

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 Eighth
Legislature***

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

Volume I

January 5, 1977 to May 25, 1977

KJ PRINTING
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Tuesday, January 25, 1977

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

Prayer by the Reverend Charles J. Burt, Green Memorial AME Zion of Portland.

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

Papers from the Senate

From the Senate: the following Joint Resolution: (S. P. 62)

Joint Resolution Accepting The Capitol Planning Commission Report And Indicating A Willingness to Utilize The Capitol Complex Plan And Public Improvement Proposals as a Guide For All Future Legislation Pertaining To The Capitol Complex.

WHEREAS, the Capitol Planning Commission has been given the responsibility of establishing and maintaining a master plan for the orderly development of future state buildings and grounds in the Capitol Complex of the City of Augusta; and

WHEREAS, the Capitol Planning Commission has submitted to the Legislature an updated master plan with proposed public improvements for the next 10 years in the Capitol Complex; and

WHEREAS, the Legislature has reviewed this plan and the public improvements; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That we, the Members of the 108th Legislature in regular session assembled, acknowledge receipt of the Maine Capitol Planning Commission Report dated November 1976 and the fulfillment by the commission of its legislative mandate contained in the public laws of 1967, chapter 458; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Legislature gives its general support of the basic concepts of the Capitol Planning Commission Plan, and indicates its willingness to utilize this plan together with any supplements to it and the public improvement proposals of the Capitol Planning Commission as a guide for all future legislation concerning public investments or other matters in the Capitol Complex.

Came from the Senate read and adopted and with accompanying Report was referred to the Committee on State Government.

In the House, the Resolution was read and adopted and with accompanying Report was referred to the Committee on State Government in concurrence.

From the Senate:

Bill "An Act Making Current Service Appropriations from the General Fund for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1978 and June 30, 1979" (S. P. 54) (L. D. 118)

Came from the Senate referred to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs and ordered printed.

In the House, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs in concurrence.

RESOLVE, Authorizing Robert J. Gilbert of Mexico to Bring Civil Action Against an Agency of the State of Maine (Emergency) (S. P. 61) (L. D. 134)

Came from the Senate referred to the Committee on Judiciary and ordered printed.

In the House, referred to the Committee on Judiciary in concurrence.

Bill "An Act to Require Municipal Clerks and Registration Commissioners to File Lists of Certain Residents with Jury Commissioners" (S. P. 60) (L. D. 133)

Came from the Senate referred to the Com-

mittee on Local and County Government and ordered printed.

In the House, referred to the Committee on Local and County Government in concurrence.

Bill "An Act Concerning Witness Fees Under the Public Utility Regulatory Statute" (S. P. 59) (L. D. 132)

Came from the Senate referred to the Committee on Public Utilities and ordered printed.

In the House, referred to the Committee on Public Utilities in concurrence.

Messages and Documents

The following Communication: (S. P. 58)

State of Maine
Office of the Governor
Augusta, Maine 04330

January 19, 1977

To: Members of The 108th
Maine Legislature

The State Budget Office has furnished me with the latest information available on the disbursement of federal revenue sharing and anti-recession funds. I am, in turn, sharing them with you in hopes they will be useful in making the decisions you will face in this session, particularly in the area of local government. This will enable you to see what towns and cities in your area have received under these two programs.

Whenever pertinent information is brought to my attention, I try to share the data, such as the attached, and it is in that spirit I will try to share this type information with Legislators. I would appreciate the same in return.

I am sharing the enclosed with you for two basic reasons:

(1) I have had many instances since being in office where information was not readily available that would have been helpful in making decisions. Along these lines, I am sure you have received many inquiries regarding federal revenue sharing disbursements and more recently on payments of anti-recession funds.

(2) I think it is important to understand all the commitments being made to local governments so we can better understand our own commitments and be in a better position to make our own decisions regarding funding and local control. As Governor, I've said that I favor more local control and I remain committed to that philosophy. However, as Governor I have become more aware that there are some who want local control but want the dollars to come from some other source. I am also more aware that there are those who will spend more if they believe that the money is coming from another level. Unfortunately, I feel far too much blame has been placed on past legislators, and former State officials for the education deficits and overspending. I believe it is important for everyone to understand that this situation was partially caused because some local officials bought buses and constructed buildings which they probably would not have, had they felt they were spending their own money, or had the local citizens been allowed to vote on the question.

I hope this information will be helpful to you.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) JAMES B. LONGLEY

Came from the Senate read and with accompanying papers ordered placed on file.

In the House, the Communication was read and with accompanying papers ordered placed on file in concurrence.

