

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 Father Marcel L. Dumoulin, St.
Augustine's Church, Augusta.
The Journal of April 15, 1986, was read and
approved.
Quorum call was held.

COMMUNICATIONS

The following Communication:

STATE OF MAINE
House of Representatives
Speaker's Office
Augusta, Maine 04333

April 15, 1986

Honorable Edwin H. Pert
Clerk of the House
112th Legislature
State House
Augusta, Maine 04333

Dear Clerk Pert:

Pursuant to Maine Revised Statutes Annotated,
Title 3, Section 42, I am pleased to appoint you to
serve on a full-time basis when the 112th Legislature
is not in Regular or Special Session.

Also, pursuant to the same Statute, I am pleased
to appoint Deborah Bedard Wood, Assistant Clerk of
the House, to serve on a full-time basis when the
112th Legislature is not in Regular or Special
Session.

Sincerely,

S/John L. Martin
Speaker of the House

Was read and ordered placed on file.

The following Communication:

Maine State Compensation Commission

April 15, 1986

Honorable Edwin H. Pert
Clerk of the House
State House
Augusta, Maine 04333

Dear Clerk Pert:

During the recent debate on the floor of the
House on L.D. 2217, "An Act to Implement Certain
Recommendations of the State Compensation

Commission", Representative Murphy of Kennebunk
indicated that the State Compensation Commission had
been "forced" to recommend increases in Legislators
salary and expenses. As Chairman of the Commission,
I believe this statement not only challenges this
Commission's work, but jeopardizes the credibility of
past and future Commissions.

The State Compensation Commission is required by
statute to include in its reports to the Legislature
its findings and recommendations regarding the
compensation of the Governor, justices and judges,
constitutional officers, elected officers of the
Legislature, and Legislators themselves. The 112th
State Compensation Commission, like its predecessors,
has encouraged the participation of members of the
executive and judicial branches, legislators, and the
general public, throughout the course of its work.
As Chair of the Commission, I attempted to keep
members of all four leadership offices informed of
the issues as they were being discussed by the
Commission. In addition, the entire Commission met
with the Legislative Council to discuss their
preliminary findings and recommendations.

This Commission's report is the result of many
hours of study and discussion. Throughout its work
the members of the Commission have been guided not by
partisan views or pressure from members of the
Legislature, but by the shared view that the
Commission's role is to attempt to strike an
appropriate balance that allows the State of Maine to
attract and retain talented individuals in positions
of utmost importance in all three branches of
government.

It has been an honor for me to chair this
Commission. The dedication, the professionalism, and
the non-partisanship of its work is something in
which I believe all Maine citizens can take pride.

Sincerely,

S/Stephen R. Crockett
Chairman
Maine State Compensation
Commission

Was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the
Representative from Kennebunk, Representative Murphy.

Representative MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and
Gentlemen of the House: While we served on
Legislative Council, we received two or three reports
from the Compensation Commission in terms of their
recommendations, in terms of the Governor, judges,
PUC and legislative expenses. My comments yesterday
in terms of changed figures are based upon a January
14, 1986 Interim Report. I will lay out what the
commission's position was at that time and contrast
it with the bill that was passed by the majority
party here.

The Interim Report, January 14th, made no salary
increase recommendation but made a suggestion that
the legislature might want to pass a law tying
salaries, expenses, per diem and so forth to the
CPI. So, January 14th, in the Interim Report, there
was no recommendation for a salary increase.
Yesterday, it was passed to \$15,000 salary. After

making a statement, I have to admit I was in error. I received a note from Representative Mayo that the salary increase is not 35 percent, that it is 30 percent. I sent a note back asking him if he wanted to get up on the floor and inform the membership it is only a 30 percent raise. He declined.

On the expense money, January 14th, -- the commission recommended a \$2.00 increase from the present \$50. That was a four percent increase. Yesterday, \$10 was added to that, a 20 percent increase over the previous year.

The per diem, which is \$50, -- they recommended a \$5 increase, the same as was contained within the bill.

On constituents service, presently \$330, January 14 -- they recommended \$30, a nine percent increase. Yesterday you adopted a \$170 increase, a 51 percent increase.

After that Interim Report was presented to the Legislative Council, there were members of leadership from the other body who went back to that commission and presented a different viewpoint, which is now reflected in the bill that you adopted yesterday.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Bangor, Representative Diamond.

Representative DIAMOND: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: Just to clarify the Record and try to straighten out some confusion that might exist on the part of some members over this issue -- the Compensation Commission did indeed complete an Interim Report. Their Interim Report is similar to a piece of legislation that is introduced by a member of this body. It is presented and, following that presentation, public comments are taken on that. Two hearings were held by the Compensation Commission following that publication of the Interim Report.

As Representative Murphy mentioned, members of the other body went down to that first hearing to express concern over the salary adjustment or the lack thereof and presented their concerns to the Compensation Commission and, as the gentleman reported, that was taken into consideration and was reflected in their final report.

At the second hearing, Representative Davis and I went down on behalf of the Legislative Council and expressed our concern that two areas weren't addressed in that Interim Report, one dealing with the constituent allowance and the other being the increase in the daily expense allowance. Both he and I were in agreement that those two figures should be included.

We made the recommendations that were accepted by the State Compensation Commission subsequently but he and I were both in agreement and we went down following a Legislative Council meeting and expressed those concerns. He and I addressed the concerns of constituents allowance and of the daily expense reimbursement. Other members of the council spoke in favor of a salary increase at a prior meeting.

I want to make it clear that the report that was published by the State Compensation Commission was one that was presented for public comment and it was after two public hearings that they came through with their final report which included the language that this body and the other body enacted the other day.

Subsequently, the Communication was placed on file.

The following Communication: (H.P. 1710)

Maine Medical Center
Portland, Maine 04102

The Honorable John L. Martin
Speaker of the Maine House

and
The Honorable Charles P. Pray
President of the Maine Senate

State House
Augusta, ME 04333

Dear Speaker Martin and President Pray:

On behalf of the Select Committee to Address Training and Employment Opportunities for Handicapped Youths Beyond School Age, we are pleased to transmit our final report to the Legislature. The report was mandated by resolve of the 111th Legislature and prepared with funding from the Maine Advisory Council on Developmental Disabilities. Additional staff support was provided by the Department of Mental Health and Retardation, the Department of Educational and Cultural Affairs, and the Department of Human Services.

We apologize for the lateness of the report; it was to have been delivered in January of this year. However, I hope that you agree that the short delay was acceptable in the interest in addressing such a complicated issue in a comprehensive manner.

Respectfully submitted,

S/Richard M. Balser,
Chairperson
Select Committee to Address
Training and Employment
Opportunities for Handicapped
Persons Beyond School Age

Was read and with accompanying report ordered placed on file and sent up for concurrence.

