken by the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Cote.

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of this House: I was not going to get up a second time to speak on this bill, but as long as

enforcement has been brought into it, I talked with one of the foremost capable men we ever had in this state in enforcement. He appeared before the Liquor Commission in support of this bill and I don't know of anyone as capable as he is, and he claims there was no problem in enforcement. That was Timothy J. Murphy.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Donaghy.

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I think probably the reason that we didn't have trouble with enforcement we had Timothy J. Murphy, and we don't have him any more. So we better not go along with the Minority Report.

The SPEAKER: The yeas and nays have been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All 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 Lewiston, Mr. Tanguay.

Mr. TANGUAY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As a signer of the Minority Report "Ought to pass" I thought I would let my views be known to you people to a certain extent. There are 191 cities and towns who have voted to have state stores in their immediate areas. These cities and towns are without these state stores, state liquor stores. This would become a service to these people who have voted to have state stores in their areas. Rather than travelling forty-five and fifty miles, or permitting a licensee to violate the law to certain personal friends and individuals who are steady customers of these Class A restaurants, hotels and clubs.

These liquors that we are talking about are already in the hands of properly licensed licensees, who are in this business not to violate the law but service to the people of the State of Maine. I don't see any

reason whatsoever why a duly licensed licensee could not be permitted to sell a bottle of liquor to individuals who would like to take it home. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Stillings, that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report on Bill "An Act relating to Sale of Liquor Not to be Consumed on the Premises," House Paper 426, L. D. 560. A roll call has been ordered. All in favor of accepting the Majority Report will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Albert, Bailey, Baker, Barnes, Bartlett, Berry, G. W.; Binnette, Birt, Bither, Bragdon, Brawn, Brown, Bunker, Bustin, Call, Carrier, Churchill, Clark, Collins, Cottrell, Cummings, Curran, Curtis, A. P.; Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Cyr, Donaghy, Drigotas, Dudley, Dyar, Emery, D. F.; Emery, E. M.; Evans, Farrington, Finemore, Gagnon, Gauthier, Good, Hall, Hardy, Haskell, Hawkens, Hayes, Henley, Herrick, Hewes, Hodgdon, Immonen, Jalbert, Kelley, K. F.; Kelley, P. S.; Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Lawry, Lee, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Littlefield, Lucas, Lund, MacLeod, Maddox, Mahany, Marsteller, McCormick, McKinnon, McNally, McTeague, Millett, Morrell, Mosher, Page, Parks, Pontbriand, Porter, Pratt, Rollins, Ross, Scott, Shaw, Shute, Simpson, L. E.; Simpson, T. R.; Starbird, Stillings, Susi, Trask, Tyndale, Webber, Wheeler, White, Wight, Williams, Wood, M. W.; Wood, M. E.; Woodbury.

NAY — Ault, Bedard, Bernier, Berry, P. P.; Berube, Carey, Carter, Clemente, Conley, Cote, Dow, Faucher, Fecteau, Fraser, Genest, Gill, Goodwin, Hancock, Jutras, Kelleher, Kilroy, Lebel, Lessard, Lizotte, Lynch, Manchester, Marsh, Martin, McCloskey, Mills, Murray, Norris, Orestis, Payson, Rand, Rocheleau, Santoro, Slane, Smith, D. M.; Tanguay, Theriault, Vincent, Whitson.

ABSENT — Boudreau, Bourgoin, Cooney, Crosby, Dam, Doyle, Hanson, O'Brien, Sheltra, Silverman, Smith, E. H.

Yes, 96; No, 43; Absent, 11.

The SPEAKER: Ninety-six having voted in the affirmative, forty-three in the negative, with eleven being absent, the motion does prevail.

Sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the third tabled and today assigned matter:

Bill "An Act relating to Compensation under Workmen's Compensation Law for Total Incapacity, Partial Incapacity and Death" (H. P. 1249) (L. D. 1570)

Tabled — April 6, by Mrs. Lincoln of Bethel.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

Thereupon, on motion of Mrs. Lincoln of Bethel, retabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 13.

The Chair laid before the House the fourth tabled and today assigned matter:

Bill "An Act relating to Duty of State Board of Education Concerning Interscholastic Activities" (H. P. 985) (L. D. 1347) — Committee Amendment "A" (H-94) adopted.

Tabled — April 6, by Mr. Millett of Dixmont.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dixmont, Mr. Millett.

Mr. MILLETT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have received correspondence from the Attorneys General and they indicate that the Committee Amendment which is presently attached to this bill contains some inconsistencies with respect to the bill itself.

For this reason, and feeling that the committee might better work out the problems which do exist, I would move that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on Education.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Dixmont, Mr. Millett moves that this matter be recommitted to the Committee on Education.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This is my measure, and I have no objection to what the gentleman from Dixmont, Mr. Millett, is doing. However, if I am going to table a bill that belongs to somebody else for these purposes, I usually would go to the sponsor and inform him of it.

Now somewhere along the line House chairmen should notify people of what they are going to do and not figure they got a first, second, and third mortgage on legislation just because it is placed before their committees.

Thereupon, the Bill was recommitted to the Committee on Education and sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the fifth tabled and today assigned matter:

Bill "An Act relating to the Color of School Buses no Longer Used for School Purposes" (S. P. 210) (L. D. 643) — In Senate, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-46) as amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-51) thereto. — In House, Committee Amendment "A" as amended by Senate Amendment "A" thereto adopted.

Tabled — April 6, by Mr. Lebel of Van Buren.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

On motion of Mr. Lebel of Van Buren, under suspension of the rules, the House reconsidered its action of April 2 whereby Committee Amendment "A" as amended by Senate Amendment "A" thereto was adopted.

On further motion of the same gentleman, under suspension of the rules, the House reconsidered its action of April 2 whereby Senate Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" was adopted. Senate Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence. Committee Amendment "A" was adopted in non-concurrence.

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

The Chair laid before the House the sixth tabled and today assigned matter:

HOUSE DIVIDED REPORT — Majority (7) "Ought to pass in new draft" — Minority (6) "Ought not to pass" — Committee on Public Utilities on Bill "An Act to Amend the Act to Prevent the Pollution of the Waters of Sebago Lake" (H. P. 201) (L. D. 268) — New Draft (H. P. 1258) (L. D. 1617) under same title.

Tabled — April 7, by Mr. Hardy of Hope.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Williams of Hodgdon to accept Minority Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Whitson.

Mr. WHITSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This is certainly a bill which is supported fully by my constituents in the Portland area. In the interest of maintaining high water quality standards for the City of Portland and surrounding communities I urge you to vote against the acceptance of the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report.

But even further, I would ask you to do this in the knowledge that the opponents may kill this bill at a later date. What rejection of the Minority Report would do would be to keep this bill alive until after an important meeting of the Portland Water District with the Cumberland County delegation which I am promised will introduce new and pertinent testimony and facts concerning this bill.

I beg your indulgence in keeping this bill alive until after this testimony is presented to the Cumberland County delegation. I further ask that when the vote is taken it be taken by the yeas and nays. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson.

Mr. SIMPSON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Probably if there is anybody in this House, or anybody acquainted with Sebago Lake who has any more feeling for the pollution of Sebago Lake or the protection of the quality of the water

of Sebago Lake it happens to be me.

I would like to remind the gentleman from Portland that there has been plenty of testimony involving this particular situation, and we don't have a situation of pollution here that we are talking about. We have just another attempt by the Portland Water District to completely close all of Sebago Lake to the use of everything, and as Mr. Williams from Hodgdon yesterday said, that it is strictly a case of public relations between the Portland Water District and the people of the Town of Standish.

This little gem dates back to the year 1913 when, on this House floor, an agreement was made between the people of Standish and the Portland Water District that a one quarter mile radius would be put into effect on Sebago Lake that would exclude swimming and so forth to protect the quality of the water.

After the hearing it was amended on the House floor and thus came the two mile limit which has been in existence since that time. In the year 1927 there was an attempt at that time to then close the entire two mile limit to the use by fishermen, boaters, and everybody else.

Now over the course of the years the Portland Water District has picked up piece by piece by piece all the shore frontage along that southern end of the lake. They have virtually put the little village of Sebago Lake completely out of existence, a village that used to be one of the most prosperous little towns in the State of Maine, having a railroad station there that was larger than Union Station in Portland.

Now during this time they have picked up this particular property they have made a so-called gentlemen's agreement with the Town of Standish that the Town of Standish would not tax it any more than what it was. Now this was years ago. Presently the Town of Standish, having the most shore frontage on Sebago Lake of any of the other towns on that particular body of water, has no access to that lake for its people

for the use of swimming and so forth.

Now over the years, as I said, the Portland Water District has continually fought that they close certain sections of Sebago Lake. Just in the matter of the last session of the Legislature there was an attempt to close a landing which we call Chadbourne's Landing. It never reached the legislature in its final form because the Town of Standish took the Portland Water District to court and won, when the Courts ruled that Chadbourne's Landing could not be closed.

