

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 Twelfth
Legislature

OF THE
STATE OF MAINE

VOLUME II

SECOND REGULAR SESSION
April 3 - April 16, 1986
Index

SECOND SPECIAL SESSION
May 28 - May 30, 1986
Index

THIRD CONFIRMATION SESSION
July 15, 1986
Index

FOURTH CONFIRMATION SESSION
August 29, 1986
Index

THIRD SPECIAL SESSION
October 17, 1986
Index

FIFTH CONFIRMATION SESSION
November 24, 1986
Index

The House was called to order by the Speaker.
Prayer by Reverend Bruce R. Hudson, Highland Avenue United Methodist Church, Gardiner.
The Journal of Thursday, April 3, 1986, was read and approved.
Quorum call was held.

PAPERS FROM THE SENATE

Unanimous Leave to Withdraw

Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Leave to Withdraw" on Bill "An Act to Transfer Probate Jurisdiction to the Superior and District Courts" (S.P. 447) (L.D. 1250)

Report of the Committee on Audit and Program Review reporting "Leave to Withdraw" on Bill "An Act to Require the Department of Human Services to Pursue Family Reunification Prior to Termination of Parental Rights" (S.P. 849) (L.D. 2150)

Were placed in the Legislative Files without further action pursuant to Joint Rule 15 in concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Establishing a Commission to Implement Computerization of Criminal History Record Information" (Emergency) (H.P. 1627) (L.D. 2295) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on April 2, 1986.

Came from the Senate passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-454) in non-concurrence.

The House voted to recede and concur.

ORDERS

On motion of Representative McSWEENEY of Old Orchard Beach, the following Order:

ORDERED, that Representative Jean T. Dellert of Gardiner be excused April 4 for personal reasons.

Was read and passed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Ought to Pass in New Draft

Representative CASHMAN from the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Relating to Place of Payment of Motor Vehicle Excise Tax on Leased Vehicles" (H.P. 1202) (L.D. 1709) reporting "Ought to Pass" in New Draft (H.P. 1647) (L.D. 2324)

Report was read and accepted, the Bill read once and assigned for second reading Monday, April 7, 1986.

Ought to Pass in New Draft

Representative CASHMAN from the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Relating to the Sales of Extended Cable Television Services" (Emergency) (H.P. 614) (L.D. 884) reporting "Ought to Pass" in New Draft (Emergency) (H.P. 1649) (L.D. 2326) (Representative NELSON of Portland - abstained)

Report was read and accepted. Under suspension of the rules, the Bill was read twice, passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

Ought to Pass in New Draft/New Title

Representative PERRY from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Relating to Liquor Excise Taxes and Freight Rates" (H.P. 1361) (L.D. 1905) reporting "Ought to Pass" in New Draft under New Title Bill "An Act Relating to Liquor Excise Taxes and Freight Rates and Making Other Changes in the Liquor Laws" (H.P. 1646) (L.D. 2323)

Report was read and accepted. Under suspension of the rules, the Bill was read twice, passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

Ought to Pass in New Draft/New Title

Representative ZIRNKILTON from the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act to Increase the Watercraft Excise Tax Tables" (H.P. 1309) (L.D. 1825) reporting "Ought to Pass" in New Draft under New Title Bill "An Act to Provide for a Study of Excise Taxes on Watercraft" (H.P. 1648) (L.D. 2325)

Report was read and accepted. Under suspension of the rules, the Bill was read twice, passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

Ought to Pass in New Draft/New Title

Representative VOSE from the Committee on Utilities on Bill "An Act to Permit Industrial Electric Consumers to Purchase Energy from and through Transmission Lines Carrying Energy from Canada through the State" (H.P. 1493) (L.D. 2104) reporting "Ought to Pass" in New Draft under New Title Bill "An Act to Permit Transmission of Electricity Between Affiliated Industrial Enterprises and to Study Power Purchases and Other Aspects of Transmission of Electrical Energy through the State" (H.P. 1656) (L.D. 2327)

Report was read and accepted. Under suspension of the rules, the Bill was read twice, passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Judiciary

reporting "Ought Not to Pass" on Bill "An Act to Prohibit the Promotion and Wholesale Promotion of Pornographic Material in the State of Maine" (I.B. 2) (L.D. 2092)

Signed:
Senators: CARPENTER of Aroostook
CHALMERS of Knox
SEWALL of Lincoln

Representatives: ALLEN of Washington
COOPER of Windham
PRIEST of Brunswick
DRINKWATER of Belfast
MacBRIDE of Presque Isle
LEBOWITZ of Bangor
STETSON of Damariscotta

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

Signed:
Representatives: CARRIER of Westbrook
PARADIS of Augusta

(Representative KANE of South Portland - Abstained)

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Washington, Representative Allen.

Representative ALLEN: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I move that the House accept the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report.

As you know, L.D. 2092 was referred to the Judiciary Committee without a sponsor because it is a voter initiated referendum question. The Judiciary Committee had three choices, we could either enact the bill as it was written without any amendments whatsoever, which two members of our committee chose to do, or we could put out a competing measure which the entire Judiciary Committee chose not to do or we could pass out the "Ought Not to Pass" Report, which we did. In effect, what we are saying is that this measure should be sent to the voters in November.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Augusta, Representative Paradis.

Representative PARADIS: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: This bill comes to us this afternoon as no surprise. We have long awaited this moment so we could deal with this issue here in this chamber.

Perhaps there might have been some of us that would have wanted to amend the bill but since it is an initiated bill, we cannot do that. We must deal with the issue that is before us the way that it is.

You have heard the quote, I am sure, from the great British philosopher Edmund Burke, "All that is necessary for evil to triumph is for good people to do nothing." Well, let me put this bill in that context to you this afternoon -- that to do nothing is to send the type of message to the smut peddlers across this country that Maine is an open state to that sort of garbage. To do nothing, I think, sends the worst form of message to the parents of runaway children who are led into this type of business, if you can call it that.