ORDERS

On motion of Representative RIDLEY of Shapleigh, the following Joint Resolution: (H.P. 1709) (Cosponsors: Senators BLACK of Cumberland, KERRY of York, DUTREMBLE of York, HICHENS of York, TUTTLE of York, USHER of Cumberland, Representatives DESCOTEAUX of Biddeford, FARNUM of South Berwick, HALE of Sanford, KIMBALL of Buxton, LAWRENCE of Parsonsfield, LORD of Waterboro, McPHERSON of Eliot, McSWEENEY of Old Orchard Beach, MURPHY of Berwick, MURPHY of Kennebunk, NADEAU of Saco, PAUL of Sanford, RACINE of Biddeford, RIOUX of Biddeford, ROLDE of York, SEAVEY of Kennebunkport, SOUCY of Kittery, WARREN of Scarborough and WENTWORTH of Wells)

JOINT RESOLUTION IN RECOGNITION OF THE 350TH
ANNIVERSARY OF THE COUNTY OF YORK

Year 1986 (H.P. 1706) (L.D. 2403)

WHEREAS, in the year 1636, King Charles I of England granted to the nobleman Sir Ferdinando Gorges land in continental North America that was later to become York County; and

WHEREAS, this act led to Maine's most southern county as it exists today and has given rise to a celebration of this the 350th anniversary; and

WHEREAS, York County has undergone numerous boundary and name changes in the course of its historic development; and

WHEREAS, once known as New Somersetshire, Yorkshire, Surrey, Devon, Cornwall and County of Canada, its land reached north to the Canadian border and as part of the Dominion of New England has extended as far south as New Jersey; and

WHEREAS, York County, the second largest and the fastest growing county in the State of Maine, it is truly a treasure of natural beauty, rich with history and tradition, which the citizens of the State proudly acknowledge; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That We, the Members of the 112th Legislature of the great and sovereign State of Maine now assembled in the Second Regular Session pause in our deliberations to acknowledge the 350th anniversary of the founding of York County and commend its citizens and officials for the many successes which they have achieved together, over the years, and extend to all inhabitants of York County our highest hopes and best wishes for continued success in future years; and be it further

RESOLVED: That copies of this Joint Resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to appropriate officials of York County to commemorate this special occasion.

Was read and adopted and sent up for concurrence.

PASSED TO BE ENACTED

Emergency Measure

An Act to Revise the Salaries of Certain County Officers (H.P. 1707) (L.D. 2404)

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. 119 voted in favor of the same and 1 against and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

FINALLY PASSED

Emergency Measure

RESOLVE, for the Laying of the County Taxes and Authorizing Expenditures of Penobscot County for the

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. 113 voted in favor of the same and 3 against and accordingly the Resolve was finally passed, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

The following matter, in the consideration of which the House was engaged at the time of adjournment yesterday, has preference in the Orders of the Day and continues with such preference until disposed of as provided by Rule 24.

The Chair laid before the House the first matter of unfinished business:

RESOLVE, to Permit Edgar Warren to Sue the State for Compensation for Injuries Incurred While He was a Ward of the State (H.P. 1377) (L.D. 1940) (Com. of Conf. "A" S-487)

- In House, Finally Passed on April 14, 1986.

- In Senate, Bill and Accompanying Papers Indefinitely Postponed on April 15, 1986.

TABLED - April 15, 1986 (Till Later Today) by Representative BAKER of Portland.

PENDING - Further Consideration.

On motion of Representative Carter of Winslow, the House voted to recede.

The same Representative offered House Amendment "A" (H-739) to Committee of Conference Amendment "A" (S-487) and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" to Committee of Conference Amendment "A" was read by the Clerk and adopted.

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

The Resolve was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee of Conference Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto 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:

PAPERS FROM THE SENATE

The following Joint Resolution: (S.P. 964)

JOINT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT, OF THE UNITED STATES THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS AND THE SECRETARY OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY TO OPPOSE POLICIES TO BOLSTER THE PRICE OF OIL

WE, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the One Hundred and Twelfth Legislative Session, now assembled, most respectfully request and petition the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, Members of the United States

Congress and the Secretary of the United States Department of Energy as follows:

WHEREAS, the Maine Legislature has learned of efforts by the Federal Government to artificially bolster the price of oil; and

WHEREAS, these efforts by the administration have an adverse impact on the northeastern states which are dependent upon this source of energy; and

WHEREAS, it was the northeast that helped support the oil producing states during the high priced energy crisis of the seventies; and

WHEREAS, the northeast has paid its dues and should not be called upon again now that prices are more affordable through some artificial policy; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That we, your Memorialists, do hereby respectfully urge and petition the President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, Members of the United States Congress and the Secretary of the United States Department of Energy to oppose any policy which will artificially bolster the price of oil to the detriment of the northeastern states; and be it further

RESOLVED: That copies of this Memorial, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to the President of the United States and Vice President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the United States Congress, the Secretary of the United States Department of Energy and to each Member of the Maine Congressional Delegation.

Came from the Senate, read and adopted.

Was read and adopted in concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Maintain the Sanford Unemployment Office" (Emergency) (S.P. 942) (L.D. 2360) which Failed of Passage to be Enacted in the House on April 15, 1986.

Came from the Senate, Passed to be Engrossed as Amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-544) in non-concurrence.

On motion of Representative Beaulieu of Portland, tabled pending further consideration and later today assigned.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act to Establish the Maine Business Opportunity and Job Development Program (BOND ISSUE) (S.P. 952) (L.D. 2387) (H. "A" H-703) which failed of passage to be enacted in the House on April 15, 1986.

Came from the Senate passed to be enacted in

non-concurrence.

On motion of Representative Gwadosky of Fairfield, tabled pending further consideration and later today assigned.

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

ENACTOR

Bond Issue

LATER TODAY ASSIGNED

An Act to Authorize the Issuance of a Bond not Exceeding \$5,000,000 for the Financing of the Maine Inland Fisheries and Wildlife Acquisition Fund (S.P. 695) (L.D. 1781) (C. "A" S-481; H. "A" H-736)

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

Representative Diamond of Bangor requested a roll call vote on passage to be enacted.

The SPEAKER: 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.

On motion of Representative Diamond of Bangor, tabled pending passage to be enacted and later today assigned.

ENACTOR

Bond Issue

LATER TODAY ASSIGNED

An Act to Authorize a General Fund Bond Issue in the Amount of \$10,000,000 for Coastal Access, Harbor Improvements, Maine State Ferry Improvements, and Marine Laboratory Improvements (S.P. 895) (L.D. 2250) (H. "B" H-737 to C. "B" S-490)

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

Representative Diamond of Bangor requested a roll call vote on passage to be enacted.

The SPEAKER: 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.

On motion of Representative Diamond of Bangor, tabled pending passage to be enacted and later today

assigned.

ENACTOR

Bond Issue

LATER TODAY ASSIGNED

An Act to Authorize a General Fund Bond Issue in the Amount of \$6,000,000 for Energy Improvements in State Facilities (H.P. 1590) (L.D. 2243) (S. "A" S-532; C. "A" H-688)

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

Representative Stetson of Damariscotta requested a roll call vote on passage to be enacted.

The SPEAKER: 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.

On motion of Representative Diamond of Bangor, tabled pending passage to be enacted and later today assigned.

ENACTOR

Emergency Measure

LATER TODAY ASSIGNED

An Act to Provide Funding for the Court Mediation Service through Fees (H.P. 1703) (L.D. 2398)

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

On motion of Representative Murphy of Kennebunk, tabled pending passage to be enacted and later today assigned.

PASSED TO BE ENACTED

An Act to Clarify the Application of Water Quality Standards to Hydroelectric Projects (H.P. 1495) (L.D. 2107) (H. "C" H-738)

An Act Relating to the Transfer of Authority from the District Courts to the Secretary of State to Adjudicate the Commission of Traffic Infractions (H.P. 1689) (L.D. 2379) (S. "A" S-540)

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.

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

COMMUNICATIONS

The following Communication:

STATE OF MAINE
One Hundred and Twelfth Legislature
Committee on Judiciary

April 15, 1986

The Honorable John L. Martin
Speaker of the House
112th Legislature

Dear Speaker Martin:

We are pleased to report that all business which was placed before the Committee on Judiciary during the Second Regular Session of the 112th Legislature has been completed. The breakdown of bills referred to our committee follows:

Total number of bills received	70
Unanimous reports	61
Leave to Withdraw	26
Ought to Pass	6
Ought Not to Pass	1
Ought to Pass as Amended	13
Ought to Pass in New Draft	15
Divided reports	9

Respectfully submitted,

S/Michael Carpenter
Senate Chair

S/Edward Kane
House Chair

Was read and ordered placed on file.