I would like to talk about the question of pollution for a minute if I might. You know we can talk about pollution, and we can talk about pollution. Now if there is a threat of pollution, I think all of us are going to be in a position to want to stop pollution. But I would submit to you that this is not a threat of pollution. And in all of the testimony presented to my planning board, my town officials, by the Portland Water District and also by Mr. Monie, general manager of the Portland Water District in this hearing, that he absolutely stated that there is no pollution in this area at this particular time; that the coli count in this area is lower than it has ever been in its lifetime.

Now eight years ago there was a problem on Sebago Lake, a very serious problem on Sebago Lake that I consider to be pollution. And that was the problem of the use of DDT around Sebago Lake. And what happened? The businessmen in that area, namely the Sebago-Long Lakes Region Association took this problem under its wing, came to the right bodies in this particular city, went out and fought for this, got the use of DDT in the area stopped. And I would ask you one question. Where was the Portland Water District while this took place? They sat back and really offered us no assistance at all in the matter.

And I would submit to you that the reason why was because Mr. Monie stood before a special town meeting of the Town of Standish and he said, "You know,

if we have our way, and I have my way, I will close all of Sebago Lake to everything." And I respect the man for that particular position, because it should be his position as the general manager of the Portland Water District to maintain the purity of the water of Sebago Lake.

Now when it comes to Frye Island we will talk about a subject that really is pollution or a threat of pollution. When this Frye Island situation first came to light it was brought about because it was brought to my planning board — at that time I happened to be chairman of the planning board — and we refused to accept the plan as submitted to us by the developer. This would be a history and a story that you could write a book upon. But my planning board decided that we would put ourselves really out on a limb and take the chance of being cut off, but we refused that particular plan.

And I spent countless hours of time and money and effort out of my own pocket on behalf of my planning board to try to get the Portland Water District involved in this issue. I tried to tell them what was going on on Frye Island and what I had in my briefcase; and Mr. Monie's direct statement at that time was, "Well, we have been assured by the developer that this is going to be a minimum amount of development, and we are really not that concerned."

I came here to the Attorney General's office, the Health and Welfare Department, and I got really nowhere; until finally I got the Portland papers involved in this, and when I did finally the situation on Frye Island started to come to life.

Now the other day we had a bill in here that this body turned down almost unanimously. At that time I had a court ruling setting on my desk which I have right here before me at the present time, a court ruling that came about because of our activities to try to stop the pollution and try to prevent the development of Frye Island. That court order is right there, and it is a court order handed down by Justice

Pomeroy that in essence said that he cannot stop the development on Frye Island because pollution has not been proven at this time.

I would submit to you that if the Portland Water District really wants to get behind something, that they ought to get the people in the Town of Standish to want to back them in their efforts on Frye Island and not try to get them in opposition to them by closing just another little short portion of the lower end of the lake.

Now I would like to tell you that this redraft has come about because of three or four different compromises that have been supposedly offered to the Portland Water District. That in the original draft this particular proposal would have closed some 900 acres in the lower end of Sebago Lake. I would submit to the people in Portland that we also in the Town of Standish drink that water; we have an intake on our particular side also. Now what is good for the goose is good for the gander. And if the Portland Water District wants to take and protect the drinking water in the City of Portland, then let them also protect the drinking water for the people of the Town of Standish.

We asked Mr. Monie if he would like to come to our town meeting, and he did. And he offered us an amendment which was totally unacceptable. That amendment would have narrowed the amount of acreage down that they want to close off. I would tell you this, that the 1800 foot radius that they are proposing right now in this particular bill would only close a certain section, and that would be the intakes for Portland. That would also close Chadbourne's Landing. Chadbourne's Landing is not a landing that is used too often, but in time of rough water and so forth that is a landing that definitely has to be used for safety reasons, and also for the people to have access to the mainland from the islands that lie within the Town of Standish.

Sabotage — I would like to have, Mr. Speaker, these remarks stric-

ken from the record as off the record on this particular issue.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that everything spoken here is on the record.

Mr. SIMPSON: Then all right, I will put it on the record, very reluctantly. Mr. Monie came before us and my town in a closed door session, and at that time he said that really the only reason he felt he really wanted this particular issue was because of the threat of sabotage. He didn't know what the radicals in this country might possibly do to the Portland Water District supply. He said that under the current law, which I would submit to you is a law, that he has the right to buoy off his intakes for a radius of 100 feet. But he was afraid that this would make a bullseye. I would submit to you that right now he has created a bullseye because all he is doing is putting the two intakes in a very short arc that would definitely pinpoint these intakes.

Now if I want to sabotage the drinking water of Greater Portland, all I have got to do is drop anything I want to into that water by plane. I can drop it in by a skin diver that wants to come under water. I can do it by going into the chlorine house which is completely unprotected. I can go into the pumping houses which are unprotected. And furthermore, I can go into any faucet in the City of Portland and introduce anything I want to into that faucet and back-feed it by putting a greater pressure on what I am putting in than what is coming out of the faucet at the present time. I would submit to you that this threat of sabotage is one of the weakest arguments that he could have presented.

I would also call to your attention that this particular bill, in its redraft, would prohibit snowmobiling. Now I would like to know what snowmobiling would have to do on ice that would have any influence on what is going on underneath that ice around these intakes.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would submit to you that this is not a

threat to pollution, and I would ask you to make that decision yourself. Are we really talking pollution here? If we are talking pollution here, fine, but I submit to you that we aren't.

I would urge that you support the Minority Report and that this "ought not to pass."

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Whitson.

Mr. WHITSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would once again beg your indulgence in keeping this bill alive. As I said before, it may be killed at a later date by the opponents. Keeping it alive will allow members of the Cumberland County delegation to attend this meeting which I have mentioned previously.

At this time I would like to extend a cordial invitation to Mr. Simpson to attend this meeting, because I do feel that his thoughts on the matter are very pertinent.

Once again I would ask you to vote against the minority report. Keep this bill alive: it may be amended at a later date. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson.

Mr. SIMPSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to remind the gentleman from Portland that the recommendation to have this county meeting happens to have been called at my suggestion. It was my feeling that the people in the City of Portland, and certain councils around the City of Portland, were taking action and passing resolutions that I felt were kind of unfounded, that not all the facts were known. And at that time I felt that if they were going to at least have any type of meetings around Portland, that the people around Portland ought to realize that the Town of Standish has all the intakes and all the fourteen miles of shore frontage that the Portland Water District owns well within their borders as well as Frye Island.

And with that I called the head of the trustees of the Portland Water District, Mr. Twaddel, and asked him what he intended to do

about it. I have talked this over with Mr. Twaddel and Mr. Monie a good many times, and it was through my suggestion to Mr. Twaddel that he said that he would then call a meeting of the Cumberland County delegation as well as the different town officials in the towns involved with this drinking water, to talk over all the particular bills that we have, but more important, to talk over the situation on Frye Island and what we can do about that problem.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Emery.

Mr. EMERY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a majority signer, I would like to defend my position on the bill. I don't want to get caught in a verbal barrage between two opposing factions here, but as a majority signer I guess I have to put on a shield and stand up here and defend my position.

In my own area we have our water intakes buoyed off by a 2,500 foot radius, starting on a point on the shore which is Lake Auburn. I feel that as the Portland Water District served 150,000 people approximately, there should be some area buoyed off to protect the intakes there.

I believe that the word snowmobiling was mentioned. I have seen a lot of debris myself from snowmobiles. The drivers throw residue here and there and we all know what the result is. I also know that we considered the ice fishing in the area, and the ice fishing would be banned. We have seen various lakes that have been polluted by residue left by ice fishermen and I feel that this is something that should be incorporated here also.

Perhaps the Town of Standish doesn't want intake protection. Their intakes are not on the same side of the lake as the City of Portland's intakes, so if they don't want protection it is up to them.

I still feel that the people of the City of Portland should have protection for the water. I wouldn't care if that water didn't have any bacteria whatsoever in it. But I still say that it should be buoyed off, and therefore I voted for the

majority. I hope you will support the majority. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Gill.

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: At this time I would like to vote to keep this bill alive so that we may attend a meeting with the trustees of the water district as I feel this is too important a question to be decided while some of us have still got some questions in our mind.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cottrell.

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Actually I am going to vote for this bill, coming from Portland, but in my mind the matter which this bill deals with is a very small matter compared with the Frye Island situation.

I was very glad to listen to Representative Simpson because I was able to get a lot of information on the background of the development of this very perilous situation, in my humble opinion, in the development of Frye Island. In fact, I have been so disturbed about it that I have started a one-man little investigation as to the possibilities of taking over Frye Island by eminent domain on the basis of the reservoir or state park, because Frye Island, as I have been learning, is really a rock with a little subsoil on top and there is, as they anticipated, development which would bring 1,400 and plus buildings on it, and to me that is a very ominous threat to a water supply for that great area in Cumberland County. And we all know that fresh water, in our great United States even, is getting to be a premium matter.

So while I am going to vote for this bill today, I certainly hope that all of you here, as good citizens of Maine, can realize this development which is taking place and which in my opinion never should have been allowed to have been started. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hodgdon, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I

would like to go along with Mr. Simpson in this thing. To me, I have always been in favor of the multiple use of the waters and the forests of Maine.