Everyone agrees that there is a problem with

pornography. I commend, in a very real way, the people who have brought this initiated bill to us. All politics aside, all rhetoric aside, there are some wonderful people who have brought a very important message to us today. Today, it is before us in this chamber.

I would ask you to stand on the side of decency, send a message loud and clear that we in this House do not stand for this type of unlimited pornography, unlimited garbage, in this state, that we are against it in its forms and that we can exercise our constitutional right given to us by the people when they approved of the constitution to enact this bill here.

I would urge you to vote against the motion before us and face this issue squarely and say that we are going to enact a major anti-pornography bill and stand behind the issue of decency.

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

Representative PRIEST: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I confess I was very reluctant to debate what is obviously an extremely emotional issue. The question of obscenity involves deeply held religious beliefs, beliefs concerning freedom of speech, beliefs concerning the proper role of government in people's private lives.

Public debate on this issue is going to take place one way or the other. If it goes out to referendum as we recommend, there is a long educational process on this bill which will take place and the public will have to deal with the issues which are proposed by this bill.

There are, I believe, strong reasons for not enacting this particular bill. I would like to discuss a few of them with you today. The reasons, as I see them, are basically summed up under four categories. First, the bill is not needed. Second, the bill, as drafted, has problems with it. Third, the bill is unlikely to be evenly enforced and fourth, it is probably going to be very costly to enforce.

You should recall that Maine, right now, has dealt with the issue of pornography in the past and has made a concerted effort to protect minors. Minors, of course, are those who cannot protect themselves and deserve and have received legislative protection.

I would like to detail for you a few of the laws that are presently on the books concerning obscenity and minors. These are all in Title 17, which is a criminal title.

Section 2911 - prohibits the dissemination of obscene material to minors.

Section 2912 - prohibits magazines being displayed to minors if there is obscene material on the cover.

Section 2913 - prohibits exhibiting obscene motion pictures to minors at outdoor movie theaters.

Section 2922 - prohibits sexual exploitation of a minor.

Section 2923 - prohibits dissemination of sexually explicit material to minors.

These laws carry substantial penalties -- many cases up to five years or more.

Frankly, another reason this bill is not needed is the success of the Portland Ordinance. You may recall that this initiated bill is based in part, although not entirely, on the Portland Ordinance. The Portland Ordinance was drafted by some of the

best legal minds in the state and has been found to be constitutional. If, in fact, a community has problems with obscenity, they have in place now a constitutional, well drafted ordinance that can be enacted and can solve a particular local problem.

In addition, there are certain problems with the bill itself. The Portland Ordinance is a civil bill, that is, the penalties are civil penalties. This bill provides for criminal penalties. It is a much more serious bill because it affects more than just sellers of material. There is a presumption in the bill, on Page four, that a person who possesses six or more obscene articles is presumed to possess them with intent to promote them. That could be a person having for example, six copies of Playboy in his possession. The presumption would be then that he is presumed to be a pornographer engaged in the promotion of pornography. That is a very serious presumption when you are talking about a year in jail as a possible penalty.

The third problem with this bill, it seems to me, it is unlikely to be uniformly enforced. The Portland Ordinance from what we can see, after the initial constitutional test, has not been vigorously enforced. The problems with enforcement are severe. The definition of obscenity depends upon community standards. Community is not defined in this bill. Is community the town in which the sale takes place for the promotion? Is community the county or the state? The bill is unclear as to that. Obviously, what one person considers to be obscene, another person may not. What is perhaps felt not to be obscene in one community may be felt to be obscene in another.

The difficulty with this bill then is that it is likely to be enforced against people who will not be sure what is prohibited and what is not. It will be enforced, not only what is considered against so-called pornographers, but also teachers and librarians who may possess material that would be considered obscene in one area of the state and not in another.

The final reason why I have problems with this bill is that I think it will be very costly to enforce and that, as I understand, has been the preliminary Portland experience.

The issue of whether something is obscene under community standards demands expert testimony in court. That means you have to hire someone who is familiar with that type of material. That quite often is a professor or a PHD. That is a costly procedure and it has to be undergone in virtually every single prosecution taken. It is going to involve confusing testimony of experts as to whether the book is obscene under community standards and that will cost the state a considerable amount of money which could better be used, it seems to me, in other pursuits.

For all of these reasons, the bill is not needed, it has serious problems with being over-broad and overly severe, that it will be unevenly enforced and it will be costly to enforce -- I think that we ought to support the "Ought Not to Pass" Report and I urge you to do so.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Presque Isle, Representative MacBride.

Representative MACBRIDE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: My decision to sign the "Ought Not to Pass" Report was a difficult one for I

feel that obscene material, both in printed form and on TV, is creating many problems. However, 48,474 people have signed a petition asking for the privilege to vote on this issue in November. I do not feel the legislature should take this privilege away from them. I would hope that we would not interfere with the initiated referendum process.

I urge you to accept the Majority Report.

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

Representative HAYDEN: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I rise today to speak to you, not as the Assistant Majority Leader but as the Representative from District 70, on this bill. I urge you to support the motion of the gentlewoman from Washington to support the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report on this L.D.

The reason that I rise to join the speakers that have spoken previously is to clarify some of the discussions that have surrounded this bill, both between us, the public and in the press.

One of the issues that has been discussed is whether or not we have a right in this legislature to either pass the bill or not to pass the bill, when the bill is a publicly initiated referendum piece of legislation such as this.

There really is a special legislative process, it is one that we have had in this state since 1909. I think it is important for us to understand just exactly what it is and what it is not.