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

FIRST DAY

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

(H.P. 1684) (L.D. 2373) Bill "An Act to Fund and Implement a Certain Collective Bargaining Agreement" (Emergency) Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought to Pass"

Under suspension of the rules, the above item was given second day notification, passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon requiring Senate concurrence were ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 5 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

Committee of Conference Report

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on: Bill "An Act to Revise the Energy Building Standards Act" (H.P. 1385) (L.D. 1954) have had the same under consideration and ask leave to report:

That they are unable to agree.

(Signed) Representatives JACQUES of Waterville, RIDLEY of Shapleigh and DEXTER of Kingfield - of the House.

Senators USHER of Cumberland, KANY of Kennebec and HICHENS of York - of the Senate.

Was read.

The House voted to reject the Committee of Conference Report.

By unanimous consent, ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

(At Ease)

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 7 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

PAPER FROM THE SENATE

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act Relating to Medical and Legal Professional Liability (S.P. 958) (L.D. 2400) (S. "A" S-521) which was passed to be enacted in the House on April 15, 1986.

Came from the Senate passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendments "A" (S-521) and "C" (S-543) in non-concurrence.

The House voted to recede and concur.

The Chair laid before the House the following matter: Bill "An Act to Maintain the Sanford Unemployment Office" (Emergency) (S.P. 942) (L.D.

2360) which Failed of Passage to be Enacted in the House on April 15, 1986, which was tabled earlier in the day and later today assigned pending further consideration.

(Came from the Senate, Passed to be Engrossed as Amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-544) in non-concurrence.)

On motion of Representative McHenry of Madawaska, the House voted to recede.

The same Representative offered House Amendment "A" (H-741) and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" (H-741) was read and adopted.

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

The Chair laid before the House the following matter: An Act to Authorize the Issuance of a Bond not Exceeding \$5,000,000 for the Financing of the Maine Inland Fisheries and Wildlife Acquisition Fund (Bond Issue) (S.P. 695) (L.D. 1781) (C. "A" S-481; H. "A" H-736) which was tabled earlier in the day and later today assigned pending passage to be enacted. (A roll call having been ordered.)

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is passage to be enacted. In accordance with the provisions of Section 14 of Article IX of the Constitution, a two-thirds vote of the House is necessary. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

94 having voted in the affirmative and 52 in the negative with 5 being absent, the Bond Issue failed of enactment.

(See Roll Call No. 324)

On motion of Representative Diamond of Bangor, having voted on the prevailing side, the House reconsidered its action whereby L.D. 1781 failed of enactment.

At this point, the Chair appointed Representative Diamond of Bangor to act as Speaker pro tem.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Eagle Lake, Representative Martin.

Representative MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We have a bond issue which has a statewide interest. We are a few votes from enactment and, at twelve o'clock noon on the last day of the session, I find some members of the minority party in the same position that they were at the end of the session last year, basically, indicating to us as members of the majority party and to the people of Maine, this is the power we have, this is the only power we have and we are going to use it any way we feel like it.

Last year, I saw a bond issue for Aroostook County, a State Park for Eagle Lake and Cross Lake and expansion of the Presque Isle Facility go down to defeat by a few votes. We are about to lose this

bond issue today for the same reasons. Last session, I sent notes but I am not doing that today because I think it's a waste of my time. Last time, members of the Aroostook County delegation and members of the Republican Party switched their votes with the exception of Representative MacBride from Presque Isle and today she voted the same way. As she indicated to me then (and I remember the words well) -- "the Representative from Kennebunk, Representative Murphy has indicated to me that I must do this for my party -- not for Aroostook County but for my party."

The bond issue died and we don't have it again this time so the voters of Aroostook County will be deprived of a state park -- as a matter of fact -- two state parks and expansion of another.

I'm really not very excited (I think it's really funny) because there is no other way to describe it, in my opinion. I don't think it is anything to get upset about. I don't think it is anything to worry about except for the future of the Republican Party and that shouldn't really concern me, but the rumors in the hall are rampant and members of the Republican caucus are spreading it or talking about it -- basically, the Representative from Kennebunk, Representative Murphy is saying, I want you to stick with me or else I am taking my marbles and going home and cleaning out my desk.

Members of the House, I served four years as Minority Floor Leader when the Republicans controlled this body from this chair. I learned from that experience, and during those four years, two very fine people served as Speaker, Dick Hewes from Cape Elizabeth and Dave Kennedy from Milbridge. Some of you know them and know them well.

As I served in those four years, my position was not to be an obstructionist to things which mattered for the people of Maine but perhaps be an obstructionist and obnoxious on things such as rules and the procedure of how things were controlled in the legislative body -- not to things that mattered to the people of Maine.

This bond issue is far too important to play this game. Aroostook County suffered last time because of it, and I kept my mouth shut publicly, but I can't do that today. Some of you know me too well for that.

As the other bond issues come up today, they are all going to go the same way I guess and that is fine. Let the Record show that it was not done on the basis of the bond issues, for support or lack thereof, it was done on the basis of whether or not it was good for the coast, good for the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife Acquisition Fund, but it was done on the basis of, this is our strength, this is our power, let's exercise it.

Now some people say, you serve as Speaker, you exercise the power. I exercise the power given to me by the rules and given to me by this body. And yes to the Representative from Camden who smiles, I will say, as I said to the Majority Party when I served my four years, the day will come when the people of Maine will be convinced that they would be better served by the Democratic Party.

To the members of the Republican caucus, I offer you the same challenge -- if you can convince the people of Maine that you can do a better job, you will occupy the same position. I will congratulate you on that job and hope you do it well. If I am here as a member of the minority, I will challenge you, I will question your judgment and I will try to change it if I can, but I will never do or try to

destroy something that is of benefit to the people of Maine for my own personal ego. I challenge any member, whether it be a member of the majority or the minority, to call the two previous Speakers that I served under for four years, and ask them.

I guess today it doesn't matter, the bond issue for wildland acquisition will go down, not because it is a bad issue, not because it meets this temporary magic cap that the Republicans talk about, (which is meaningless anyway) but because it serves the immediate political desires of a few people.

In the campaign that will be waged for political office this Fall, I hope this issue does in fact become an issue with the voters. Let us go out there and talk about who can continue to provide leadership and who can provide it better -- whether it be in the gubernatorial election or our own races. Once the elections are over, I would hope that we can come back and work to represent all the people of Maine.

I guess it's probably asking too much since everyone has locked themselves into positions and roll calls to ask any of you to switch but I am going to anyway. There are more of those issues coming and I would simply ask you not to vote politically but vote your conscience. Do what you believe is right, rather than what you think I want or someone else wants.

I have also heard the rumor in the hall -- as a matter of fact, the offer was made to me -- all you have got to do is repeal the Order which was passed sending the referendum question on pornography to the voters in June and we will give you all the bond issues you want. That makes no sense to me at all. That battle was fought -- unfortunately, the minority lost, the majority won. That issue was decided at the polls a year and a half ago as to who would control this body.

And so, as my friend from Kennebunk, Representative Murphy, proceeds to respond to me, (and I hope he does) I ask him to respond to what charges he has left with the members of his caucus as to how they are to vote on these issues today.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Kennebunk, Representative Murphy.

Representative MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: It's ironic that we are in the closing day and the Speaker and I are having our first formal talk here on the floor. I must say the Speaker has come a long way since he was in my office yesterday morning where he said very emphatically quote, "I don't care about any of them" -- referring to the bond issues, placing his value judgment on all of the bonds. I think the gentleman from Eagle Lake and I guess maybe we could find another word in terms of looking at blind loyalty -- he's looking at the wrong party.

I must admit that being in the minority party, there are times that one feels frustrated on such things as basic courtesies, in terms of suspending the rules, a power very much in our right -- last year, and this year. I think you could probably count on one or two fingers the times that has been denied.

In terms of being obstructionists, if this party was a party of obstructionists, we could be here until the second week of September if it was legal in terms of suspending the rules.