Now this intake pipe, according to the Portland Water District, is under 110 feet of water. Now I cannot for the life of me see why we should make Sebago Lake the private pond of the Portland Water District. There is no valid reason why the people of Maine, including the people of Standish, should not continue to fish and sail boats on Sebago Lake. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunkport, Mr. Tyndale.

Mr. TYNDALE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As a signer of the Majority "Ought to pass" Report, I would like to defend my position. We had a good hearing on this bill and I listened very attentively, particularly to the report of the Portland Water District and their trustees, who for years have maintained a good, sound water supply for 145,000 people in Portland.

This is a serious matter, and I sincerely trust that you will give it your undivided attention because it is important. You have here a responsibility of 145,000 people in the City of Portland. And this is one reason why, among other reasons, I signed the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gorham, Mr. Mosher.

Mr. MOSHER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The court ruling was that this Chadbourne's Landing could not be closed, and this bill closes Chadbourne's Landing.

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 members 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 pending question is on the motion of the

gentleman from Hodgdon, Mr. Williams, that the House accept the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report on Bill "An Act to Amend the Act to Prevent the Pollution of the Waters of Sebago Lake," House Paper 201, L. D. 268. If you are in favor of this motion you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Albert, Ault, Bailey, Baker, Barnes, Bartlett, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Binnette, Birt, Bither, Bragdon, Brown, Call, Carter, Churchill, Clark, Collins, Crosby, Cummings, Curtis, A. P.; Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Cyr, Donaghy, Dow, Dudley, Dyar, Emery, D. F.; Evans, Farrington, Fecteau, Finemore, Gagnon, Genest, Good, Hall, Hancock, Hardy, Haskell, Hawkins, Hayes, Herrick, Hewes, Hodgdon, Immonen, Kelley, K. F.; Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Lawry, Lee, Lessard, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Littlefield, Lund, Maddox, Manchester, Marstaller, McCormick, McNally, Millett, Morrell, Mosher, Norris, Page, Parks, Porter, Pratt, Rollins, Scott, Shaw, Simpson, L. E.; Simpson, T. R.; Stillings, Theriault, Trask, Williams, Wood, M. W.; Wood, M. E.; Woodbury.

NAY — Bedard, Bernier, Berube, Boudreau, Brown, Bunker, Bustin, Carey, Carrier, Clemente, Conley, Cooney, Cottrell, Curran, Drigotas, Emery, E. M.; Fraser, Gill, Goodwin, Jalbert, Jutras, Kelleher, Kilroy, Lebel, Lizotte, Lucas, Lynch, MacLeod, Mahany, Marsh, Martin, McKinnon, McTeague, Mills, Murray, O'Brien, Orestis, Payson, Pontbriand, Rand, Ross, Santoro, Shute, Slane, Smith, D. M.; Starbird, Tyndale, Vincent, Webber, Wheeler, Whitson.

ABSENT — Bourgoin, Cote, Dam, Doyle, Faucher, Gauthier, Hanson, Henley, Kelley, P. S.; McCloskey, Rocheleau, Sheltra, Silverman, Smith, E. H.; Susi, Tanguay, White, Wight.

Yes, 81; No, 51; Absent, 18.

The **SPEAKER**: Eighty-one having voted in the affirmative and fifty-one in the negative, with eighteen being absent, the motion does prevail.

Sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the seventh tabled and today assigned matter:

Bill "An Act Transferring Services to Alcoholics and Drug Addicts to the Bureau of Mental Health" (H. P. 674) (L. D. 911)

Tabled — April 7, by Mr. Carrier of Westbrook.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Good of Westfield to indefinitely postpone.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Payson.

Mrs. **PAYSON**: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill would transfer services for alcoholism and drug abuse from the Department of Health and Welfare to the Department of Mental Health and Corrections. Present personnel and present funds in Health and Welfare would remain there. However, any new funds appropriated for services to these two groups in the Department of Health and Welfare in this session would be transferred to the Department of Mental Health and Corrections.

The report out of committee on this bill was 12 "ought to pass" and 1 "ought not to pass." The two primary reasons behind this decision were first, the basic problems of alcoholics and drug addicts are now considered to fall within the purview of mental health. And second, the federal government, from which the state receives substantial funds, recommends that these services be provided through a mental health department.

I therefore urge you to vote against the motion to indefinitely postpone this bill.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Carrier.

Mr. **CARRIER**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Today is the day that I rise to show to my friends that my quietness in the past two months was not because of illness or because of noninterest. Today is the day that I started my diet on raw nails before I came in here, and that can be doubled if it so demands.

I rise in opposition to the motion that was made yesterday to indefinitely postpone this bill. This bill,

of course, was presented by me. I think it is a good bill. I think that the members of the committee have used good judgment coming out with a 12 to 1 "ought to pass" report. I would rather accept the judgment of 12 persons than accept the judgment of one person who objected to this bill yesterday.

In order for me this morning to know what the objections to the bill were yesterday, I had to wait and read the proof to make out what bothered somebody about this bill. I can only say that I was not impressed, nor am I overexcited on what I read.

I submit to you that there were a few points raised by Mr. Good yesterday which are to be considered. First, where does the personnel of the Health and Welfare go? Well, we are not interested in the personnel of Health and Welfare. They want to keep their personnel. If these services are transferred to Mental Health the personnel of Health and Welfare will stay where it is. And of course, the Mental Health is not asking for any more personnel. They can apparently take care of this, absorb this work without any additional help.

Two, it says in there that somewhere drunkenness or alcoholism is based on insecurity, bashfulness, lack of confidence as personality defects. Well, maybe I should take another appraisal of myself, as this is not the cause of my bashfulness, and this is surely not the cause of my timidity. And I know that my bashfulness wasn't caused by excessive drinking.

The speech also states that every one of the counselors in the Division of Alcoholic Rehabilitation are recovered alcoholics. Well, this is really beautiful. This is quite a qualification to have to have in order to be on this Division.

And one of them would say that no more money will be generated through putting this through the Mental Health. Well, I submit to you that there will be. I can only rebut that remark by saying that how much money has the Health and Welfare received in the past years because alcoholism services were under their department. And I can assure you that if it would have been under the Mental Health

Department where it belongs, that we would have had much federal funds to help to alleviate alcoholism.

These programs that are proposed by the bill would be worked through the Mental Health districts, or through the Mental Health facilities we already have in different communities. I can only say, too, a fast observation that I have made, that there was very little opposition at the hearing. The opposition, incidentally, was by another Mr. Good. And this makes me to wonder just what is going on.

I can also say that Commissioner Kearns of the Health and Welfare and Mental Health program was not present. He was out of town but he did send one of his men down and talked in favor of this bill. I believe that this is a good bill. I think that if you want to do something for the drugs and the alcoholics, that this bill would be much more effective in a different department than where it is. I hope that your good judgment will prevail and that you will vote against the indefinite postponement of this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Santoro.

Mr. SANTORO: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I just want to add a few more words to the passage and the merits of this bill. I have been a doctor for 40 years minus a few months, and I have seen alcoholics, I have seen drug addicts; and I am telling you this is a psychiatric problem. Alcoholism, drug addiction does not belong to the Health and Welfare Department. It belongs to the mental institutions, it should be referred to the Mental Health program as this bill does. So I move for this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westfield, Mr. Good.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: First let me say that the Mr. Good, who is head of the Division of Alcoholic Rehabilitation, is no relation of mine.

Secondly, the task force report that came out just prior to the

104th has a paragraph in it, a recommendation to create a functional unit of rehabilitation services within the Department of Health and Welfare, having bureau status, which would include the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, heretofore a function of the State Department of Education; the Division of Eye Care and Special Services and the Division of Alcoholism Services and other rehabilitation services.

The Division of Alcoholic Services has just been put into the Bureau of Rehabilitation, Department of Health and Welfare by the 104th Legislature. As a result of a two year study by the Governor's Select Commission on Rehabilitation Needs, which, with major agency and citizen representation, considered a variety of alternatives before making its recommendation.

There is pending legislation to combine the Department of Health and Welfare, the Department of Mental Health and Corrections, and some other service agencies in a new Department of Human Relations, which, if enacted, would negate the necessity of L. D. 911, even if it had clear merit.

The existing alcoholism problem in this present department location has been successful. The Bureau of Mental Health has had, and currently has, legal authorities who establish programs to combat alcoholism without such legislation, but has shown little inclination to do so. In fact, a program for alcoholics which formerly existed at the Bangor State Hospital under the co-sponsorship of Doctors Pooler and Kadi, and the Division of Alcoholism Services has recently been terminated by the new hospital administrator Dr. Eliazarian.

The implementation of the intent of this bill would dilute the alcoholism services program by combining it with a program of drug abuse. These two problems, as I told you yesterday, are separate and distinct, and require different approaches and solutions.

L. D. 911 makes no provision for the transfer of state present staff, designates no organizational

structure, and provides for the transfer of funds only in general terms. There is nothing in the bill which provides or even suggests program improvement or extension of services.

I hope you will go along with my motion to indefinitely postpone this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Santoro.