In 1909, the people gave themselves the right to initiate a piece of legislation to make it law because they have voted for it. Incidentally, they also have the right to veto anything that we do. That also occurred in 1909. The point of that process is to give the people a say. The people have a say when they vote, first by referendum signed by as much as 10 percent of the people that voted in the last gubernatorial election. In this case, 48,000 signed a petition saying that they would support this piece of legislation and there should be a vote on it.

It has been suggested that once that happens, we don't have a right to pass it ourselves. Although I am opposed to this piece of legislation, I think it is important to clarify that point. There isn't any question that we do have a right to enact this legislation now rather than have a referendum. I think it is important that it be stated clearly and that the reasons for it be stated clearly. By this process, the people have a right to have legislation. We can enact it or we can disagree with it and have the referendum process.

There has been some debate as to why some people may consider enacting it. In my opinion, if we chose to enact this legislation because we really knew in the back of our minds what the people of this state really thought, I think that would be a terrible mistake. I don't think that there is any chance that that will happen.

If we looked at this legislation, studied it, debated it and said we agreed with it, then we would be justified in voting for it. In my opinion, in the end, we will not do that.

These are the reasons why. This bill was compared at the time of the petition process and during the debates we had before the Judiciary Committee as similar to the Portland Ordinance, which basically applies the community standards of what is obscene, to the law. Well, it is not the Portland Ordinance, ladies and gentlemen. It is very

important to understand exactly what it is that we are voting on here. We are voting on a piece of legislation which, unlike the Portland Ordinance, would make it a crime to be associated to promoting pornography. It is a criminal statute. If there is a fine line as to what is pornographic and what is not pornographic, if the person that is living in that world misjudges that line, he goes to jail, ladies and gentlemen.

Pornography makes me sick. I don't want my daughter to have anything to do with it. I don't want any of the children that I represent to have anything to do with it. It makes all of us sick. We have in our state laws today, a way to do something about that. The Portland Ordinance that was passed went right up to the State Supreme Court where it was upheld. What that said is, there is a statute upholding that ordinance. There is a statute that individual towns can enact, if they choose, to control what it believes is pornography within its boundaries.

It is sort of interesting that there hasn't been a real tidal wave of support of other towns jumping on this. As a matter of fact, even the towns surrounding Portland, who you would have thought might have had the best instinct to support this legislation, have decided against it, even though they may have had the argument or the thought or the fear that, with these prohibitions in Portland, these pornographers are going to come across our borders. This is speculation on my part, but my guess is that that has something to do with this referendum process. If the Portland Ordinance was upheld and all the towns looked at it and in their wisdom said, this is the kind of legislation we want, it is the kind of legislation that my neighbors want, there wouldn't be the need for this referendum process. That didn't happen. So, now we are being asked to look at this legislation.

Let's get back to the referendum process. I think it gives us a very special invitation. It is an invitation that we didn't have in 1909. When the referendum process was first started, the people that signed that petition could force a public election, no matter what it was that was being voted on. In 1980, there were some amendments, part of the new idea that came in then was to give the legislature an opportunity to do its duty by reviewing legislation that has come through the referendum process. If it disagrees with the referenda, the people still have a right to vote but the people now are given the benefit of our thoughts on this legislation. Anyone that suggests that we are being irresponsible by tampering with the process either way is simply wrong.

If we look at the substance of this bill, a bill that makes this activity a crime, a bill that takes the decision essentially out of the hands of the local town officials, who have that authority now, that is a bad thing to do. This referenda process was passed around by people that are just as offended as you or I by pornography, by the effects it has on our communities and particularly our young people. I don't doubt their motives but if this legislation becomes the law, a fear that I have is that this is a tool in the hands of a skillful politician, a skillful minister, a skillful public citizen, to breed fear into a community, to breed the fear of accusation into someone that does something that may be against our standards. We have tools, our neighbors have tools, to deal with this problem now.

It is tempting to march into step and to follow through with this piece of legislation because maybe we could kill this beast twice. We have got the tools now to kill the beast. We can decide to do it in our own towns. It is for that reason that I think our constitutional duty is to tell the people that, although they have a right as we do to vote on this in a referendum election, we think it is a bad idea.

In spite of what people may say, our opinions collectively as a legislature, make a great deal of difference to the people who vote for us. We have been given the invitation to say whether or not we think this is a good idea or a bad idea. Collectively, we think pornography is bad. I think in the end, collectively, we will think that this bill, although well intended, doesn't serve the proper purposes of dealing with the problem. It is for that reason that I urge you to support the Majority Report in telling the people of the state, when they vote on this piece of legislation, that we think it is an unwise piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Damariscotta, Representative Stetson.

Representative STETSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would just like to add a couple of points to the debate, particularly that presented by the Representative from Brunswick, Representative Priest, because sitting on the Judiciary Committee with Representative Priest, I think we found ourselves in this difficult position -- that here is a piece of legislation that obviously needs an amendment to stand the test of validity. Yet, the Judiciary Committee's hands were tied, we could not amend it. It was presented as a package proposed by the people, by referendum vote, and we could not change a word of it or a line of it to improve it. We either had to take it or leave it.

In my own experience as a prosecutor in the federal system, I have handled the obscenity laws at the federal level, both for the importation of obscene material, and in the District of Columbia with laws pertaining to obscene matter. I can tell you that these are very difficult laws to enforce and, unless they are very carefully crafted, they do more harm than good because they do not accomplish what they set out to do.

I just wanted to make the point that had we been given the opportunity to amend the law and to improve it and to make it effective, possibly we could have done something effective with it. But, at this point, I would have to agree with Representative Hayden that we should urge the electorate to reject it in its present form because we don't think it is properly drafted and to enact it by referendum would be a terrible mistake as well. Therefore, I urge you to accept the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Madawaska, Representative McHenry.

Representative MCHENRY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have a few questions if I may.