The gentleman from Eagle Lake makes reference to a referendum, a June referendum. He uses words like irresponsible. In the Portland Press Herald and Bangor Daily morning newspapers, they are using that

word irresponsible for political purposes and I don't think the gentleman from Eagle Lake is teflon on that issue.

There are low points in terms of being in the minority party. We have our ups and downs and the gentleman from Eagle Lake has had his ups and downs during the last twenty four hours. But in terms of being irresponsible, we have many issues in terms of bonding that are undecided. I supported a university measure for \$7.7 million bonding. That is not with us. We passed a Joint Order asking it to come back and in what form will it come back — \$12.1 million, \$15 million, \$20 million to make it politically attractive? We are only retiring \$36 million worth of bonds.

We haven't received a date in terms of a special session but we are coming back. I hesitate to mention the date, because every time I do, the Governor says, as Minority Party Leader, I don't have the right to call a special session. The rumor is that in May we will be looking at bond items dealing with corrections. Will it be for renovations? Will it be for new maximum security, prison construction, minimum security? Will it be \$5, \$10, \$15 million? On the agenda here before us, we have had bonds over \$50 million with many of them not on the table yet.

So in terms of the gentleman from Eagle Lake, his question as to who is responsible or irresponsible, or some magic formula, we're not talking about 90 percent reduction or a 100 percent reduction, there is the potential, if we apply that blind loyalty and pass every bond without knowing what is coming to us in May, of it being 200 percent, 225 percent. Members of the House from both parties, I call that irresponsible.

(At Ease)

At this point, the Speaker resumed the Chair.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from St. George, Representative Scarpino.

Representative SCARPINO: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I should like to say, number one, I take both grievous insult and personal injury by blanketly being painted with a partisan brush by the gentleman from Eagle Lake. As far as I am concerned, and there have been no bones about this for the past two years, if the gentleman from Kennebunk took his marbles and went home, it wouldn't upset me, there is no love lost. I cannot see how one can call this that kind of partisan issue.

I, as an individual, I, as a Representative from District 81, and I, as a Republican with a fiscally responsible philosophy, have looked at these bond issues, set my priorities on those that are the most important for the general good and well being of this state and taken my position accordingly.

The gentleman from Eagle Lake made references to

the exercise of strength and power. I would refer you to the actions of the past couple of days where we saw the exercise of raw political power in the Majority Party refusing to allow the presentation of minority views in the form of amendments on the floor of this House. For an action like that to occur and then for the leader of the political group who took those actions, to accuse the other body of the exercise of political power, is one of the most gross examples of the pot calling the kettle black that I have ever heard in my life.

What I just listened to in debate was not some one or some party concerned about the exercise of power or control of the House, I heard someone complaining that he did not have total control of the House instead of the limited control he has. I would say to you quite simply, your responsibility to your constituents and to the people of this state is to judge how much we can afford to spend, prioritize where that spending should be made, and make that decision without any concern to specific areas or specific personal, parochial needs.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Canaan, Representative McGowan.

Representative MCGOWAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I wish that I could back this body up about a couple of weeks and ask you to remember our process that we created amongst ourselves, Democrats and Republicans, about committee reports, committee procedures and ask you to look at this report on the Joint Standing Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs.

Our debate on this issue has swayed, I apologize to members of this body that we are not debating the bond issue for \$5 million for Fisheries and Wildlife acquisitions. I apologize to people who are listening to this debate.

I asked the staff person that works with the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs about our time in Maine's history to bond. He said, there was no time better than the present to bond. If you have had support of a bond in the past while sitting in these chambers, whether you have been here one term or whether you have been here ten terms, there is no time better than now to bond. So I think that with those remarks, our committee took his advice and we sent this bill out Unanimous "Ought to Pass". I worked very hard on this bill as other members of the committee did in getting the bill out because I firmly believe in it.

I want to tell you a little story about why I believe in it so much. A couple of weeks ago, I had my three year old down here and I think you all saw him walking around the House. When he was about two weeks old, his grandfather gave him a hundred year old Model 98, 30-30. You know he will never use that gun until he has completed a NRA safety course like his father did but he doesn't understand these political considerations. My father was the Republican town chairman in Pittsfield when I registered to vote, so maybe my son will grow up to be a Republican. I have no control nor will I try to sway him — maybe my wife will.

I know that all over the northern part of this state there is land that is going to private sporting groups and only the members are able to use it. This is a trend that is happening all over this country and has been happening in Canada for many, many years. Only the rich will be able to hunt and fish.

As far as my personal land acquisitions, I have a

couple of acres of commercial property in Canaan and a small house lot a few miles from my store — not exactly the best wildlife habitat for hunting. I would hope that someday when my son grows up he is able to utilize that hundred year old rifle that was given to him by his grandfather, that he will have some land and waters to utilize and that he may enjoy it like I have when I have hunted and fished in this state. I have fished with Representative Callahan, I have fished with Representative Jacques, and I have fished with several members of this body and hunted with other members of the legislature.

I know that when we leave these halls, we hang up our D's and R's on the door or many of us do. I would hope that we could consider the time to bond, which is 1986, on the issue before us. We really must try and put ourselves back a couple of weeks and say, is this really worth a vote? I would ask you to please vote for this and take away the considerations that the political leaders of this body have given us.

I think the Unanimous Committee Report was a wise vote. We started at \$8 million and we decided to bring that back to \$5 million and it was a Unanimous Committee Report. We worked very hard in that committee to get this bill out. I would hope that for your grandchildren and for those of you who have moved to Maine and want your children to live in this state and appreciate the lowest per capita publicly owned land in the United States that they would be able to have some land for fisheries and wildlife use. I would ask you to please, put yourself back a couple of weeks. Think about what we are voting on — \$5 million for Fisheries and Wildlife acquisition.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Rumford, Representative Erwin.

Representative ERWIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I believe this is one of the most important bond issues we are going to face during this session.

I would like to comment to my good friend, Representative Murphy from Kennebunk, that we in the majority have not had daily caucuses nor have we had a caucus on this particular bond issue. It is not blind loyalty that causes me to vote on this bond issue. I believe this bond issue is one of the best that we can pass for the State of Maine.

This came before our committee in a bill that was presented to us through the Sportsmen's Alliance of Maine, not the leadership of this body. I would certainly hope that you members would support this good bond issue.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Livermore Falls, Representative Brown.

Representative BROWN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am shocked. I guess if we can't interject a small element of humor into an otherwise gory kind of initial discussion, we all ought to perhaps take our marbles and go home.

Responsibility and fairness, like beauty, are in the eyes of the beholder. I guess if you are viewing those two items from the rostrum, you tend to get a different definition than some of us who are viewing the rostrum from our seats.

What we saw earlier in the presentation of the Speaker was an attempted lesson in humiliation and intimidation. I will tell each and every one of you that I am neither humiliated nor intimidated by any of the previous speakers including our own Speaker. He speaks of offers, I know of no such offers. I

think that the Speaker understands my views and my vote and those from whence they come.

He also spoke in kind of a threatening sense that we are all going to be facing the voters in November and are going to have to answer fairly and squarely on this issue. I can assure the Speaker and every member of this House and every member of the general public that I will have no problem, no problem, justifying my vote. It is almost insane to listen to some of the accusations that have been made.

As I have sat in my seat and been frustrated, as others have, with the attempt to put forth meaningful, well thought out, amendments on issues and been turned at every course, I must smile when I hear the Speaker talk of fairness, responsibility and understanding, as if that party is the only one that knows the meaning of those terms.

I will tell you exactly why I am voting against this bill and this bond issue. The people of the State of Maine, I believe, have had enough of borrowing, borrowing beyond what we retire.