Mr. SANTORO: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In regard to the lack of programs, as Mr. Good explains, we generally leave the programs to the doctors and the hospitals.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will order a vote. The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Westfield, Mr. Good, that Bill "An Act Transferring Services to Alcoholics and Drug Addicts to the Bureau of Mental Health," House Paper 674, L. D. 911 be indefinitely postponed. If you are in favor of indefinite postponement you will vote yes; if you are against you will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken. 26 having voted in the affirmative and 92 having voted in the negative, with 32 being absent, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

The Chair laid before the House the eighth tabled and today assigned matter:

Bill "An Act Prohibiting the Turning Back of Speedometers or Odometers on Motor Vehicles" (H. P. 1244) (L. D. 1553)

Tabled — April 7, by Mr. Hewes of Cape Elizabeth.

Pending — Adoption of House Amendment "A" (H-102).

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Hewes of Cape Elizabeth, House Amendment "A" was adopted.

The Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended and sent to the Senate.

The Chair laid before the House the ninth tabled and today assigned matter:

HOUSE JOINT ORDER — Legislative Research Study review-

ing State Laws relating to Health Manpower.

Tabled — April 7, by Mr. Norris of Brewer.

Pending — Passage.

Thereupon, Mrs. Payson of Falmouth withdrew the Order.

The Chair laid before the House the tenth tabled and today assigned matter:

HOUSE REPORT — “Ought to pass in new draft” — Committee on Transportation on Bill “An Act relating to Fees for Inspection of Motor Vehicles” (H. P. 281) (L. D. 370) — New Draft (H. P. 1256) (L. D. 1576) under same title.

Tabled — April 7, by Mr. Wood of Brooks.

Pending — Acceptance.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Stillings.

Mr. STILLINGS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I realize that we have a unanimous “Ought to pass” Report in new draft here. However, I should like to point out to the members of this House that the new draft of this bill does not do what the original draft intended for it to do.

The essential problem relating to the inspection of motor vehicles is that we don't have enough inspection stations, we don't have enough inspection mechanics, and under existing law, with a statutory fee of one dollar, the stations just can't do the kind of inspection, the kind of safety inspection job that is necessary in the interest of good highway safety.

It takes from 20 to 30 minutes to do a proper inspection, and I am sure that few of us, if we were in business, would be willing to devote 20 or 30 minutes of our mechanic's time and receive in return a one dollar fee. Many of these stations, as I have said, and especially the larger ones, are dropping by the wayside.

Now we inspect somewhere in the vicinity of 550,000 vehicles twice each year. The original bill would have increased the inspection fee for school buses to \$4 and for other vehicles to \$2.50. It also increased the cost of the in-

spection sticker to the station owner, and therefore would have produced some \$400,000 additional revenue in the biennium.

But in the new draft as reported out of committee, the bill does not, as I have mentioned before, do what it was originally intended to do. Number one, it takes away the revenue producing feature, and in fact it would be a revenue loser. It exempts construction equipment from inspection, and I have no serious objection to this provided it is not used on the highway.

It does increase the inspection fee for a school bus to \$5, yet leaves other vehicles at \$1. And even though it might take twice as long because of additional paperwork to inspect a school bus as it does an automobile, it certainly doesn't take five times as long.

The original bill did more than just increase fees. It provided a new licensing system for station owners. It provided for them to be licensed for three years rather than one year. It provided for a refund for unused stickers which is not in existing law.

What I would like to ask this House to do is to allow me to get the bill back to its original form, then in the course of the legislative process it can be amended so that we can include a realistic fee for inspection in the law. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would move that we substitute the Bill for the Report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Stillings, moves that the House substitute the Bill for the Report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley.

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As you have probably been told here, this was the unanimous report of this committee, and we had what I consider some very sound reasoning for this unanimous report. However, most of the things that were in the bill the committee went along with. We extended the licensing time so that the State Police license them once every three years; that was in the bill, it is still in there. It was in the bill to inspect school buses for \$4,

and the committee saw fit to make that \$5 because a school bus occupies the whole building while it is in there, and it takes up a lot of space, and we have to fill out a lot of forms; one going to the Superintendent of Schools, one for the school bus, and one for the State Police. And it is very time consuming. And we increased that from \$4 to \$5 in the original bill.

Now I, as a member of the committee and also being of some authority on this, having been inspecting cars, and as another member of the committee has also been inspecting motor vehicles for some time, he can enlighten you on this inspection to some degree. First, let me tell you it is my opinion that most good business people would rather give this sticker to the customer if they are any kind of a merchandiser. I can just imagine any of these self-service stores that has paid hundreds of dollars in local newspapers to advertise their merchandise, what they wouldn't give to have every customer driving into their store twice a year. This is essentially what getting them into the motor vehicle inspection does. It is not the intent to sell stickers and make money on the stickers, it is to get these people to come into your place of business. Thereupon, you sell them brake linings, tires, safety belts, light bulbs and many other services.

Now if any of you people in your local vicinity have got a garage man that doesn't know how to charge, there are some of us in the House here, and I think it is a known fact that there are a lot of things we don't know, but we do know how to charge. And if you have got one in your town that doesn't know how to charge, I would like to know his name because he is a very unusual person.

Now let me tell you about getting these people into your station. This inspection station is tickled to death to have these people come in because thereupon you sell them all this merchandise and you have a chance to meet everybody in the area, country gawks,

widow women, and all these kinds of people, and sometimes you can explore this even further for something that goes on in the evening. And there are many other advantages. The main thing is to get these people in there so you can converse with them; otherwise, you never see them. So there are a lot of side effects that the people don't know about in getting the person first in the place of business.

Now not too long ago I sold automobiles, and I can't think of how many, but I will tell you there were quite a few automobiles, new ones, that I actually sold on account of this sticker. At that time it was fifty cents. I would just as soon it would be nothing.

Let me tell you how it was. A guy comes in with a car and it is really pretty well shot. He has got to have a muffler and it is probably an expensive one, and maybe some cars have two, and his tires are gone, he has got a cracked window, and this is pretty dilapidated. So gee whiz, it is going to cost you so much to inspect this car, I think you would be using good judgment if you swapped cars. Well the customer would say, "Well, I wasn't planning on swapping cars until fall, but I guess rather than spend a couple hundred dollars to get this one repaired, I better swap cars." Now look what the customer makes. He sold the automobile just because they came in to get a—in those days a fifty cent sticker.

Now this House a few years ago went along and made it a dollar. At that time I opposed that too. But I think they are getting plenty, one dollar, to have these people come in twice a year. There are a few that come in that don't have anything done, they have a new car, and you look the car over, maybe it does take a few minutes. But let me tell you, these people in my business do a lot of things that are free. We wash the windshield, we check the tires, and information—wind and water so to speak, and this is just another service that we have for the people. And I am quite satisfied and I think most inspection stations are.

Now let me tell you too, there are an awful lot of us here in this

House that are a little bit tax shy, or tax conscious, and I for one am not here to put a tax or pick anybody's pocket in this session, whether it be a sticker on his windshield or any other tax. And this is a tax that when he sits in his automobile and takes his wife to the store or to the post office, he sure can see it. This is what the 105th Legislature did. They made them pay another dollar twice a year.

And I think it is needless to irritate people with nuisance taxes when we are getting along very nicely as we are. And I hope the motion does not prevail and we accept the committee report and get on with business at hand.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Crosby.

Mr. CROSBY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I do not operate a service station and I don't depend on customers coming in for my relaxation and rest. However, I did reluctantly sign this bill while it was in committee because of one feature, and that was a \$2.50 fee attached to the inspection sticker. I thought this perhaps was a little too much of an increase. I tried to get them to put a two dollar fee which I think is fair. As we all know, this means two dollars every six months which I don't think is taxing the people too heavily.

So I would hope that you folks today would go along with the motion of Mr. Stillings to substitute the bill for the report so that this could be worked over a little more and perhaps come up with something that will satisfy not only the service station men in the small areas, but some of these service stations that operate in the cities where they have to hire a mechanic. The mechanic is getting more money; the mechanic has to do the inspection. I think it is only right that they receive enough money so they can pay for the mechanic that is doing the work. So I hope you will support Mr. Stillings in his motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Albion, Mr. Lee.

Mr. LEE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I thought

the committee did a good piece of business on this. I run a garage. I don't do sticker business for a business, but I do have it and I don't suffer from it at a dollar. I don't know if I was doing this business for a living if that would be enough or not. But I thought from the feeling of the committee that we did a pretty good job on it.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Stillings, that the House substitute the Bill for the Report on Bill "An Act relating to Fees for Inspection of Motor Vehicles," House Paper 281, L. D. 370. If you are in favor you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

72 having voted in the affirmative and 54 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

The Bill was read twice and tomorrow assigned.

The Chair laid before the House the eleventh tabled and today assigned matter:

HOUSE DIVIDED REPORT — Majority (8) "Ought to pass in new draft"—Minority (5) "Ought not to pass"—Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Prohibiting Personal Liability of School Board Members" (H. P. 6) (L. D. 6)—New Draft (H. P. 1252) (L. D. 1578) under new title "An Act to Indemnify Public Officials and Employees of the State of Maine" Tabled—April 7 by Mr. Susi of Pittsfield.