**Petitions, Bills and Resolves
Requiring Reference**

The following Bills and Resolutions were received and referred to the following Committees:

Agriculture

Bill "An Act Relating to the Definition and

Licensing of Applications under the Pesticide Control Law" (H. P. 108) (Presented by Mr. Teague of Fairfield)

(Ordered Printed)

Sent up for concurrence.

Business Legislation

Bill "An Act to Clarify the Maine Municipal Securities Approval Act" (H. P. 109) (Emergency) (Presented by Mr. Whittemore of Skowhegan)

(Ordered Printed)

Sent up for Concurrence.

Education

Bill "An Act Relating to the Payment of Fees for Certification of Educational Personnel" (Emergency) (H. P. 110) (Presented by Mr. Bagley of Winthrop)

Bill "An Act to Amend the Vocational Education Laws" (Emergency) (H. P. 111) (Presented by Mr. Lynch of Livermore Falls)

(Ordered Printed)

Sent up for concurrence.

Fisheries and Wildlife

Bill "An Act Authorizing the Issue of Combination Hunting and Fishing Licenses at Reduced Fees to Members of the Maine National Guard" (H. P. 112) (Presented by Mrs. Berube of Lewiston) (Cosponsors: Mrs. Lewis of Auburn, Mr. Raymond of Lewiston)

(Ordered Printed)

Sent up for concurrence.

Labor

Bill "An Act Revising the Disqualification Periods for Persons who Voluntarily Quit Work or are Discharged for Misconduct" (H. P. 113) (Presented by Mrs. Tarr of Bridgton)

(Ordered Printed)

Sent up for concurrence.

Legal Affairs

Bill "An Act Concerning Approval of Marriage by the Judge of Probate after the Filing of Objections" (H. P. 114) (Presented by Mr. Cote of Lewiston)

(Ordered Printed)

Sent up for concurrence.

State Government

RESOLUTION, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Abolish the Office of the Treasurer of State (H. P. 115) (Presented by Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston) (Cosponsors: Mr. Kelleher of Bangor, Mrs. Mitchell of Vassalboro, Mr. Norris of Brewer)

(Ordered Printed)

Sent up for concurrence.

**Study Report
Committee on Health and
Institutional Services**

Mr. Goodwin from the Committee on Health and Institutional Services to which was referred the study relative to Mental Retardation Services in Maine, pursuant to H. P. 1724 of the 107th Legislature, have had the same under consideration and ask leave to submit its findings and to report that the accompanying Bill "An Act to require the Board of Registration in Medicine to Provide for an Educational Program in Developmental Disabilities (H. P. 116) (L. D. 130) be referred to this Committee for public hearing and printed pursuant to Joint Rule 17.

Report was read and accepted, the Bill referred to the Committee on Health and Institutional Services, ordered printed and sent up for concurrence.

**Study Report of
Committee on Health and
Institutional Services**

Mr. Goodwin from the Committee on Health

and Institutional Services to which was referred the study relative to Mental Retardation Services in Maine, pursuant to H. P. 1724 of the 107th Legislature, have had the same under consideration and ask leave to submit its findings and to report that the accompanying Bill "An Act to Prohibit Insurance Discrimination Against Operators of Boarding Care Facilities" (H. P. 117) (L. D. 131) be referred to this Committee for public hearing and printed pursuant to Joint Rule 17.

Report was read.

On motion of Mr. Goodwin of South Berwick, the Bill was referred to the Committee on Business Legislation, ordered printed and sent up for concurrence.

Consent Calendar

First Day

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

(H. P. 9) (L. D. 19) Bill "An Act Relating to Removal of County Buildings" — Committee on Local and County Government reporting "Ought to Pass"

(H. P. 22) (L. D. 31) Bill "An Act to Amend the Potato Lien Law" — Committee on Agriculture reporting "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-1)

No objections being noted, the above items were ordered to appear on the Consent Calendar for January 26, under listing of the Second Day.

Consent Calendar

Second Day

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

(H. P. 51) (L. D. 72) Bill "An Act Pertaining to Out of State Marriages"

(H. P. 54) (L. D. 75) Bill "An Act Pertaining to Town Clerks Fees for Record of Burial Permits"

No objections having been noted at the end of the Second Legislative Day, the House Papers were passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

Orders of the Day

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

Senate Divided Report — Majority (12) "Ought To Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-1) — Minority (1) "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "B" (S-2) — Committee on Judiciary on Bill, "An Act to Revise The Board of Bar Examiners Law." (S. P. 5) (L. D. 10) In Senate, Majority "Ought to Pass" Report read and accepted and Bill passed to be Engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-1)

Tabled — January 19, 1977 by Mr. Spencer of Standish.