The Speaker mentioned that this was a very worthwhile item. I couldn't agree more. In fact, and this may even surprise the Speaker, I think that every single bond issue that was brought before this body is a responsible, well deserving, well meaning item. I don't question that. What I do question is the state citizens' willingness to continue on with this borrowing trend that we have been on in the last two or three years.

We used to have a kind of unwritten rule that we wouldn't pass more than 90 percent of what is being retired. Well, that seems to have gone out the window.

Members of my caucus will tell any member of this body that I have continually pushed for sticking to some kind of a guideline so that we don't exceed 100 percent of what is being retired. Believe it or not, the citizens back home will agree with that kind of thinking. Talk to them — perhaps some of you haven't in a little while.

On the Committee of Energy and Natural Resources in the last couple of sessions, we have dealt with a number of land trades that have been negotiated by the Bureau of Public Lands and Department of Conservation with private ownerships around the state. We have heard in every single instance, on all of these trades, that one of the major purposes in these trades was to gain access to areas for sportsmen and others who just like to get away into the back country, into lands that presently are not available to them. In every single instance, that has been the major thrust of these land trades.

I think that the Bureau of Public Lands, Department of Conservation and State of Maine have done a good job in the last few years of negotiating lands for the people of the State of Maine, lands which were presently not available to them. In addition to that, the state has picked out a number of camp lots, a number of smaller lots that are just scattered throughout the state, and offered them for sale to the people who were presently leasing them. The money from those sales went into an acquisition fund, an acquisition fund which will do exactly the type of thing that these land swaps were intended to do and the type of thing that this bond issue is intended to do.

Therefore, my reason for voting against this bond issue is that I think that we are already on a pretty good course of providing additional land to the

people of the State of Maine. I think that, on balance with \$5 million of additional state borrowing, doesn't wash in my view.

Representative McGowan said, is this worth a vote? Yes, it is. Yes it is, to add an additional \$5 million of bonding indebtedness to the people of the State of Maine, it certainly is worth a vote. I will be voting no.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from South Portland, Representative Macomber.

Representative MACOMBER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: You have heard leadership of both parties speak here today. I have been here six years, there is a D in back of my name, but I have always voted the way I felt, the way I felt my people in South Portland that I represent wanted me to vote. I am not a member of any inner circle here. The Speaker and I have had our differences over the six years but that is not the thing. I go home nights, I sleep very well. I owe nobody here anything.

When I sit here and hear you people say, well I am voting for this bond because of this reason or against the bond for this reason, then you are not really being very honest about it, I don't believe. Some of you who are knowledgeable about the bond are voting for it for that reason or against it for that reason.

Perhaps I have a little different position than most of you here, I am 62 years old, I have no problem getting reelected in my district, I have no ambition to be Speaker, Majority Leader, Committee Chairman, anything else you can name but I think that when you have an issue that concerns all the people of this State of Maine, just forget about the R or the D in back of your name, give a little thought to what you are voting on.

This distresses me, it makes me feel that we look ridiculous to the people out there, who elect us as responsible leaders in our community to come here to consider what we are doing and to do it to the best of our ability. I follow no lights, I have no problem with that. Perhaps some of the Democrats are unhappy with me in my position at times but frankly, I have no problem with that either. All I am saying to you is look at this issue that is before you and vote your conscience.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Waterville, Representative Jacques.

Representative JACQUES: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: Back to the issue at hand -- I have heard that some of the members that are voting against this are doing so because they considered my answering of Representative Armstrong's question the other day, rough treatment to him. I have been told that a couple of times people have voted against this and said, there, we have taught Jacques a lesson. Well, men and women of the House, you are teaching the wrong guy a lesson. The lesson you are teaching me is not the one that you are trying to set out to teach me.

I always was under the assumption that Representative Armstrong (I am sorry he is not here) is a pretty big, rugged fellow and I didn't think that his feelings would be hurt by a little puny guy like me. If I did hurt his feelings, I am not going to say I am sorry for that, because I don't think I intended to hurt his feelings. I probably gave him

an abrupt answer and I guess we are all giving abrupt answers right now.

I hope no one is voting in retaliation and think you are punishing me because you are not. This isn't my bill, my name isn't on it, our committee didn't hear it, Appropriations did.

I am a little bothered myself that my party didn't allow the amendments to be presented the other day but, as a freshman, I was told when leadership does something, you follow through and I think that applies whether Representative Murphy is doing it or Representative Diamond is doing it. I would have had no problem letting those amendments come forth and letting them stand or fall as they may but that is just the type of guy I am I guess. I don't hold grudges and, if the members of the minority party give me a licking once in a while, that doesn't bother me either, that is part of the game. If I can't take it, I would have stayed home and baked pies, I guess, I wouldn't be down here in the Maine Legislature.

What we have before us today is an issue that I think is of major importance to all the people of the State of Maine. I think Representative Brown said that. The only place I differ with Representative Brown is -- I have said it before and I will say it again -- I have an awful lot of faith in the intelligence of the people in the State of Maine. The people in this state are fiscally conservative, there is no question about that, but they are also very intelligent. They have a tendency to look forward, they look for something positive, they are very progressive. That is why I have no problem sending these bond issues out because I know if the people in my district think it is too much money, it is not money well spent, if we can't afford it, then they will show that in the booth.

I am very proud to say, in the City of Waterville, we usually have 90 percent and above voter turn out. We really do. In the last election, the four wards in my district got 93 percent plus Democrats out to vote. I can't say about the Republican party because I don't really pay that much attention to their voter turnout. I am very proud of my party's turnout at the polls and I have nothing but confidence, Representative Brown, that those people will do the right thing, just like you believe you are doing the right thing today.

I think I have enough land, at least we pay taxes on enough land, that I will always have a place to hunt and fish. Yes, Democrats do pay taxes, once in a while. It does concern me that there are a lot of people in this state that don't have that ability. That is what this bond issue is all about. So, whether you are voting for it or against it and whatever the reasons are that you are or you aren't, don't think you are punishing me because I don't get punished that easy. I take my lickings.

I have heard all kinds of stories when the Democrats were in the minority in this body and I said to myself, if I am ever in a position that I would be able to do something about that, I would hope that I would never treat the minority party in the way we were treated back in those days. Of course, those are just stories that I have heard and, probably ten years from now, the stories will be repeated and it will be the other way around. I am a firm believer that you should learn from history, not repeat it. As long as nothing is personal, I have no problem with what is happening.

I hope that you are not trying to teach me a lesson because I am pretty stubborn and pigheaded and you can teach me a lesson but I will just keep coming back and trying to do what I think is right again and you will probably give me another lesson and I will be back again. So, whatever reason you vote for or vote against it, do it because you think it is the right thing to do, not because you think it is the expedient thing to do.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Hampden, Representative Willey.

Representative WILLEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I heard something today that I thought I would never hear, that is, that I voted for personal reasons or political reasons. I never, never in my life ever have, I don't expect I ever will. I am sorry that the Speaker didn't appreciate my vote today but there have been many times in the past when he has appreciated it when I have been on the other side of the issue. I just wish to be called exactly what I am, that I am capable of making up my own mind, in my own way, for whatever reasons that they might be, but I want all of you to know and I want the Record to show, that I have not and will not vote for a political reason.

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

Representative SPROUL: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: Earlier in this debate, we heard the Representative from Eagle Lake challenge the Representative from Kennebunk specifically what marching orders or what instructions were given to the members of the minority party. First of all, I thought that question was somewhat humorous coming from leadership of a party where the Majority Floor Leader, just a year ago, asked for blind loyalty.

I remember very distinctly my first few weeks as a member of this body, some three and a half years ago as they were discussing and about to vote on the retroactive tax indexing packages, distinctly remembering, not caucuses on the part of Democrats, but rather three and four people being marched into the Speaker's Office.