Pending—Motion of Mr. Orestis of Lewiston to accept Majority Report.

On motion of Mr. Page of Fryeburg, retabled pending the motion of Mr. Orestis of Lewiston to accept the Majority Report and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 13.

The Chair laid before the House the twelfth tabled and today assigned matter:

HOUSE DIVIDED REPORT — Majority (10) "Ought to pass in new draft"—Minority (3) "Ought not to pass"—Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to the Right of Access by Landlords" (H. P. 193) (L. D. 250)—New Draft

(H. P. 1253) (L. D. 1573) under same title.

Tabled—April 7, by Mr. Call of Lewiston.

Pending—Motion of Mr. Hewes of Cape Elizabeth to accept Majority Report.

Thereupon, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted.

The New Draft was read twice and tomorrow assigned.

The Chair laid before the House the thirteenth tabled and today assigned matter:

HOUSE DIVIDED REPORT — Majority (7) "Ought not to pass" —Minority (6) "Ought to pass" —Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act to Repeal the Prohibition of Publishing a Periodical by the Department of Economic Development" (H. P. 897) (L. D. 1217)

Tabled — April 7, by Mr. McTeague of Brunswick.

Pending—Motion of Mr. Donaghy of Lubec to accept Majority Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Farrington.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: One of the most disturbing things I have observed in my short tenure as a freshman legislator is the almost xenophobic behavior of certain politicians in regards to James K. Keefe and the Department of Economic Development. Petty politics was initially observed in the 104th Legislature when that body passed the following statute: "The commissioner shall not use any funds appropriated to the department for the purpose of publishing any periodical which tends to report the activities and accomplishments of the department. It is the intent of the Legislature that the continued publication of the periodical 'Maine on the Grow' or any other similar publication shall cease and not be resumed."

Does it make any sense because of a personality clash to eliminate the above publication which is useful to the business interests of Maine in attracting new business and industry? The other 49 states all have publications that

promote and attract new industry to their respective states.

Mr. Simpson of Standish has presented a bill before the Committee on State Government that would repeal the mistake of the 104th Legislature and allow the resumption of the periodical "Maine On The Grow." Commissioner Keefe has even gone so far as to promise that any resumed publication shall guard against promotion of personalities or partisan political bias, and should objectively serve the economic development of the State of Maine.

I have carried this matter to our Chief Executive and among other things he has pointed out the following: "I find in all the criticism of DED that its critics completely forget the role it played in the reopening of mills in Brewer and Lincoln or in your own vicinity in its cooperative effort in acquiring a designation of the Biddeford-Saco area as a surplus employment region and the resulting expansion of the Maremont Corporation."

The record of the Maine Department of Economic Development, under the direction of James K. Keefe, speaks for itself. Between September 20, 1967 and March 1, 1971 there were located in the state a total of 80 new industries that brought new employment to 4,799 individuals. The rest of the picture in Industrial Development included 113 expansions that brought 4,656 new jobs. Vacation Travel volume in dollars has increased 55% and per capita income growth has soared by 21.6%. Statistic after statistic proves the value of the Department of Economic Development. For the sake of Maine and its people let's be big enough to keep subjective thinking and evaluations out of this Department.

Wouldn't it be better to iron out petty personality clashes internally than the washing of dirty linen in the press to the detriment of the people of Maine we are supposed to represent?

I urge you to defeat the "ought not to pass" report. I request the yeas and nays. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Hodgdon.

Mr. HODGDON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The good gentleman from Old Orchard has just produced some statistics which would certainly be to his benefit. I would at this time like to further bring some statistics to the attention of this House, things that have happened since the now famous action of the 104th. Two of them stand out vividly in my mind.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of this House, that last year was a great year for the State of Maine. Last year we celebrated a sesquicentennial. We had a chance to promote our state throughout the country. DED at that time saw fit not to appropriate any money for furtherance of this celebration. In fact, in order for the committee for the sesquicentennial to set up a booth at the New England States Exposition, they found it necessary to pay rent for a booth to the department.

It has been brought out about some of the jobs that DED has brought into the State of Maine. I think by now every member of this House is well aware that for some time all the communities in the southern part of the state have been fighting to keep the Kittery Shipyard open.

Some two years ago the Governor and the Commissioner of DED appeared and spent some two hours in the Town of Kittery with the representatives of the municipalities of the southern part of the state and representatives of the shipyard. And I assure you that we were sweet talked to death. I can also assure you that as one who has been as close to this situation as anybody in the district, that as of the present time, to the best of my knowledge, DED did not spend a six-cent stamp to further the protection of 7,500 jobs. These are not positions that had to be brought into the state, Mr. Speaker, these were positions that were existing and we wanted them protected. By our own influence we have protected them.

I would like to have this House know of some of the testimony given before the State Government Committee. It was asked in the opinion of the proponent how much

the previous publication had done in bringing industry into the State of Maine. And the answer was, not too much. There were questions asked on the distribution of this publication. And it was admitted that most of the distribution was within the State of Maine.

Now I submit to you ladies and gentlemen that no one can convince me that we need a publication to convince the citizens of the State of Maine on what a great state we have. We all know it. If a publication is to go out to seek industry, to seek tourism, I ask you, is this a proper vehicle to use to editorialize?

I am sure that you are all aware of the publications you receive each and every week through the mail and if all the departments within our state government would pool their resources and their knowledge, then we could provide a publication that would not only be sent throughout the United States, but we could cover Europe as well.

Now ladies and gentlemen, especially those of you who were here for the 104th, must remember the conditions when this last squabble arose. And I submit to you that the atmosphere today is exactly the same that happened two years ago. It started because of budget cuts. And it rather amuses me because proponents were asked how much money would be necessary, what the price tag would be to resume publication. And we were told that there was enough money within the department that no further appropriation would be necessary. Yet we have a hue and cry because the department has been cut on their appropriations.

The 104th saw fit to give this publication a decent burial. I now submit this is a very poor time to exhume the body. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson.

Mr. SIMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I regret that I had to take on two controversial subjects in the same day. It is not often that I agree with the gentleman in the far corner, from the other end of the Hall. However, I feel that his

remarks the other day, when he said that if we want to keep the DED we should keep it, and if we don't want to keep it then we should kill it and stop nit picking and so forth until we kill it slow but sure.

We have talked and talked and talked about dogs and how they affect deer and how they kill deer, and I look at this particular piece of legislation the same way as I looked at that. All we are doing here is we are taking one of the basic instruments that this state needs in a department, a department that is called the Economic Development, and I really have to ask myself anyway, as a member of the 105th and not a member of the 104th, as to whether this is good legislation for the people of the State of Maine.

At a time when we are faced right now with 30,000 unemployed in the state, I have to ask myself the question, what am I going back and telling the people who are unemployed that this Legislature is doing for them? And I hope that I can tell them something other than just the mere fact that we will increase welfare payments or that we will offer them an additional 13 weeks of unemployment.

I submit to you that personalities can be changed over night if the proper approach is taken. I submit to you that a department such as the Department of Economic Development is too important in this state to start taking personalities at task for the sake of the department.

As to the publication, the statutes now very much say that the department shall issue a periodical advising the people of this state as to what the department is doing and so forth. Maine on the Grow, which has been removed, did that along with some other things. I would submit to you right now that the magazine put out called Mark Me has a distribution of about 200 in the State of Maine, whereas Maine on the Grow had a distribution of around 12,000, and that particular magazine went to all parts of the country and to people who wanted to know what was going on in the State of Maine and

what we were doing in the area of economic development.

I have received some of the periodicals that are put out by other states. Not only do I get an idea that I might like to move there and open up a business, but I also get ideas as to what that department is doing in the field of promotion for the state. I get an idea what other areas of industry are doing, what industries are expanding and in what field, and I feel that the businessmen in this state want to know the same thing. I feel that they would like to know what the DED is doing, what they are spending, and where and why. I think they would like to know what other areas in the State of Maine are doing in the field of recreation to promote their areas and so forth. I feel that they would also like to know just exactly what businesses are expanding in this state, want to expand, and the reasons why.

The money — we have the materials and staff in the Department of Economic Development at the present time that would do the printing, do all the art work and so forth. The cost would have to come in the form of mailing, and the program that is now under Mark Me would be the program that would be encompassed into this particular periodical, and the funds for mailing would then come out of the Mark Me project.

It has been said that not too much industry was ever brought in by Maine on the Grow. Advertising is one of the things that we as businessmen I think have to take on as a calculated risk, but yet a necessary evil. There are many times we don't know what the advertising dollar has meant to us in investment return. Sometimes we don't know just exactly what caught a man's eye to want to do business with us and for what reasons.

I would also state that in this periodical I feel that many people in the state don't realize that when they also took away the periodical, they took away \$100,000 in promotional budget during the 104th Legislature which took us out of 12 of the major shows that

this state always participated in to promote the state — industrial shows, recreational shows and so forth. At the same time that they out this particular fund, they took us out of the colored advertising in magazines.