If this bill is drafted in such a way, which I understand, and I have read the bill, that it is almost unworkable, in my opinion, would it not be better to enact it ourselves and later on amend it after it has been enacted? If the public had the questions put before them and were they to enact it, I believe we would be hard pressed to change it, to amend it in any form. That is my opinion. Am in

correct in my assumptions?

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

The Chair recognizes the Representative from Brunswick, Representative Priest.

Representative PRIEST: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would hope and the Judiciary Committee I am sure would agree with me, although they can speak to it if they wish, that we would not enact unworkable legislation in any case. This is going to be voted on no matter what we do unless we enact it as is. It is certainly my preference and I think the preference of the committee to let it go to a vote. It seems to me that we are able, in any case, always to change an unworkable law once it is in law and make it better if we have to.

At this point, the Speaker appointed Representative Gwadosky to act as Speaker pro tem.

The House was called to order by the Speaker pro tem.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Westbrook, Representative Carrier.

Representative CARRIER: Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House: I have signed the "Ought to Pass" Report and I suggest to you that when your vote comes up, you use good common sense and good judgment and support what is good for the people of this state.

I do not profess to be an expert on pornography, I know I am not and I don't want to be. I can only say to you that everybody in here knows what pornography is. We don't have to apply a test as suggested by some newspapers such as who is the average person and what does he like. We don't have to describe to anybody what prudent interests are, all of you know what it is. You know what pornography is -- whether it be in books or on film or wherever, you know what pornography is. Through the years, you have been taught that this is not a way of life. It shouldn't be a way of life and we should not promote it. We should do something or try to do something about it. Maybe this is not the best way to do it but we are trying to do something about it.

In this House a few years ago, we passed a law to let the people know that we had our children's interests in mind and that the sellers of these magazines had to cover up the magazines (up to the neck or wherever). They not only had to do that, which I think was very commendable for this House to pass, but we also put in there the fact that these magazines had to be taken off from the first or second shelf so that young children could not reach them. I think that was great too.

I really believe that if you want to promote character and discipline, this is the way to go. This bill will give us an instrument to get rid of some of this pornography. I am wise enough to know that the people who want it, will get it. If it means that much to them that they want to live by

this standard of living and want such pornographic pictures or whatever you want to call it, if that is what they want, they will get it one way or the other.

Let me confess to you, this is a very poor way to talk about pornography. I really gave some thought to ask the Speaker to shut off the microphones and I would give you a dissertation on pornography. We would talk right down to the level where it is, right down to the trash and the filthy place where it belongs. In consideration of the young people that are growing up in this state, they don't need this stuff, but they get it everywhere. That is what they go for all the time. All it leads to is trouble. It leads to young people having abortions, it leads to sterilization, it has led to these lesbians and the other nice bills that we have had in here promoted by the women's issues. The women don't want this stuff. They don't want to have their picture in such books that are around everywhere. Do they? Well, you ask some of these women lobbyists over there -- they don't want it in there but they haven't got the guts to come up here and say so. They should, but they don't.

Something was mentioned about the need, we do need this legislation, and it's drafted as properly as anybody can draft it. But, how are we going to enforce it? The enforcement part of it is very simple. It is held in the hands of all of us in this House and by all the people out there -- all you have to do is not buy the things. If there was such a process where you could say they can only charge 50 cents for such a book, you wouldn't even have a chance to buy one of those books. I don't want a chance and I know most of you don't either, you wouldn't even buy it. People spend \$8, \$10, \$20 for some of this filth. It is not good. I am sure that a husband wouldn't want his wife to ponder on that all day and the woman wouldn't want the husband to look at that all night, or all week or forever and ever.

I think that we have to do something. I don't think that we should make it so the people have access, especially the young ones, to these books which only promote a filthy minded public by a bunch of sick minded perverts. That is what they are. Is there a normal standard applied to us humans as human beings? Can you tell me of any doctor that ever prescribed to you or to any of your family or your friends to go get a book like that -- this will be your cure? Is this the way it is? Of course it isn't. You have faith in the doctor, that is why you go to him, because you want to stay alive. Well, you have to stay alive with a clean mind as well as a clean body.

I suggest to you that we take a good stand. I think the people out there, as far as I am concerned, will vote for this anyway if you send it to referendum. We have a duty here today, we can handle it right here. We can handle it right here by not making such books and such filth. I am not familiar with what is going on but I do know it is there. I can only ask you to use your good sense and vote against the present motion so we can make the motion to accept the present bill. If that doesn't do it, then it will go to referendum. I truly believe that the people of this state have enough common sense, decency, they want a good life in this world and they will only get it by getting away from some of this pornography. I submit to you that you should vote against the present motion and I ask for a roll call.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Portland, Representative Baker.

Representative BAKER: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I just want to say a few words about this issue, primarily because I followed this issue pretty closely when it came to the vote in Portland.

I would like to refer a little bit to a statement made in the June 14, 1977 House Record in reference to the very same bill that the good Representative from Westbrook, Representative Carrier, was talking about in trying to ban nudity from being displayed in magazines. Representative Burns had stated that we purposely skirted the definition of obscenity because it is so difficult to nail down and so difficult to prove.

In 1698, Jeremy Collier wrote a short treatise on the profanity and obscenity on the English stage. It was to effectively destroy English comedy for approximately 100 years. I bring this up because there is a section of the bill which is of particular concern to me. The section of the bill deals with the term performance.

I was in a play some time ago at the University of Maine in which several people walked out when the language became somewhat strong. I suggest that even though the play itself would not be considered pornography by our standards, it may have been considered obscene by the standards of those people who chose to leave.