Pending — Acceptance of either Report.

Mr. Spencer of Standish moved that the House accepted the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report in concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Gauthier.

Mr. GAUTHIER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to give you my reasons why I signed the report "ought not to pass." After the bill had been presented by a sponsor, the next person appearing as a proponent was the lady secretary of the Board of Bar Examiners. One of the questions that was asked her, "If the vacancy did occur, did they ever have any trouble finding replacements on this board?" Her answer was that they never had any trouble finding a replacement because lawyers are all willing to serve for the honor of being a board member.

I have been informed that this board meets

twice a year. Last year, many members of this House served along with many other citizens of this state on various commissions. Some of them served twice a month for a period of one year and never asked for or received any pay or remuneration whatsoever. The only thing that they did receive was the gas mileage, and these members travelled from York County up to Waterville, Maine and did this for almost a year, and there were several committees that did the same thing.

I am sure that a majority of the attorneys in this state would be only too glad to continue offering their services twice a year, as they do at the present time, and without any increase in pay. The qualities of sharing knowledge, experience and talents to the State of Maine is very good. Let's not destroy it by passing this bill. And remember the saying of President Kennedy on his inauguration day — "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." Let's apply this to our state like others have done.

I make the motion that we indefinitely postpone this Amendment "A" and I hope that you accept Amendment "B", which brings it back to the remuneration that the attorneys are getting at the present time. In fact, I feel that they should do like the rest of us who worked last year on committees and not receive any remuneration, but they are receiving some at this time.

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

Mr. JOYCE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I stand to ask you to defeat this bill so that we can move on to Representative Gauthier's amendment to the bill.

I feel that we should let the lawyers carry the torch for fiscal restraints. This is a prestigious service that we are asking them to perform. Giving a fee or increasing the fee like this almost seems degrading.

I would urge you to open your books of L. D.'s to L. D. 10. You know, when they cross out some of these bills, cross out words, sometimes that bothers me here. You can see in the first section of this bill that they want to make a change in there. The present law reads that the board shall be composed of seven competent lawyers. Now, they are crossing out the word 'competent.' I am really suspicious of this one, and I hope you will vote to dump this. Look at that and then vote.

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

Mr. CARRIER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think Mr. Joyce got ahead of me, because that was one of my chief arguments against the bill — where they take out 'competent' lawyers. This is not the whole thing. I am not so much upset by the fee that they want; I am more upset by the ambiguity that the bill itself presents compared to the other bill that has been repealed.

For a little background on this bill, you would believe that we are running the Judiciary Committee especially for the Bar Examiners. You have this bill before you in the 108th Legislature. You people who were here last time passed one in the 107th Legislature. We passed one in the 106th Legislature, we passed one in the 105th and 104th. So for the last five terms of this legislature they have come back because they are not satisfied with what they themselves draw up for a bill. Therefore, I cannot support the bill. I am not going to make a motion to indefinitely postpone it, but I think that is where it belongs. I think it is a waste of time for whoever drafted this bill, and if it is a matter of interpretation, with the new section that has been put on there, you could interpret it that as present members expire, lawyer members of the board shall be appointed annually. Well, that could mean, if you want to interpret it this way, the

lawyer members on that board now would have to be reappointed. So it is a matter of fooling around with words.

I don't like the bill. I think the one that you passed last year was much better than this. I won't say it was better than the one before, but at least it clarified the position and the duties of the people on the Board of Examiners.

As far as the \$50 is concerned, I think that somebody is playing a game here. I don't think that \$50 matters to the members. I know every member of that board.

Let me tell you something, in the past sessions this same type of bill was presented by the brother of somebody who is on the Board of Bar Examiners. You take all that up and smoke it and see what you come out with.

I am not going to support the amendment, I am not going to support the bill, and it is up to you to consider all these things and use your best judgment.

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

Mr. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to start by agreeing with my good friend from Sanford, Mr. Gauthier, that what is at issue here is not whether or not it will be possible to find people who will be willing to serve on the Board of Bar Examiners. I think the people who serve on the Board do so because of their concern for the quality of practice and so on, and that they would serve even if there were no compensation.

The bill that was presented to the Judiciary Committee suggested that the compensation be increased to \$50 per day, and the bill was presented by Edith Hary, who is the public member of the board, who in fact turns her compensation back to the state because she is already being paid as the State Law Librarian. She suggested, and the majority of the committee agreed, that the current level of compensation was out of date. According to Edith Hary, the fee was first established in 1899 at \$5 a day, and it was increased in 1941 to \$10 a day. It hasn't been increased since that time.