Representative Erwin mentioned that the Democrats had not caucused to take a position on this. Well, I have to tell you that I received no orders from the gentleman from Kennebunk on how to vote. Our caucuses over the last two years have always been open caucuses. We have always invited and been very pleased to have the press there when we caucus. We are politicians, we like a little ink in the press too.

I think, if you look at that roll call, I haven't really studied it to be honest with you, but I am willing to bet that at least 15 to 20 percent or more vote of the members of my caucus are voting in favor of it. We are not, I repeat, we are not, voting as a block. I challenge you to look at the roll call on that.

I am very pleased that the Representative from Canaan brought the discussion back to the bond issue at hand and I will address my future remarks to that.

I tell you, I personally have mixed feeling. In two elections I have received (for what it is worth) the political endorsement of the Sportsmen's Alliance of Maine. The president of the Sportsmen Alliance of Maine is a constituent of mine, but more than a constituent, he is a friend of mine, which dates back a good number of years to when we played little league baseball together on the same team. I am sure

that, despite my vote, when I walk out of here, he and I will still be friends.

I am voting no. I am going to continue to vote no and there is a reason for that. I want you to know that I am concerned that we will be coming back at some point within the next month or two and we are going to be discussing corrections at that time. I am concerned that there could very well, though I don't know, be another bond issue there and we are going to be looking at total bonded indebtedness.

On enactment, I have voted no on every bond issue this session. I will continue to vote no on every bond issue this session. I did support the move yesterday to extend the University of Maine bond issue because I felt that should be deferred until we get a look at the total bond picture. I feel that on this bond before us now. I will continue to vote no but it is not on marching orders.

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

Representative HILLOCK: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I guess it is only appropriate in the last day of the 112th Legislature that we go out just like we came in. When I came up here, I came up here for a purpose to better represent my district and ran smack into the face of partisan politics dealing with a political witch hunt. Today, we are dealing with a bonding issue that has been branded as partisan. We already know that that is not the case. No one has ever told me to come into his office to switch a vote. If they ever did, they would be threatened with physical harm.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would ask the Representative from Gorham to please be careful about the threats he makes on the Record.

Representative HILLOCK: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I take your suggestion.

I have worked hard for what I have got in my life and many people in the state have done so. They have written me many letters about the frustration of the federal debt, which I have no control over -- the state debt, which I have some control over.

I have two young sons that like to hunt and fish and would like to have the opportunity when they grow up to hunt and fish. My two young boys, when they were brought into this world, each were given a bill for \$10,000, as everyone of us has over our heads right now with the federal government. I don't know the size of the bill that we are giving our children, but I want to work hard, I am working hard -- we all are for a better life for our next generation. When we have to make a decision of whether they should carry on the debt, should we expand the debt, or give them a place to hunt and fish, the decision is clear in my mind.

It is time for all of us to not look at D or R or the next election, we should look to the future of the State of Maine. I have been part of the Republican party for the last two years and I am proud of that but never once were we told to vote as a block. Every major issue, whether in a committee or on the floor of this House, was not opposed without a viable alternative. The alternative to the issue that we are discussing, this bond issue, is fiscal responsibility. Many of us have voted for other bonds here today. There has never been a carte blanche attitude against all bonds and I hope there never will be.

We have to prioritize, we have to stand the line if we are ever going to stop the onslaught of

indebtedness in our country. Where will we stop? It is so much easier to give it away.

This issue is split among many of us. My best friend that sits in front of me is on the other side. I ride to Augusta at least once a week with Fisheries and Wildlife lobbyists. The Rod and Gun Club is in my area but I can go before SAM and rod and gun clubs in southern Maine and tell them why I voted against this bond and they will understand. I hope everybody here can understand and your constituents will understand.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Old Town, Representative Paradis.

Representative PARADIS: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I will have no trouble defending my vote to reject these bonds which we have remaining before us today. I am quite certain that I would have trouble defending or justifying my vote to support bond issues which would be far in excess of the amount we are retiring.

As many of you know, my district is probably one of the lower income districts per capita in the state. For me to ask my people to come down here and vote for bond issues to place before them and before the state, which will cause further indebtedness for them, I feel is asking a bit too much, especially for these items we have before us -- that there should be another way in order to meet these needs or to meet these requirements.

I feel a great sense of responsibility when I ask my people to take on additional debt. I equate it to my own set of circumstances. You and I know how we agonize when we take on debt for major improvements, either to our home or to meet our needs, and I do use that word needs. I find myself wondering if fish and game are really needs. Recreation has its place but I feel that we have provided fairly well for the people of our state.

So I will continue to oppose these bond issues which we have remaining before us today.

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

Representative GWADOSKY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Since there has been some discussion in regards to fiscal responsibility and bonding indebtedness and the fact that the continued consideration of bond issues may, in some manner, affect or endanger our credit rating, I want to share some information with the members of this House.

Over the last several years in the State Government, we have kept pretty close contact through the State Treasurer's Office, with both Standard & Poor's, and Moody's in terms of how ratings were developed and how these various figures were arrived at, what type of things did they take into consideration. I would like to share some of this with you because the fact is, even if we were to add another \$20 to \$40 million worth of bond issues right now, it really wouldn't affect our ratings. I think those people, if pressed, would admit to that even those members who may be opposing this particular measure because of the bonding provisions.

I spoke with Chris Erwin who is the analyst from Standard & Poor's, Chris is the analyst for the State of Maine, and asked what were the criteria that they used when determining what Maine's rating is. By the way, Maine has a Triple A rating with Standard and Poor. It is the highest rating that is available from this rating company. They told us one of the

considerations that they considered is the level of debt over time. We learned that the Maine debt level has not been increasing significantly over time and that debt level is moderate and well controlled. Also Maine's debt per capita is lower than many other states. They also take into consideration financial performance from year to year. Their response was that Maine has a very good history of financial performance and usually has a minimum cushion of 5 percent, which Standard and Poor considers very important.

Short-term borrowing -- their response was that Maine has not had a problem with short-term borrowing for emergency purposes. In other words, state revenues have been sufficient to pay debts and emergencies that have ever arisen.

Budget deficits -- their response was that Maine has had no problem with budget deficits.

Tax and initiatives and referendums (and these are all things they take into consideration when they are making these ratings) -- they indicated that the State of Maine has had no problems with tax initiatives. The only exception was something that Representative Sproul had recently mentioned and that was the tax indexing issue. They said to us, if that tax indexing issue had been passed and had been retroactive, that may have been a factor in reducing our credit rating at that time.

They talked about quality of financial reporting and they told us that Maine has had an excellent financial reporting system and that we use generally accepted accounting principles. They talked about trends in state revenues over time. They said that Maine has had an excellent record in the past five years. They talked about the diversity of revenue sources and they said that Maine's revenue sources are diverse and reflect increasing in diversity and this is the type of thing they like to see.

I could go on and on with the internal economic profile, the degree of diversity of employment, the rate of employment, all things which they think in Maine are very favorable. Financial management and government structure -- they indicated the state government structure and fiscal management are very effective and sound.

Infrastructure needs -- many states have had problems with not making timely infrastructure repairs. Maine hasn't had that problem. Be it the current administration, be it the current legislature, for the past eight years, Maine has made the type of infrastructure improvements that Standard & Poor's deems as worthwhile. That is one of the reasons our credit rating is the highest available.

We also spoke with Moody's; we speak with Moody's on a regular basis. Now Moody's takes into consideration a number of things and, for the benefit of time, I won't go over them all. They take into consideration things like debt ratio, debt per capita, debt burden, fiscal policy, which they say Maine policies are generally conservative.

Fiscal policies and practices -- they say Maine has had a long tradition of sound financial policies and practices and that the state provides excellent security for its general obligation bonds and, at the current rate of retiring of our bonds, 70 percent of the state's total debt would be retired within ten years.