More specifically, I would like to point out a play which I feel could come under fire if this ordinance were to be enacted. Peter Shaffer's play *Equus*. It had a fairly successful run on Broadway and has been performed at numerous college and university theaters. The play deals with a very disturbed young man who puts the eyes out and blinds some horses. In this particular play, there is a scene that is fairly sexually explicit. It is simulated, probably in very dark light. On Broadway, it happened to be a nude scene. Other places, it is not done as a nude scene. Now, what would happen if a group of people feeling that this was obscene, a performance with a sexually explicit scene, simulated as defined by the ordinance, was to challenge the right of a group of performers to stage this play in a town or community — chances are, if it was ever brought to court, and I am not sure what the mechanism is for bringing this to court under this ordinance, it would probably be thrown out because it has artistic merit. The point is, why should somebody have to go to court to prove a play like this has artistic merit?

I was also in this particular play when we did it in Portland. In a discussion of this particular scene, one of the actresses came up to the director and said, "I am not so sure we ought to do this because of the ordinance that was recently enacted in Portland." So, what I am trying to point out here is that this ordinance will have a chilling effect on legitimate artistic performances that happen to deal with sexual issues.

Again, we are talking about contemporary community standards, the average person, whose standards are we talking about. Is there a board set up similar to the Hayes Office that for years set the standards for motion pictures in Hollywood? Is that included in this ordinance? Is the mechanism there? It is not. How would each community set up a board to determine what are contemporary community standards? If this board were to be set up, would it

be elected or appointed? Again, this is not explained or laid out in this ordinance.

Finally, I should mention that the City of Portland has had a very similar ordinance for years. Just what has it done to the dissemination of hard core pornography? Has it resulted in the wholesale closing down of these so-called adult book stores? It has not. The only way I know of that an adult book store has been closed down in Portland is when the landlord decided to raise the rent high enough to evict the tenant, which in this case was an adult book store. They are still in existence and they are still selling the magazines. So, even this particular ordinance has really not accomplished what the supporters set out to do.

Obviously, if we kill this, it will go out to a referendum and people will vote on it. I sincerely hope that those of us who are concerned about the chilling effect that this ordinance will have will also stand up and be counted when the time comes to vote on this measure.

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

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

At this point, the Speaker resumed the Chair.

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is the motion of Representative Allen of Washington that the House accept the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

110 having voted in the affirmative and 32 in the negative with 9 being absent, the motion did prevail.

Sent up for concurrence.

(See Roll Call No. 277)

PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED

Bill "An Act to Establish a Commission to Examine the Availability, Quality and Delivery of Services Provided to Children with Special Needs" (H.P. 1652) (L.D. 2330)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Second Reading, read the second time, 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:

An Act to Amend the Drug Enforcement Law (S.P. 797) (L.D. 2004) (C. "A" S-440)

TABLED - April 3, 1986 by Representative DIAMOND of Bangor.

PENDING - Passage to be Enacted.

On motion of Representative Diamond of Bangor, retabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for Monday, April 7, 1986.

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

RESOLVE, Authorizing the Commissioner of Finance and Administration to Convey, by Sale, the Title and Interest of the State in Land Located in Windham, County of Cumberland (S.P. 923) (L.D. 2300)

TABLED - April 3, 1986 by Representative GWADOSKY of Fairfield.

PENDING - Passage to be Engrossed.

Representative Gwadosky of Fairfield offered House Amendment "A" (H-643) and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" was read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Fairfield, Representative Gwadosky.

Representative GWADOSKY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The purpose of this amendment is to be more precise with respect to the appraisal of the property for this particular land. This amendment would require the appraisal to be done by a qualified real estate appraiser. The appraisal value, as defined, is the value or price at which the property could be sold on the market for the highest and best use of the property.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Portland, Representative Manning.

Representative MANNING: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would just hope that we would take a real close look at this proposal. A few years ago, the Department of Corrections had a building in Skowhegan and in Skowhegan that is where the women were situated. I think the Department of Corrections would love to have their Skowhegan plant back right now. I think if they did, the overcrowding wouldn't be as bad as it is right now.

I am looking at taking 125 acres of land away from the Department of Corrections down in South Windham. I am just hoping that down the road we won't be wishing we had that land back because this is an area where we want to maybe build another minimum or medium security unit. Maybe it could be another area where we could propose to build a maximum security unit.

I would hope we would take a close look at this proposal before we have a vote on it because if Skowhegan, as I indicated earlier, was on line right now, the problems of where we would be placing women, I don't think, would be as critical as they are right now. Maybe down the road, we might need this land.

I know the State Government Committee took a hard look at it but, in my personal opinion, we are playing Russian Roulette with the land down there. We are going to take this land away from the state, give it to a private non-profit organization and I think 60 acres is not enough for us to take a look at a prison down the road. I think we need a full 200 acres. I have some real grave reservations on this.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the

Representative from Fairfield, Representative Gwadosky.

Representative GWADOSKY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The land in question is approximately 185 acres adjacent to the correctional facility in Windham. Currently, this 185 acres is leased to the Maine State Society for the Protection of Animals. They have over a 30 year lease, probably 32 year lease still on this land. They will get to use it for the next 32 years unless something else happens to develop. They came to the State Government Committee early this year in hopes of being able to secure title to this land. They originally wanted the land for \$1 or some negotiated amount, the premise being that the types of things they do is for the public good of the State of Maine and we should be supporting that.

The committee spent quite a bit of time on this. We did hear from the corrections people who had indicated to us that they had some reservations about giving all this land up in the event that they needed to expand the correctional facility in Windham. We asked them to tell us what they felt they needed for land in the event they would ever expand down there. They did a survey, they did a site test and they indicated that they would need at least 60 acres. That 60 acres has now been taken out of the proposal that we were going to originally sell to the State Society for the Protection of Animals and 60 acres has now been given back to the correctional facility in the event they want to expand some day.

We were left with approximately 125 acres of land in which we had to deal with. The committee then decided that we felt it best, if we are going to give this land that we shouldn't give it to them for \$1, we shouldn't give it to them for \$5, but that we should sell it for the appraised market value. The local tax assessor in that area has indicated that that is apt to be anywhere from \$1,000 to \$1,500 per acre. So you are talking over \$100,000 that they would have to come up with to purchase this land for the society.