In looking over the daily compensation for other equivalent boards, I might cite the Veterinarian Board receives \$50 a day, the Osteopathic Board receives \$50 a day, the Board of Medicine receives \$750 per year, the Cosmetologists receive \$35 per year, the Board of Hearing Aid Examiners receive \$40 per year. As the thing came into the committee, I suggested that rather than putting the attorneys at the top of the scale, which is \$50 a day for the Osteopaths and so on, that we ought to simply try to pick a figure that would fall somewhere in the middle of the range of the equivalent boards, and I thought that the House might enjoy putting the lawyers in the same rate of compensation as the hearing aid fitters, so I suggested the figure of \$40. I don't think it is a major issue and I don't think that there is any danger that we won't be able to find people to serve on the board.

The other changes, removal of the word "competent," it seems that the Board of Bar Examiner went through the procedure of determining competency, and it didn't seem that it was necessary to make a further determination as to whether the particular person who was appointed had some other level of competence. So, basically the bill is designed to bring the bar examiners into line with the other licensing boards and to clean up the language.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Gauthier.

Mr. GAUTHIER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In answer to my good friend, Mr. Spencer, I don't think the lawyers are hurting very much. I think if you can find people in this state who have much less money than lawyers have, and make much less,

because I understand lawyers make at least \$65 to \$75 an hour, it seems to me that they could help their state out and show the rest of the state that they can serve without remuneration whatsoever. I feel that they owe something to their state.

If there are others who have been on commissions — and there were quite a few commissions last year who worked for no remuneration at all — I feel that this bill is not in order. I feel that this amendment should be killed right now, and I hope that the lawyers will lead the way and show the others that they should serve their state and do it without — I don't think the \$40 makes that much difference. I think they should set an example for the rest of the state.

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

Mr. TARBELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am doing my best to serve my state. I am an attorney and I wish I were receiving \$65 to \$75 an hour as an attorney.

It was brought out that it would be approximately 24 to 30 days a year for any person on the Board of Bar Examiners to devote to the Bar examination questions, drafting up the questions as well as grading the questions, and every other question that might arise pertaining to the Board of Bar Examiners. This is about a month out of the board members time.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Newcastle, Mrs. Byers.

Mrs. BYERS: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: There is one other small consideration, and that is that we have a public member on every board. The public member this time is Edith Hary, who, of course, we all know works for the state and she does turn back her per diem for working on this board. But other people might not be able to do that, and we would like to have any consumer be able to serve on this board, and \$40 a day, as has been stated, is exactly what people in another profession, the hearing aid dealers, would make in a day. I don't feel this is unfair.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Stow, Mr. Wilfong.

Mr. WILFONG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question to the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Spencer. Where does the money come from that is used to pay the Board of Bar Examiners? Is that a General Fund expenditure? How is that money raised?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Stow, Mr. Wilfong, has posed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Spencer, who may answer if he so desires. The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, any compensation that was paid to the Board of Bar Examiners would be paid out of their own special account. There would be no General Fund expenditure involved. There is currently a surplus in the account which would enable them to operate at the increased rate of \$40 compensation.

One of the things that has happened is that the number of people taking the Bar exam has increased dramatically since Maine went to the multi-state bar examination system, so there has been an increase in revenues from the fees for operating the examination which would enable the proposed increase to be paid out of the fees of the Board of Bar Examiners.

Mr. Blodgett of Waldoboro requested a roll call vote.

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

Mr. JOYCE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I feel still that competency is the hallmark of the present law, and I would like to see that stay in there.

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

Mr. CARRIER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and

Gentlemen of the House: There is much that hasn't been said. For one thing, they said there have been more candidates to the Bar; this is true, but the number hasn't been that great ever since they went on this multi-state. Ever since the University of Maine Law School has been in operation, the number of applicants to the Bar has increased tremendously. On the other hand, I don't want you to forget that it is immaterial how much it has increased and how much it costs, because I don't think there is any limit that you can show me in any bill that they have put up here and it is at their discretion to charge any amount of money they want to take an exam. It doesn't say that they will charge \$50 or \$35, which they used to. They weren't satisfied with that, they just leave it open end. They can justify whatever it costs by asking for \$100 or \$125 for taking the Bar exam. The no-limit fee does apply to this because they are free to ask any amount in order to balance their expenses along with other things.

As far as them spending much time — it is a two-day affair twice a year, and I doubt very much that if you had the time and you checked on it, you will find that they didn't spend any month trying to get these exams set up.