Moody's was concerned about the government structure and efficiency of financial management. Moody's has ranked Maine State Government as a very

effective and efficient organization with respect to financial management. These are all the types of things they look at, not merely the issuance of total amount of bonds and, from Moody's we have a Double A-1 rating. Only two states in the country have a Double A-1 rating, so I think that the notion that by not accepting these bonds, we are doing something to preserve our credit rating or doing something fiscally responsible, is not necessarily the case. In fact, Moody's and Standard & Poor's takes a number of things into consideration. The fact is that the State of Maine, over the past eight years, has done pretty darn good.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Dover-Foxcroft, Representative Law.

Representative LAW: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I am not going to make a long-winded speech but I would like to respond to a statement that a previous speaker made. It was concerning -- why not put it out to the people? Somebody or some group of wise men in the historic past in the State of Maine decided it would take two-thirds vote in both Houses to put these bond issues out. I don't know why but I have to assume they were right. That gives my vote in this House a lot more strength than the 7500 people on a general vote in the Fall or in the Spring. Therefore, I am obligated to vote the way they want me to vote.

Earlier in the year, I put out a questionnaire asking the people in my district if they would support the \$5 or \$8 million bond issue to buy land for wildlife management and better than two to one told me not to. So, I am going to stop at that.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Milo, Representative Masterman.

Representative MASTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I rise very briefly today because those of you who have been here ten years or more know that I seldom rise and I don't have too much to say but there is something that has been overlooked today.

On these bond issues, early on, I picked out three that I would completely support and the others I would take into consideration. This is one that I was very interested in.

When I came down here, I asked to serve on Fisheries and Wildlife and I did for two terms. One of the areas that I was interested in was land acquisition. I must say I thought the realty division at that time was sitting on their hands. We had several million dollars and we started procuring land. The Corrections Center up in Charleston is on some of that land. Some of the land has furnished the energy for the heat in that installation.

One thing that hasn't been brought up here today is where monies come from at the federal level to aid us in this land acquisition. Some of our congressmen, who had far reaching ideas, determined that to do this, there should be a tax and when each one of you here go to buy any fishing equipment, you pay the tax and I think it is up around 11 percent, if you buy a reel, rod or net. Then too, if you buy a rifle, ammunition, then it was another bill. There too, that generates a tax that goes to the federal level and there is no way you are going to get that back unless you have projects like this.

I don't expect that I can change a single vote but I want you to know that you could get back \$15 million, you could. You could get back \$15 million

and that would give you \$20 million and when you vote, I would like to have you consider that.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Winslow, Representative Carter.

Representative CARTER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We have had a lot of rhetoric this morning and many of you have different reasons of voting for or voting against the issue before us.

I would like to try to bring to your attention to an aspect that hasn't been mentioned yet. The bond issue that is before us is for land acquisition, Fisheries and Wildlife, designed to either enhance or preserve part of our heritage in the State of Maine.

It is also part of the second largest industry in this state, referred to as tourism, that part and parcel is in the same economic ballpark. I think we should let the people decide if they want to promote this economic activity and not try to out guess them and decide for them.

Representative Gwadosky gave you many good reasons why we shouldn't be concerned about our bond rating. I am told that we could issue \$100 million worth of bonds, or retire \$50 million, and it wouldn't affect our bond rating one iota. Last year, we debated this issue and we were dealing with the 90 percent rule. This year, apparently we are willing to issue bonds equivalent to the amount of bonds that we retire.

Some of you may recall that, based on recommendations of the bonding houses such as Prudential that was circulated last year, one of the headings inside reads, "The State of Maine, a Quiet Success Story" -- the Governor decided by Executive Order to adopt the 7 percent rule.

Under the 7 percent rule, the state would be limited. Its borrowing would be limited to its total debt service to within 7 percent of its projected own resources, that is including General Fund and Highway Fund. Now its own source revenues are directly under state control. When we talk about retirement, we are talking about debt service and interest required, whenever we float a bond issue.

It is difficult to say just what the exact figures would be, but in the ball park -- you take a \$10 million bond issue for ten years at current rates, and I may be on the high side, we would need roughly \$1 million and three quarters for a \$10 million bond issue in terms of debt service for retirement purposes. Based on the latest figures that I have available, and incidentally that is for the last fiscal year, our total debt service and general obligations is \$23.8 million, interest is \$11.7, general obligations under the highway and bridge issues, the principal is \$7.6 million, and the interest is \$7.2 million. You add those together, you come up with \$50 million in debt service -- \$50,466,528 to be exact. Under the 7 percent rule, and using the figures that I used earlier, we have a total revenue shortfall of just under \$1 billion for this coming year, which means that we could, in effect, issue \$110 million worth of bonds and still remain within the 7 percent rule.

I would like you to consider this before you flip your switch. There is ample room for growth without changing our bond rating one iota. You should look at this bond issue as to its potential both now and for the future of our children, and our children's children. Also consider it in light of the economic activity it will generate for the second largest

industry in the state. I would urge you to take a positive step and vote yes and send this to the people.

Representative Martin of Eagle Lake requested a roll call.

The SPEAKER: 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.

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

Representative STETSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: You know, I happen to be a member of SAM, I happen to be a life member of the Wiscasset Rod and Gun Club and there are no activities that I enjoy more than hunting and fishing in the State of Maine but I cannot quite understand the good Representative from Winslow asking that this bond issue go out to the people of the state. I sat with him in the 109th Legislature, when we were wrestling at that time with the problem of corrections, and the problem of corrections has not gone away. If anything, it has become a greater problem. I understand and I guess everyone of us understands that that is going to be problem that we will be confronting very shortly on how to fund the necessary changes that will have to be addressed, not for the next generation, but for this generation. So, I cannot quite see it in my heart as a sportsman, as an outdoorsman, to put this bond issue out to the people, which may well pass at the expense of the corrections bond issue that is sure to come.

If I had my druthers, I would much rather fund hunting and fishing than I would to fund the corrections but I realize where the priorities are for the benefit of the State of Maine, not my personal priorities.

There is one thing I would like to mention before I depart for this session. I served here, as I said in the 109th Legislature, and one of my colleagues at that time was the good Representative from Presque Isle, Representative Mary MacBride. I really take umbrage at the gentleman from Eagle Lake attacking personally the gentledady from Presque Isle.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the Representative that the Speaker did not attack the Representative from Presque Isle. The Representative may proceed to debate the issue.

Representative STETSON: I would say this, that when I attack the gentleman from Brunswick, or if I attack the gentleman from South Portland, Representative Kane, they are able to stand up and defend themselves, but I would just ask that we not attack people who have the State of Maine at heart like Representative MacBride.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the Representative that the Record speaks for itself.

The Chair recognizes the Representative from Island Falls, Representative Smith.

Representative SMITH: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I don't think I can add much to what has already been said. Representative McGowan, his concerns for his young son, where is he going to hunt and fish in the future, I think, is a

concern that I had the other day when we had a doe bill before us and you supported me on that and I thank you for it.

I don't have the latest figures, but in 1984, I have some figures that said \$4 million that was invested in the department from the State of Maine perpetuated over \$120 million for the state. That is what the Fisheries and Wildlife Department is doing for us. I think we should be looking to the future. Now is the time to buy land.

Outside, people are buying up land and posting it; if we wait another year or two, land prices are going up, what are we going to be doing then? The interest now, as has been pointed out, is the time to buy. So, I would hope that you would lay aside any political motive you have to vote against this and support it for the future generations that do not have land to hunt and fish on.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Lewiston, Representative Nadeau.

Representative NADEAU: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think I would like to begin by echoing the gentleman from Island Falls, Mr. Smith's comments, and ask you to look at this from a different perspective.

First of all, let's do just a brief reminder of what a bond issue is all about -- it is the ability to borrow money and spread the debt over a period of time. There is no question in my mind that what the gentleman just said in terms of land being swallowed up is inevitable, this is becoming a very attractive state by the constant immigration of people and it is a real danger.