From the society's perspective, they have a number of investors who would like to build up the society for prevention to animals. It is a wonderful group of people, but as you can imagine, they are reluctant to invest into this land unless they know they are going to have clear title. Certainly, they don't want to invest if there is only a lease and the state may take the land back from them. The essential gist of this was to grant them title as long as they pay the appraised market value which we have just stipulated in this amendment. That is essentially what the bill does.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Gorham, Representative Hillock.

Representative HILLOCK: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This land that we are talking about is in the middle of my district. I am not too excited about the possibility of a maximum security center there. They will have 60 acres and I think we are going to be in bad shape if we need all of those 60 acres for a prison.

Some people may be asking why they need 124 acres here in the proposal for the Windham Humane Society. First of all, they want to buy the land because the contributors want to expand the facilities of the Windham Humane Society and they want the society to own the land that they are going to invest into.

They use a lot of the land to harvest hay for

feed for the large animals that they deal with, they specialize in large animals. The land that is not suitable for hay, they have plans to make it into a game preserve. The land is not really suitable for any other thing because of the high water table.

I would like to give you just a brief background of what these people do and the dollars they save us up here. \$300,000 a year of private money is used for the public service that they provide, a great needed service. They have been in this facility for over 12 years. The facility used to be part of the South Windham Correctional Center and it was decided years ago that perhaps the correctional center owning a farm is not the greatest idea.

Let me tell you one thing, they do something else, they offer an outlet for pre-released prisoners from the South Windham Reformatory -- this year alone, 52 prisoners found employment in a pre-release program. This was unique because they are right next to the prison. Instead of waiting in their cells, passing time, they are able to go down to the farm and work and take care of these abused animals. I think everyone will agree here that any way we can have prisoners rehabilitated and try to get a work ethic back should be unanimously supported here.

They have also put in \$150,000 into the plant itself in improvements to the facility so it can be functional for the humane service that they provide. This service is statewide. They have 5,000 members across the state who support this program.

I would hope that we wouldn't be missed by other uses for this property -- any time that we can have a private agency do service to this state without any cost to the state, certainly they are more efficient than probably government could administer it, that we give serious consideration to this and pass Amendment "A" that is provided to us.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Portland, Representative Manning.

Representative MANNING: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I don't doubt that this organization is doing a tremendous job over there. I am just questioning whether or not, we in the Legislature, want to give up enough land that the Department of Corrections has right now. If people have taken a look at some of the reports that have been coming out of the Department of Corrections and looking at what we might be dealing with in the next ten or fifteen years to the year 2000, I think they would be a little frightened to find out how much space we are going to be needing. That is my only concern.

As most people in this House know, I was on the Blue Ribbon Commission dealing with corrections and it is a concern of mine and I think a concern of a few people in this House.

I would like to pose a question through the Chair to the Representative from Fairfield, Representative Gwadosky, whether or not \$100,000 will be going back to the Department of Corrections or will it be going to the General Fund?

The SPEAKER: Representative Manning of Portland has posed a question through the Chair to the Representative from Fairfield, Representative Gwadosky, who may respond if he so desires.

The Chair recognizes that Representative.

Representative GWADOSKY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It is my understanding the money goes back to the General Fund.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the

Representative from Thomaston, Representative Mayo.

Representative MAYO: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to pose a question through the Chair.

I would like to pose a question to the Representative from Gorham, Representative Hillock. Did I understand him to say that this land in question used to be part of a prison farm system at the minimum security unit?

The SPEAKER: Representative Mayo of Thomaston has posed a question through the Chair to Representative Hillock of Gorham who may respond if he so desires.

The Chair recognizes that Representative.

Representative HILLOCK: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It was my assumption, that years ago, that that was a work farm for the prisoners. I am not sure if they were into dairy producing work there at that time or not.

I would like to add also that the land that we are talking about is not continuous with the property of the correctional facility. It is across the road and they have 60 acres adjoining that facility. I feel, if they are going to expand that facility, 60 acres of continuous property, it is certainly large enough and that shouldn't be any factor.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Thomaston, Representative Mayo.

Representative MAYO: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As someone who has stood in this body before in support of legislation that would restore the once thriving prison farm system that we had in this state, as someone who represents a district that has both a maximum and medium security facility in the center of those districts on both sides of the road, I would urge this body to strongly listen to what Representative Manning has said.

We are talking about a future need in our corrections department that we are not quite sure what it is going to be. I think it is rather risky and rather upsetting to me as one who has worked to restore the prison farm system to a point where it used to be, to cut off that option permanently. I would urge this body to vote against the pending motion.

I ask for a Division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Gorham, Representative Hillock.

Representative HILLOCK: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I can't tell you what it was like 30 years ago and what type of operation the prison farm had there. What we have right now is a private, non-profit organization that uses 52 inmates on a pre-release program adjacent to that facility and there was no pre-release program place for these young men to work prior to their existence there. I guess you might call it a quasi-prison farm system but no cost to the state. These prisoners are paid. I think if the Humane Society wasn't there, it may be questionable whether these people would be where they could go out into society and work. They are in view of the facility, they are only 150 yards away, down the hill, across the street.

I am concerned about prisoners being actively productive while they are incarcerated and they are doing that now. In the future, I am sure they still will be because it helps the Humane Society, it is a regular adaptable work force for them, it helps the prisoners and they are compensated and it doesn't cost us a dime up here.

I might also add that, in the not so distant past, the state wanted to give that land to the town of Windham for nothing. I don't know why Windham refused it. Now we are getting money for the land. Services are being provided to the prisoners at the correctional facility and a service is being provided for all the citizens of the State of Maine. 60 acres of land will still be left with the correctional facility.

Representative Manning of Portland was granted permission to address the House a third time.