We have been virtually left now with a department over there that answers requests that might possibly come in, but we have done very little to enhance their position as a department that could be promoting the State of Maine and encouraging our economic development. In my opinion, I don't see how anybody in good faith can sit down and say that we should take the Department of Economic Development to task, but that we should be taking and doing something to enhance it. And I would urge that you support this particular periodical and we give the department the tools it needs to work with.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I wish to be very brief, but a couple of thoughts come to mind about this which I think probably some of you might be interested in. I know that many of us have indeed been concerned with the atmosphere that exists between some of us and some of them. We have been concerned, and I was one of those who was on the receiving end of one of the editorials that came out on 'Maine on the Grow' when we were involved with budget cuts two years ago as were the other members on the Appropriations Committee.

We at that time felt somewhat concerned with what was being done. We felt that this was not a policy that ought to be done by any department, but on the same avenue I think that we have to be honest with ourselves and admit even though we really criticized the department for doing what they were doing in that periodical, that in effect we ended up to some degree doing the same thing they did and that was of course by rebounding in the press, myself included, and saying that

perhaps the things they were doing were not right.

One of the things that perhaps bothers me about this is that first of all the state is the only state in the nation that does not have some form of a periodical. And I am not saying that we need one particularly, but we don't have one and we are the only state that doesn't have one. I am not saying either that perhaps the department ought to have a periodical to lobby us, but I would point out to you that the other departments are doing an effective job of doing that.

If any of you have been receiving the press releases from the State Highway Commission on every bid opening, on every item that is being done, if you receive the periodicals from the Inland Fisheries and Game Department, if you receive the periodicals from the Sea and Shore Fisheries, if you receive the periodicals from TRIGOM, from the University of Maine, you can keep right on going. And you might argue that all of those ought to be discontinued. But I am not sure. I am not sure if really these periodicals are not serving a purpose in at least helping to enlighten some of us as to what they are doing.

Now one comment about the money in reference to the celebration of Maine's 150th Anniversary. As I recall, on the Appropriations Committee we decided the DED should not play a part in that and we gave that function and what money we did give to the Maine Sesquicentennial Commission and the vice-chairman of that of course, as you know, is the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt. I am sure he will tell you that we didn't give him much money either. They had to go out and raise it.

Now I think that if we have to keep some of these things in mind, even though we disagree with personalities and persons and with the issues, and I have done the same, I must admit that I have done my share of screaming to the gentleman in the other building as well. But I think if we have to be realistic with the job

that Maine is to do, I think that sometimes we have to forget personalities, and at this point this morning I am going to forget mine and vote for the bill, and I would hope that you would do so.

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

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Certainly this is the last thought that I ever had this morning, that I would get into a discussion of the Sesquicentennial, but to clarify at least one point, and it was part of this overall problem that developed during the last legislative session which I think the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin, has very well covered, that there was a good deal of feelings on both sides. But this whole program, the Sesquicentennial, was presented to the head of the Department of Economic Development, and he wrote back a rather sarcastic letter saying that he did not want to become involved in it.

And the comments that were made by the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Hodgdon, as to the charging of a fee for the use of a booth is true. Basically these comments were right, and I just wanted to clear the record on that particular thing. As far as the situation had developed relative to this paper last year, I think it was quite well covered by Mr. Martin, and I think he covered it pretty truthfully, as I understood the situation.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Hewes.

Mr. HEWES: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I support the bill as presented by the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson. It seems to me that when we get into promotion, advertising and publicity, there are different techniques to accomplish a certain goal. And the goal to be accomplished here is to promote and publicize Maine, and to encourage industry to come in, or vacationers, and to improve the lot of the people of the State of Maine.

Maybe the soft sell, maybe the hard sell, maybe advertising in

out-of-state magazines, newspapers, local magazines, or radio and television, pamphlets, little buttons such as the potato button we received a few days ago, or a yardstick from one of my neighbors who is in the oil business.

I don't think we ought to hamper the promotion people, or the DED. We ought to let them decide how they can best promote the state, and give them a free hand with reasonable bounds. I thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Mills.

Mr. MILLS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. After listening to this discussion here this morning, there is only one thing enters my mind. This is the only department we have in our state government that is doing anything to broaden the tax structure. We all know where education is going, and the other costs of services. I think it should be supported.

The SPEAKER: The yeas and nays have been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All members desiring a roll call 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 pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Donaghy, that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report on Bill "An Act to Repeal the Prohibition of Publishing a Periodical by the Department of Economic Development," House Paper 897, L. D. 1217. If you are in favor of accepting the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Ault, Baker, Barnes, Berry, G. W.; Birt, Bragdon, Brawn, Brown, Bunker, Call, Carter, Clark, Crosby, Curtis, A. P.; Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Donaghy, Dudley, Dyar, Emery, D. F.; Evans, Gill, Good, Hall, Hardy, Haskell,

Hayes, Henley, Herrick, Hodgdon, Immonen, Jalbert, Jutras, Kelleher, Kelley, K. F.; Kelley, R. P.; Lee, Lewin, Lincoln, Lund, Maddox, Marstaller, McCormick, McNally, Millett, Mosher, Norris, Page, Payson, Pontbriand, Porter, Pratt, Rand, Rollins, Shaw, Shute, Simpson, T. R.; Stillings, Susi, Trask, White, Wood, M. W.

NAY — Albert, Bailey, Bartlett, Bedard, Bernier, Berube, Binnette, Bither, Boudreau, Bustin, Carrier, Churchill, Clemente, Collins, Conley, Cooney, Cote, Cottrell, Cummings, Curran, Cyr, Dam, Dow, Drigotas, Emery, E. M.; Farrington, Faucher, Fecteau, Finemore, Fraser, Gagnon, Gauthier, Genest, Goodwin, Hancock, Hawkens, Hewes, Kelley, P. S.; Keyte, Kilroy, Lawry, Lebel, Lessard, Lewis, Littlefield, Lizotte, Lynch, MacLeod, Mahany, Manchester, Marsh, Martin, McCloskey, McKinnon, McTeague, Mills, Morrell, Murray, O'Brien, Orestis, Parks, Rocheleau, Ross, Santoro, Scott, Simpson, L. E.; Slane, Smith, D. M.; Starbird, Theriault, Tyndale, Vincent, Webber, Wheeler, Whitson, Wight, Williams, Woodbury.

ABSENT — Berry, P. P.; Bourgoin, Carey, Doyle, Hanson, Lucas, Sheltra, Silverman, Smith, E. H.; Tanguay, Wood, M. E.

Yes, 61; No, 78; Absent, 11.

The SPEAKER: Sixty-one having voted in the affirmative, and seventy-eight in the negative, with eleven being absent, the motion does not prevail.

Thereupon, the Minority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted, the Bill read twice and tomorrow assigned.

The Chair laid before the House the fourteenth tabled and today assigned matter:

HOUSE JOINT ORDER — Re — State Controller Furnishing list of State Employees with their Salaries. (H. P. 1263)

Tabled — April 7, by Mr. Binnette of Old Town.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Birt of East Millinocket to indefinitely postpone.

Mr. Kelley of Machias offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" (H-113) was read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the same gentleman.

Mr. KELLEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This amendment would provide that the University of Maine will furnish the State Controller with a list of officers and employees, together with their salaries. And it would, of course, be of considerable assistance to this Legislature in reaching decisions on many matters concerning the University of Maine.

As many of you realize, the super-university hasn't enjoyed the best of public relations with the taxpayers. And this will give them an excellent opportunity to improve their image. Personally I would imagine that the University would welcome this opportunity of cooperating with the legislature.

Now occasionally one hears the rather curious argument that if these salaries were published that the university would be at a disadvantage because other colleges would raid their staff, they would offer larger salaries, and so forth. This argument is something less than impressive. In the first place, any college can easily find the salary schedules of another, and in the second place recent newspaper articles over the past two years have shown that every school and college in Maine has a backlog of applicants who would gladly accept a smaller salary for the privilege of living in Maine.

And I would remind the members of this House that this amendment and the original resolution are based on the inherent right of the people to know how much they are paying, and to whom.

Now in late years we have witnessed a rather dangerous attitude on the part of many public officials. And that is the tendency to withhold from the public information which traditionally has been, and should by right be, available to them. In the past 25 years we have seen how aggressive government becomes ever

more restrictive, and how easy it is for bureaucrats to assume a "father knows best" attitude.

Now I am not suggesting that those who oppose this right of the people to know are stooges of the state departments. But it is unfortunate that their attitude serves the same ends; namely to draw a cloak of secrecy over the matters of public salaries. Now in this case it is doubly ironic, because we are only asking that this information be made available to members of this Legislature, duly elected public officials. But evidently there are those who feel that we can't be trusted with this top secret information.

And I say to you, ladies and gentlemen of the House, that it is a sorry day for the State of Maine when we reach a state of affairs whereby the legislature itself feels that it is not qualified to request this information.

Therefore, ladies and gentlemen, I earnestly urge you to accept this amendment and the Joint Order, and when the vote is taken I would respectfully ask for a roll call.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am chagrined to again have to oppose the good gentleman from Machias, Mr. Kelley, although I frankly must admit that whether I am for or against any measure I always enjoy his rhetoric. I think it is outstanding in this body.