Something that bothers me is the fact that I did not know, but I do know now, that Miss Hary is the public member appointed, and I do feel very strongly that the other members have used her on this bill. I don't see any reason why she should put this bill in if she were familiar with the feelings and what has transpired in the past as far as getting the thing raised and as far as bringing it up every term of the legislature. If they can't make a good bill, let them live with the one they have.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Norris.

Mr. NORRIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Being a non-lawyer on the Judiciary Committee, I felt that I should say just a few words. I don't agree with my good friend from Westbrook. If a law isn't correctly written, I see no reason why we shouldn't change it. I see no reason that we shouldn't upgrade it. That is really what we are all here for. If you want to make this a vendetta against lawyers, fine.

I think my good friend from Sanford, if you look at his report, the only objection that he has to the changes in this bill is the remuneration. He has no objection to the structure of the bill, he has no objection to the changes that are made other than the amount of money. As the good House Chairman of the committee has stated, this is simply putting lawyers on a basis with hairdressers. If you feel that they don't deserve to be there, fine and dandy; vote against it. If you have a vendetta against lawyers, vote against it, don't give them the \$40. It isn't going to bother them one way or the other.

But as far as the mechanics and the change in the bill, no one on the committee objected to that. The only objection within the committee was whether or not they get \$10 a day or \$40 a day, and if they have to drive any miles at all and they make as much money as we are talking about, the \$10 wouldn't even buy the gasoline for their automobiles.

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

Mr. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Standish. Why was the word 'competency' deleted?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Green, has posed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Spencer, who may answer the question if he so desires. The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, the word

'competency' was deleted in the bill as presented and it simply was taken for granted that in appointing a group of people who were going to determine the qualifications of the applicants to the Bar, that you would not go to appoint somebody who was not competent. It just didn't seem there was any reason to put that in.

The SPEAKER: 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 those desiring a roll call vote will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

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

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Spencer, that the House accept the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report in concurrence on Bill "An Act to Revise the Board of Bar Examiners Law," Senate Paper 5, L. D. 10. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Alopis, Austin, Bagley, Beaulieu, Bennett, Benoif, Biron, Birt, Boudreau, A.; Boudreau, P.; Brenerman, Bunker, Bustin, Byers, Carey, Carter, F.; Chonko, Churchill, Clark, Connolly, Cox, Davies, Devoe, Dow, Drinkwater, Elias, Fenlason, Flanagan, Fowlie, Garsoe, Gibbs, Gill, Gillis, Goodwin, H.; Goodwin, K.; Gould, Gray, Greenlaw, Henderson, Hickey, Higgins, Hobbins, Howe, Huber, Hughes, Hutchings, Jackson, Jacques, Jensen, Kane, LaPlante, Lewis, Locke, Lunt, Lynch, Marshall, Masterman, Masterton, McBreairty, McHenry, McMahon, Mitchell, Moody, Nadeau, Najarian, Nelson, M.; Norris, Palmer, Peakes, Peltier, Perkins, Peterson, Quinn, Shute, Silsby, Spencer, Sprowl, Stubbs, Talbot, Tarbell, Tarr, Teague, Tierney, Valentine, Whittemore, Wilfong, Wood, Wyman.

NAY — Ault, Berry, Berube, Blodgett, Brown, K. L.; Brown, K. C.; Burns, Carrier, Carroll, Conners, Cote, Curran, Dexter, Diamond, Dudley, Durgin, Dutremble, Gauthier, Green, Hall, Hunter, Immonen, Jalbert, Joyce, Kany, Kelleher, Kerry, Kilcoyne, Laffin, Littlefield, Lizotte, Lougee, MacEachern, Mackel, Mahany, Martin, A.; Maxwell, McKean, McPherson, Nelson, N.; Pearson, Post, Prescott, Raymond, Rideout, Rollins, Strout, Theriault, Torrey, Tozier, Trafton, Truman, Twitchell, Tyndale.

ABSENT — Bachrach, Carter, D.; LeBlanc, Mills, Morton, Powell, Smith, Stover.

Yes, 88; No, 54; Absent, 8.

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

Thereupon, the Bill was read once. Committee Amendment "A" (S-1) was read by the Clerk and adopted in concurrence and the Bill assigned for second reading tomorrow.

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

Joint Order — Relative to Senate and House Services, Supplies and Equipment (S. P. 21) In Senate, read and passed.

Tabled — January 19, 1977 by Mr. Palmer of Nobleboro.

Pending — Passage in concurrence.

On motion of Mr. Palmer of Nobleboro, retabled pending passage in concurrence and specially assigned for Thursday, January 27.

(Off Record Remarks)

On motion of Mr. Lizotte of Biddeford, Adjourned until four o'clock tomorrow afternoon.