Representative MANNING: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Representative Hillock just talked about what had been happening in the past 30 years. Ladies and gentlemen, I can't tell you what is going to happen in the next 15 years, I can't tell you what is going to happen in the next five years, all I know is it has been indicated that the prison down in Thomaston is in real bad shape. Whether or not we want to build a new maximum security unit down the road there, or whether we might want to bring it back into a more populated area and the only land that I see that the Department of Corrections has is the land in Windham. The people in Windham have been very helpful to the Department of Corrections and they have received those inmates, I think, in a pretty decent way.

To answer Representative Hillock's question as to whether or not that is the only place that the inmate can go, for this body's information, most of the renovations that have been going on at Pineland for the last four or five years, have been done by the Department of Corrections. I think that is one of the things the department hasn't really publicized enough to let people know that these people don't sit in their cells a lot, there are a lot of them going over there and doing a lot of renovations that the federal court mandated.

While we are on federal courts, I want to state to this body right now that before this year is up, if we don't do something about corrections, if we don't start taking a hard look on corrections, we are going to be back here next year talking about the federal courts and what the federal courts are going to be doing to this state. If you don't think I am right, just start reading about what happened in Tennessee, California, Texas and a few other states across this country. The federal courts have come in and made them do a lot.

I am just saying today that I hate to see us lose some land that maybe down the road we could use. Land that is in an area where the people have accepted a prison, accepted the people who are in there. Go back home and think and say to your people -- will you accept a prison? I don't know how many would. But at least the people in Windham have and they have accepted it graciously. I just would hate to see us lose all this land and, down the road, have nothing.

Look what happened in Skowhegan. If we had Skowhegan back, would we be in the position we are in today dealing with the problems of the women? The women are being housed down in Windham right now in a situation that I don't think is that great. Some of us have been through there. Part of the bond issue that we will be dealing with is the bond issue we had a couple of years ago and part of that problem is dealing with the problems of the women. Why? Because we closed Skowhegan down about ten years ago.

I think it is time we took a hard look at corrections and I would hope that we would take a

real hard look at this bill. If we decide to pass this bill, remember down the road that we might need this land.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Windham, Representative Cooper.

Representative COOPER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to thank the Representative from Portland for saying that the people from Windham are gracious in hosting a correction center down there. I think they have been to this point. It was made clear at a town council meeting that we had, where this issue was discussed, that they were not excited about having a high security prison down there or even much of an expansion of the present type of facility that we have.

There is, however, room enough to expand on the present site. They occupy a large area of land at this time and it is probably large enough to accommodate any immediate expansion that they have in mind but, in addition to that, this bill is allowing them an additional 60 acres across the road where the society presently exists so that they can expand even beyond that point.

The Representative from Gorham indicated that Windham was offered the land at one point. I believe it was the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty that was offered the land free of charge by the state when they were first formed. They were not comfortable at that point being a new organization and did not take it. They did take a 45 year lease and at present, I believe there are about 32 or 33 years left on that.

The concern about expansion, I can understand. I think that has been taken care of. Indeed, there is a facility now where they used to actually house some farm animals, which is now being used just for storage facilities because it is simply not being used for any other purpose.

I am not sure how practical it is at the end of 32 or 33 years if we don't sell them the land now, to think that the state is going to go in and take over that land, they are going to need to expand and I believe it is just going to be very difficult for the state to go in and say, we are going to destroy this facility as it exists and take back the land. If you do, then the state is going to have to establish its own protection for animals, buy land somewhere, construct buildings and hire personnel to take care of them.

I do hope you will support the legislation before you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Thomaston, Representative Mayo.

Representative MAYO: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I also care about and have worked to see that the inmates in our state prisons have meaningful productive work to do. Don't get me wrong, I think it is wonderful that the Humane Society is providing this work for them.

I am concerned for the future. I want this state to keep hold of all the options it has before it.

If the Humane Society has a 32 year lease, and at the end of that 32 year lease we decide that we don't want to use that land, we can give them another 32 year lease. We desperately need to keep hold of all lands that are available to the Department of Corrections.

I would like to see that prison farm someday be brought back to life. I think it would be too bad at this time to choke off that option. We don't know

what is going to happen, as Representative Manning said, even two or three years from now. I think it would be inappropriate and unwise at this time for the legislature to act when the land is under no jeopardy and can remain in the present position without any trouble at all. I would urge this body to vote against the pending motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Cumberland, Representative Dillenback.

Representative DILLENBACK: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am not going to drag this out any longer but I just want to make a point.

This property is across the road from where the reform school is on the other side of the road and, being an old farmer, I am telling you you could put three of the prisons in Thomaston over there. There must be several hundred acres on the other side of the road that isn't involved in this in any way. If we ever get to the size of a tremendous large prison complex, I am sure this land will stay undeveloped other than the old farm buildings that are on it. They want to use this for the horses to pasture, for the birds and things. We will condemn the land and then through eminent domain, we would take it back. So don't worry about the land, that is the least of your worries, there is ample property there.

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

Representative MICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to speak in favor of this bill. I would like to speak as an endorsement of the Maine State Society for the Protection of Animals. I have been to their facility in Windham. I have seen the work that they do. I have gotten to know a few of the people over the years because sometimes they come before our committee. I would like to support the status quo in one sense meaning that they have used that land for many, many years. I would hate to think that we would hold back from them.

They are a group that knows what it is to serve. They are a very unselfish organization and I would just like to vouch for the work that they are doing. The state could use a few more outfits like this group who do not have their attention on themselves and look to see how they can actually serve the community. So, we would really be missing the boat and using the wrong example to hold back from these folks.

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is adoption of House Amendment "A". Those in favor of adoption will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

72 having voted in the affirmative and 21 in the negative, House Amendment "A" was adopted.

Subsequently, the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" and sent up for concurrence.