I have always stood opposed to the printing of snoop books. The good gentleman mentions that we should be trusted as members of the legislature to have these in our possession. But once these things get onto the mimeographing board and they hit us, I can assure you there will be several copies that will have deviated in other areas, and will be up for sale at a dollar or whatever the prevailing rates are.

Secondly, if this amendment would pass within a very short period of time every state university in the country would ask for such a list, and everybody in our system of the State of Maine University would be up as a sit-

ting duck for recruiting universities throughout the country. And I have been one, as you know, of the severest critics at times of the State of Maine University programs and some of its expenditures. But I don't think this is any way at all for us to help the situation.

I think this thing would serve more as a detriment than anything else. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move the indefinite postponement of this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The gentlemen from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, now moves the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "A".

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I arise this morning to support my good friend from Machias, Mr. Kelley. I heard the same arguments from Mr. Jalbert two years ago, and I don't think they have improved any since then.

We are all going to be asked to vote for salary increases in here for the state employees, and we are also going to be asked to give more money to the University of Maine. And from where I come from, my constituents, they are very concerned about the University of Maine, because we have the south campus right there in Bangor. And when someone asks me what they are paying for a salary at the University of Maine, I cannot give them an honest answer.

I think Mr. Kelley's amendment is very reasonable. They are receiving public funds. It is the people's money that is paying their salaries, and I can't see any reason why the people up in the University of Maine are any different than the people over in that office building right over there. I think what is fair for one is fair for all.

And maybe some of us would be quite surprised at the salaries that they are getting at the University of Maine. I would like to get a chance to look at them. I asked a friend in this House a short while ago for some information on it, and apparently he

hasn't got it available yet. And I think this is one way where we can find out what we are paying for salaries. We give them quite a bit of money up there; it is no dimes and cents there.

So I feel that we should support Mr. Kelley's amendment, and oppose Mr. Jalbert's motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise to support the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, for the following reasons. I personally have no objection in finding out what salaries are at the university, or within the State House complex, or throughout the state for any individual that happens to be a state employee. But I do get concerned when we start listing names.

If we want to find out what individual persons are receiving, as an individual legislator we can go over to the Bureau of Finance and Administration, and they have on file the listing of each individual, both within the state employee system and also the University of Maine. This is not a problem. But we get this thing out, and we get ourselves in a real mess.

If we are concerned in knowing what employees are getting, both at the university and here, I would be in favor of an order that would so state, provided that it did not list individuals by name. If you pass this, why should we not pass an order saying that lawyers ought to disclose their entire salary? Why should we not pass an order saying that insurance agents ought to do the same? Why not School Administrative Districts ought to list their teachers by name and the amount of money they receive? This is done in one or two communities, but not in all. What we ought to do is to list the amount of money they get for the position that they hold, and not by name.

And so I am opposed to the amendment, and I am also opposed to the original order.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Carey, just sent me a memo crossing out captain next to Mr. Kelleher's name, and putting the word lieutenant. I crossed out the word lieutenant, sent it back to Mr. Kelleher as a buck private.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Drigotas.

Mr. DRIGOTAS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I introduced this order, and I did it because through the course of the four terms that I have served here I do not know of any misuse or abuse of this little publication. I have found it at times when I couldn't lay my hands on it immediately, when somebody asked me about a certain salary category, I have found it embarrassing.

I think that we as representatives of this wonderful State of Maine are as entitled to know about these things as others, because the people that we represent ask us these questions. Now as I say, there are only, I think, about 200 copies of this printed, and I am pretty sure that each and every one of them in the past that has received them find them right in their own homes. And I urge and I urge very much you support the passage of this joint order.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Dam.

Mr. DAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in support of the joint order and of the amendment that was offered. In the first place, I try to justify this in my mind as to just what we are trying to hide from the members of the Legislature. In going to the reference of my good friend, Mr. Martin from Eagle Lake, when he spoke about the teachers, I can see very shortly if we are denied this information regarding state employees in the Legislature, very shortly the teachers will say that the school board members should only have the information pertaining to the positions and not to the individual. I think this is pertinent information. I think that this is information that we should have had long before this date so that

we could look objectively at what we are raising money to pay, and if there is anything so secretive about what the employees in the State of Maine are getting, then I would like to know why we have to be secret when we are spending the taxpayers money.

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

Mr. BINNETTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I certainly do agree with the gentleman from Machias, Mr. Kelley, I think he did an excellent job in presenting the facts in regards to this so-called snoop book. I disagree entirely with my Floor Leader, Mr. Martin, in regards to some of the statements which he made when he said why don't we put this out with the lawyer's salary. We have nothing to do with the lawyers. The lawyers are private individuals and this is state's money that we are working with, and I certainly believe that the state money as being spent, that we should, as legislators, know what it is all about.

I have an example that came a few years ago in regard to this book. I had one of our State Troopers come down to my place and he told me how much he was underpaid, overworked and underfed, due to the fact that he was getting a small salary. Well, I couldn't say that he was right or he was wrong. But I did finally contact this book and after I did so I found that he was only in error of about ten dollars a week. He was giving me the impression he wasn't getting what he was getting, and I thought it wasn't right. But after finding the book, I went up to his place and I corrected his statements. But I think a lot of our members are being misled by a lot of these people who say they are underpaid. So I think we should carry on the tradition and have that snoop book.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon.

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I find myself in disagreement with the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, on this matter, also with the

honorable gentleman down in the corner, Mr. Martin. I am not aware of any abuse that this information has been put to in the past. I look upon it as information that this body is absolutely entitled to. I don't think that anybody working for the state or for the University of Maine should be ashamed of the salary they are receiving.

And with regard to the fact that this is available, I am aware of that. But after I go home and someone asks me about a certain salary, it would be much more convenient to me if I have a copy of this book and can look it up without bothering to call the proper offices here in Augusta to get the information. I know where to find it and I presume that most of you do. But this little book is a very handy thing and I think it is more timely perhaps at this time than perhaps at any time in the future.

And the reason that I make this statement is, I think if we have reason to be and are interested, since the recent reorganization of the University of Maine, I think there possibly are things there, I feel personally that while I wouldn't bother perhaps to go over and look them up, but as time goes on I am interested to look and see what changes have been made in their salary scale since the University has been transferred or been reorganized.

We used to get, along with the state employees salaries, we used to get the salaries of everybody except the University at Orono. What I refer to is, we had them from Gorham, from Farmington and all those other areas.

I believe this information is very timely at this time. And I hope you go along with the order of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Drigotas and also along with the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lund.

Mr. LUND: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As I understand it, the pending motion is a motion to indefinitely postpone the amendment

which would add the names and salaries of the university employees to the people that would be included in what we have called for many years the snoop book. But I think there is a distinction to be drawn here which has been lost sight of, and I simply would like to point it out.

If we amend this order by failing to indefinitely postpone the proposed amendment, we will be including within this book which is proposed to be published the names and salaries of people who are not state employees. The employees of the university are not covered under our state retirement system. They have their own retirement system. They are hired by the university. While it is true that the state contribution to the university is for all practical purposes the entire source of income, the university does have other source of income, and I don't believe the university is a state employee.

I therefore am going to vote in favor of indefinite postponement of the amendment, but in favor of the order as it is presently drawn.

I am not particularly impressed by the suggestion that there are lines and lines of people who are waiting to take these jobs at the university, and I am reminded very much of a story that was told to me by a man who was the custodian of the county building a few years ago. He was talking with a young deputy who had a chance to meet some of the prisoners in the county jail. The young deputy was telling him of all the talented people who were there in the county jail. And the custodian was an old timer and he listened for awhile and he said to the young deputy, "Yes, I am sure you can find some talented people there. I am sure there is someone there who would take your appendix out if you let him."

I am sure there are all kinds of people who are applying who would like to go to work for the university. I am not entirely sure that I want to have them teaching our young people.

I have been aware for some time that the university does have problems of recruiting because of the present pay scale. It is substantially below what is being offered in other similar institutions throughout the country. I think if we publish this list, we will only be adding to our troubles in hiring and retaining competent people.

Mr. Gagnon of Scarborough moved the previous question.

The SPEAKER: For the Chair to entertain a motion for the previous question, it must have the consent of one third of the members present and voting. All those in favor of the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than one third of the members present having voted for the previous question, the motion for the previous question is entertained. The question now before the House is, shall the main question be put now? This is debatable with a time limit of five minutes by any one member. Is it the pleasure of the House that the main question be put now? Those in favor say aye; those opposed say no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the main question was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston that House Amendment "A" to Joint Order Re State Controller Furnishing List of State Employees with their Salaries be indefinitely postponed. A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All members 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 pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed. If you are in favor you will vote yes;

if you are opposed you will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Berube, Birt, Bither, Boudreau, Brown, Bustin, Clemente, Collins, Conley, Cummings, Curran, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Fraser, Goodwin, Hancock, Haskell, Hayes, Herrick, Hodgdon, Jalbert, Kelley, P. S.; Kilroy, Lawry, Lincoln, Lucas, Lund, Lynch, Mahany, Martin, McCloskey, McTeague, Morrell, Murray, O'Brien, Parks, Payson, Pontbriand, Porter, Rocheleau, Santoro, Scott, Slane, Smith, D. M.; Susi, Theriault, Wheeler, White, Wood, M. E.