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

An Act Relating to Boards and Commissions (H.P. 1614) (L.D. 2269) (S. "A" S-446; S. "B" S-448)

TABLED - April 3, 1986 by Representative GWADOSKY of Fairfield.

PENDING - Passage to be Enacted.

On motion of Representative Gwadosky of Fairfield, retabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for Monday, April 7, 1986.

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

Bill "An Act Providing for the Lease of Unused Space or Facilities Owned by the State" (S.P. 917) (L.D. 2291) (H. "A" H-636)

TABLED - April 3, 1986 by Representative GWADOSKY of Fairfield.

PENDING - Passage to be Engrossed.

Representative Gwadosky of Fairfield offered House Amendment "B" (H-645) and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "B" (H-645) was read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Fairfield, Representative Gwadosky.

Representative GWADOSKY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill sets up a policy for the lease of unused space in our facilities owned by the State of Maine. Specifically, the amendment is to allow for some exclusions of those departments that would be adversely affected.

Let me read into the Record the Statement of Fact. "This amendment allows the Department of Transportation, the Department of Conservation, the Department of Marine Resources, the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife and the Baxter Park Authority to lease space in buildings under their jurisdiction. These agencies have some unique facilities and situations which prevent the efficient application of this bill to those agencies. Railroad facilities, cargo port facilities, public land facilities and other types of buildings and facilities may not be leased in an efficient or easy manner under the bill. In addition, federal rules and laws governing the use of federal funds that are allocated to these agencies contain provisions that conflict with the bill."

Subsequently, House Amendment "B" was adopted.

The Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" and "B" in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

The following items appearing on Supplement No. 1 were taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

FINALLY PASSED

Emergency Measure

RESOLVE, for Laying of the County Taxes and Authorizing Expenditures of Kennebec County for the Year 1986 (H.P. 1637) (L.D. 2306)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 105 voted in favor of the same and 2 against and accordingly the Resolve was finally

passed, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

PASSED TO BE ENACTED

An Act Concerning Self-funded Pools among Public Agencies for Tort and Property Liability (S.P. 902) (L.D. 2263) (S. "A" S-447)

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

The following items appearing on Supplement No. 2 were taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

PASSED TO BE ENACTED

Emergency Measure

An Act to Establish the New England and Eastern Canada Legislative Commission (S.P. 888) (L.D. 2237)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 110 voted in favor of the same and none against and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

PASSED TO BE ENACTED

Emergency Measure

An Act to Discourage Frivolous Appeals in Cases Involving Judicial Review of Certificate of Need Decisions for Nursing Homes of the Department of Human Services (S.P. 922) (L.D. 2298)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 115 voted in favor of the same and none against and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

PASSED TO BE ENACTED

Emergency Measure

An Act Concerning the Waldo County Budget Committee (H.P. 1436) (L.D. 2027) (C. "A" H-629)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 111 voted in favor of the same and none against and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

PASSED TO BE ENACTED

Emergency Measure

An Act to Amend the Charter of the Passamaquoddy Water District (H.P. 1631) (L.D. 2299)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 112 voted in favor of the same and none 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 to Adopt the Maine Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (S.P. 834) (L.D. 2116) (C. "A" S-451)

An Act to Encourage the Rehabilitation of Members Receiving Disability Benefits under the Maine State Retirement System (S.P. 920) (L.D. 2296)

An Act to Obtain Information from the Consumer Advisory Board, the Commissioner of Mental Health and Mental Retardation and the Mental Health Advisory Council (S.P. 921) (L.D. 2297)

An Act to Limit Preferential Taxation within a Unitary Business (H.P. 1254) (L.D. 1764) (C. "A" H-628)

An Act Concerning State Contribution to Pollution Abatement (H.P. 1469) (L.D. 2071) (H. "B" H-614 to H. "A" H-540; S. "A" S-389)

An Act to Provide Technical Assistance to Schools on Truancy, Dropouts and Alternative Educational Programs and to Amend the Permanent School Fund (H.P. 1569) (L.D. 2219) (C. "A" H-618)

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

PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED

AS AMENDED

An Act to Authorize Preferred Provider Arrangements in Maine and to Establish a Cash Reserve Requirement for Health Maintenance Organizations (H.P. 1625) (L.D. 2290) (H. "A" H-627)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed.

On motion of Representative Brannigan of Portland, under suspension of the rules, the House reconsidered its action whereby L.D. 2290 was passed to be engrossed.

On further motion of the same Representative, under suspension of the rules, the House reconsidered its action whereby House Amendment "A" was adopted.

On further motion of the same Representative, the House vote to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A".

The same Representative offered House Amendment "B" (H-644) and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "B" was read by the Clerk and adopted.

Subsequently, the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "B" in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

Adjourned until Monday, April 7, 1986, at nine o'clock in the morning.

The following items appearing on Supplement No. 3 were taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

PAPERS FROM THE SENATE

RESOLVE, to Establish a Maine Commission to Examine Chemical Testing of Employees (Emergency) (S.P. 934)

Came from the Senate under suspension of the rules and without reference to a Committee, the Bill read twice and passed to be engrossed.

(The Committee on Reference of Bills had suggested reference to the Committee on Labor.)

Was referred to the Committee on Labor and sent up for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, was ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

Bill "An Act to Maintain Unemployment Offices" (S.P. 935)

Came from the Senate, referred to the Committee on Labor and Ordered Printed.

Was referred to the Committee on Labor in concurrence.

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 4 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED

Bill "An Act to Authorize a Bond Issue for Androscoggin County to Raise Funds for Renovations to the County Building and County Jail" (H.P. 1660) (Presented by Representative NADEAU of Lewiston) (Approved for introduction by a majority of the Legislative Council pursuant to Joint Rule 27)

Under suspension of the rules, without reference to any committee, the bill was read twice, passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

(Off Record Remarks)

On motion of Representative Smith of Mars Hill,