NAY — Albert, Ault, Bailey, Baker, Barnes, Bedard, Bernier, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Binnette, Bragdon, Brawn, Bunker, Call, Carey, Carrier, Carter, Churchill, Clark, Cooney, Cote, Cottrell, Crosby, Curtis, A. P.; Cyr, Dam, Donaghy, Dow, Drigotas, Dudley, Dyar, Emery, D. F.; Emery, E. M.; Farrington, Faucher, Fecteau, Finemore, Gagnon, Gauthier, Genest, Gill, Good, Hall, Hardy, Hawkens, Henley, Hewes, Immonen, Jutras, Kelleher, Kelley, K. F.; Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Lebel, Lee, Lessard, Lewin, Lewis, Littlefield, Lizotte, MacLeod, Maddox, Manchester, Marsh, Marsteller, McCormick, McKinnon, McNally, Millett, Mills, Mosher, Norris, Orestis, Page, Pratt, Rand, Rolins, Shaw, Shute, Simpson, L. E.; Simpson, T. R.; Starbird, Stillings, Trask, Tyndale, Vincent, Webber, Whitson, Wight, Williams, Wood, M. W.; Woodbury.

ABSENT — Bartlett, Bourgoin, Doyle, Evans, Hanson, Ross, Shetra, Silverman, Smith, E. H.; Tanguay.

Yes, 48; No, 92; Absent, 10.

The SPEAKER: Forty-eight having voted in the affirmative, ninety-two in the negative, with ten being absent, the motion does not prevail.

Thereupon, House Amendment "A" was adopted.

The SPEAKER: The pending question now is on the motion of the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt, that this matter be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt.

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think my main thought on this order is the difference between what I feel is personal and public privacy. I feel my own pay check is personal privacy. I feel that this is information which is my right and my employer's.

Now as far as what I make on an hourly or weekly rate, I think this might be considered to be public information. I think the same thing is true with the state employees. I think the amount of money that they take home, or what they receive for a weekly pay, is personal information, and it is subject to personal privacy.

I think their salary classification, their job classification, information relative to this is public information, and I think this should be available to the general public, or members of the legislature.

Now, as I said yesterday — and I think one of the frustrating things that occasionally happens, you make some comments on a bill and then somebody moves to table it, and you find your comments have gone down the drain. But I did talk with the members of the Personnel Department, and they told me that the State of Maine Compensation Plan for State Government Employees could be made available to all members of the legislature. This has in it a schedule of pay ranges which ranges from three up to, I believe, 47, and it also has a list of all job classifications.

If you want to know what any particular person might make, and you can find his classification, which is readily available, and he happens to be a tax examiner and his range number is 15, then you can look up under class 15 and you can find out what the pay scale of that is. That ranges from \$118 to \$155 for a person with 15 years employment.

I believe this is public information, and I believe it should be made available if anybody desires it. I believe this is the information that also should be available, and is of assistance to the members of the legislature in determining salary costs.

But when it comes to the individual name of a state employee being printed in a book which can be obtained from any legislator once it is circulated, I feel this is private information, and I believe it is wrong.

And for this reason, this is the reason why I have made and support the indefinite postponement of this order.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Mills.

Mr. MILLS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I have been here, on my third session; I have been through this snoop book bit before. I have found the snoop book to be very reliable information when I am talking with people that voted for me.

Now as far as this situation goes, the way I have seen it is this. We were elected to this House at \$2,500. This covers a two-year period. Analyze that down with the number of hours you put into your salary and you will find you are the poorest paid state employee there is in the state. Therefore we have a bureaucracy with the highest paid salaries trying to tell us who represent the people at a very minimum wage — mine figured out at eleven cents an hour. I think that the rest of you will find the same facts apply to your salary as well, and to the people who voted for you.

I am in favor of the snoop book, ladies and gentlemen.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt, that this Joint Order as amended be indefinitely postponed. All in favor of indefinite postponement will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

27 having voted in the affirmative and 107 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Joint Order as amended by House Amendment "A" received passage and was sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the fifteenth tabled and today assigned matter:

HOUSE DIVIDED REPORT — Majority (10) "Ought to pass in new draft" — Minority (2) "Ought not to pass" Committee on State Government on Resolution Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Providing for Apportionment of the House of Representatives into Single Member Districts (H. P. 208) (L. D. 274) — New Draft (H. P. 1238) (L. D. 1524) under same title.

Tabled — April 7, by Mr. Susi of Pittsfield.

Pending — Motion of Mrs. Goodwin of Bath to indefinitely postpone Reports and Resolution.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Donaghy.

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some misunderstanding about the report of the committee and I would like to have it recommitted so that we can change any signing that the folks want to.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Donaghy, moves that this matter be recommitted.

Whereupon, Mr. Mills of Eastport moved that the matter be tabled for two legislative days.

Mr. Donaghy of Lubec requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Mills now moves that this matter be tabled and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 13, pending the motion of the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Donaghy, that it be recommitted. A division has been requested. All in favor of the motion to table will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

18 having voted in the affirmative and 113 having voted in the negative, the motion to table did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Maybe I am a little dense, but perhaps I would like to have the reasons why this ought to be recommitted. I am fully aware that there is some confusion as a result of the way the report was signed. I am also aware that the State Govern-

ment Committee has more bills than it probably will ever handle before we get out of here, and we may never get out of here if we have to wait for the State Government Committee.

I am also aware that this recommitting is not going to solve this problem. I am also aware that this bill isn't getting anywhere. And for those reasons perhaps I would ask the chairman of the State Government Committee to further explain it.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Donaghy, who may answer if he chooses; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would thank the Minority Leader for his confidence in the chairman of the State Government Committee. I am sure that he is not confused in this issue. It seems as though the three members of his party think that they have had something pulled on them, so we will take it back to the committee and if they were confused, whatever happened, if they want to resign the bill they may do so.

As far as I know the Majority Party is very happy with the way the bill came out of committee.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: If the good gentleman of the State Government Committee knows that the only reason that this is going back to committee is that two jackets are going to be signed over again, it really does not seem to me that this is a valid reason why you ought to return this to the committee.

And so I would oppose the recommitment and I would ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Bath, Mrs. Goodwin.

Mrs. GOODWIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Donaghy, suggested that the three Democrats are confused, and if I

am not confused myself, yesterday he admitted to me that he had not seen the new draft either. And Mr. Gill said yesterday that he thought the new draft was a much purer version; it is purer, it is pure Republican.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Gill.

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Frankly it doesn't make much difference to me if you recommit this or not. I took the position I would go along and do whatever the majority wanted to do; and that is the way I feel now. I do feel that it is a pure bill, and I certainly have a great deal of respect for the Committee on State Government and I am sorry this confusion exists upon that committee, but I will reiterate. On the day I presented the original legislative document I felt rather strange. I informed the chairman, and perhaps this is a bit unusual, but we are not going to speak to the bill, we are going to speak to the new draft.

That may have only been a month ago; it seems like six or seven months ago. And through some procedure which perhaps the State Government Committee are aware of, they started to sign out jackets and they weren't sure just what they were signing on. Well I mean this is up to the committee, and I know the Appropriations Committee doesn't always run their committee the way the rest of the House thinks they should so therefore I don't want to interfere with State Government.

But I would like to comment. I don't know if this bill is going to committee or where it is going. I have a fair idea where it is going. But this morning I received a report from the Research Association of Maine. This is on a survey that was run in the town, or rather in the City of Waterville. It simply states that this is a survey of the City of Waterville pertaining to the state representatives, and there was a simple question asked. It simply said—who are your state representatives? Four percent did not know, and I think that percentage figure is low; I think in

Portland it would be greater. Three percent said Cy Joly. Two percent said Mr. Smith. Two percent said Mr. Genest. Two percent said Mr. Carter. And one percent said Mr. Carey. (laughter)

The SPEAKER: The House will be in order, and the pending question is recommitment. All in favor of this matter being recommitted to the Committee on State Government will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken. 39 having voted in the affirmative and 85 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Whereupon, Mr. Susi of Pittsfield moved that the matter be tabled for two days.

Mr. Mills of Eastport requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi now moves that L. D. 1524 be tabled and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 13, pending the motion of the gentlewoman from Bath, Mrs. Goodwin to indefinitely postpone both Reports and Resolution.

All in favor of the motion to table will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken. 65 having voted in the affirmative and 63 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

The Chair laid before the House the sixteenth tabled and today assigned matter:

HOUSE DIVIDED REPORT — Majority (11) "Ought not to pass" — Minority (2) "Ought to pass"— Committee on Education on Bill "An Act to Create a School Administrative District for the Town of Orono" (H. P. 804) (L. D. 1077)

Tabled — April 7, by Mr. Susi of Pittsfield.

Pending — Acceptance of either Report.

On motion of Mr. Curtis of Orono, retabled pending acceptance of either Report and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 13.

On motion of Mr. Susi of Pittsfield,

Adjourned until twelve o'clock noon tomorrow.