I am not a hunter, I fish twice, three times a year maybe -- not a big outdoorsman. I represent a city, do have constituents who hunt and fish, but I recognize the significant economic contribution that the sportsmen in Maine and out of Maine contribute to this state. From my perspective, that is good for business, it's good for revenues, it gives us the ability to generate money to provide the funding for what I feel are many social responsibilities of state government. So it all is interrelated.

What I would like you to do today is look at it this way, from a business point of view, -- I am in the real estate business and do some investing, if I can get a 15, 20 year fixed rate at 6.87 percent, I am going to look very seriously at that. If I have the cash in the bank, I might finance that. When you are in business, you manage your money, you manage your debt. It is an essential part of being successful. I don't think there is anything wrong with state government operating in that vein. This is the problem -- the acquisition of this land will be dealt with at some future date. I don't think any of us can dispute that.

At the moment, a point that Representative McGowan made, and it is very, very important, we have the ability to borrow money at those kinds of rates. We don't know if those rates will be available in a couple of years. As a matter of public policy, acquisition of these lands, many of us think is very, very, important. Now is the time to finance some of those obligations, whether it be a university, capital facilities, which we will deal with, whether it be a building at AMHI, whether it be coastal harbor developments, all of these things are essential for the public good.

Ladies and gentlemen, bonding is a perfectly appropriate way to service that public good. Look at

it from a business point of view, look at it from a fiscal management point of view. The gentleman from Winslow, Mr. Carter was very convincing, I thought, as was the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Gwadosky, on what our current bond situation is, the Triple A rating we enjoy that has all come about in the last six years. I think the state has been managed quite well, fiscally speaking. The record speaks for itself on that particular point, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, look at it on the long term.

I think it would be wise for us to put this issue out to the voters today. Let them determine what they are going to do in terms of their authorization of this expenditure or this authorization. They will have the information come election day in November as to our total bond picture and will make the determination at the polls.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Standish, Representative Greenlaw.

Representative GREENLAW: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I'm like Mr. Dillenback, I didn't plan to speak today, but I have had about enough of it. You talk about respectability and credibility. Down my way, the first week I was in the House four years ago, after we got out of the House Friday night, the next Monday morning I went down to the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife. There was a herd of 200 deer in my district -- a piece of land in Hollis, which is really being debated today. This man in the Department by the name of Norman Trask, the Deputy Commissioner, told me, sure there is 200 deer there, but you don't understand deer. You build a house there, they will move down the street. The land could have been bought then for practically nothing. They still have got \$100,000 over there that they could have matched up with funds but they haven't used it.

What bothers me is, you talk about credibility and respectability. When I walk out of this House and if I don't come back in November, I will walk with my head up. If I switch my vote today, I can get that piece of land purchased. If I switch my vote today, I can get money for my campaign. I am not switching my vote, and whether I come back or I don't come back, Greenlaw will walk with his head up and he won't be looking at his toes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Benton, Representative Parent.

Representative PARENT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I know it is getting late and we all want to get this over with but before we vote, I would like to restate briefly what the main motive and the real objective of the minority party is in these bond issues as I see it. There are no evil motives, believe me. There are no selfish objectives, we mean well.

As I see it, the main objective of the minority party is to approve some of the bond issues, to disapprove of others, so as to lessen the increase in the proposed state bonded indebtedness. We do this because we feel that this, in the long run, is good and is what is best for the people of the State of Maine.

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

Representative DILLENBACK: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Everybody else has spoken today and I would like to have lunch too but I might as well take my chances and go along with the

rest.

The point I want to make is, you are talking about mass voting here, that we, as a caucus, are voting in a block. There are 16 Republicans voting yes, including myself, on this bill right now. There are only two Democrats, except Representative Diamond who changed so he could move reconsider, so I can tell you exactly what happened in the Republican caucus. The Republican caucus went over each bond issue independently and we all took a vote on how we were going to vote on these issues. We discussed them, we worked on them, and people took their positions. This is a conscientious vote and I would like to go to lunch.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Scarborough, Representative Higgins.

Representative HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise after having listened to the Representative from Cumberland, Representative Dillenback, about changing votes. The reason that I rise on this issue is because the bill was in our committee and, even though there were a number of people in my caucus who were concerned that we were deviating from the so-called 90 percent rule, I make it a habit of reading these General Fund bond issues when they are put out (they are pretty dry reading) but nevertheless, I feel it is pretty important to do so.

I read through the latest issue and there were a lot of things in there that impressed me. There were a lot of things that indicated to me that yes, we could, in fact, issue more than 90 percent, more than 100 percent, even use the 7 percent rule if we wanted to, but I felt comfortable in the votes that I took in the committee that we were doing the right thing. If \$40 million or \$45 million worth of bonds were sent out to the people, that wasn't totally irresponsible, understanding that perhaps the people might defeat some of them. So, I was comfortable with that position.

As the gentleman from Cumberland mentioned, in yesterday's caucus, each of us did vote how we felt on each issue. It was not a caucus position. I say that most emphatically because at the end of the caucus I stood up and said, I voted a number of these bond issues out of committee and, if the caucus is going to take a position against these bond issues, I you want to know that now because I don't want to vote for them, people say to me, the caucus took a position and you voted the opposite way.

I was assured then, as I have been a number of times this morning, that that was not the way it was handled. If we voted for the bond issue yesterday, we were free to vote for it today. That is what I did.

What concerns me and what brings me to my feet, however, and I have had a number of experiences with this, is that when we get down to the end of the session and there are a number of things that the majority party wants to pass or doesn't want to pass and somehow the minority party gets involved and trigs up the works, if you will, all of a sudden, it becomes partisan. It becomes obstructionist. I object to that.

I do object, as I said, to the comments from the Speaker of the House regarding obstructionists and regarding the terms partisan. It seems that, at the end of the session, it is always easy to come down from the rostrum or have someone else do it and

attempt to demean the integrity or the intent of the minority party when they, for whatever reason, choose to vote no. I object to that because, over the last couple of days, we have seen a number of circumstances where the majority party has seen to use rules to object to the minority party offering amendments to bills. We have seen Joint Orders come in that are contrary to history, I guess, (for lack of a better word) and I object to that. If it goes through here on a straight party line vote and it is enacted because it takes a simple majority vote, that is not partisan somehow. I argue that it is. But because it doesn't require a two-thirds vote, nobody brings it up. In this particular case, it requires a two-thirds vote. So, all of a sudden, because there are a number of members of the Republican caucus who are against it, it is becoming obstructionist, it is becoming partisan and we should hang our heads in shame. I voted for a number of these.

I want to mention one other thing too because it has bothered me for a year. I listened to the gentleman from Canaan, Representative McGowan, speak earlier. I wasn't on the floor but I did listen to him in the other room. There have been a number of people talking about, let's vote for the issue and let's not have blind loyalty and all that sort of thing. I had a piece of legislation last year that I sponsored and I asked the gentleman from Canaan, Mr. McGowan, to cosponsor with me as I did a member or two members of the other body, one of each party I might add, -- you know that bill came out of committee on party lines with even the Senator, who was a cosponsor and of the majority party, voting against it. It was brought to the floor of the House and the gentleman who was the cosponsor, Representative McGowan, voted against it after having told me it was a good bill. I don't want to get into debate with him over that issue but that has bothered me for some time because it was defeated on a straight party line vote in this body. If that is not blind loyalty, if that is not partisanship, I don't know what it is.

I bring these things up because I really don't think it is fair at this hour of the day, in this part of the session, to call the minority members obstructionists because they are voting their conscience on an issue.

If this bond issue is defeated, then I think the people will certainly decide who is right and who is wrong, if it becomes that big of an issue. I have supported it until this time. I am, however, going to vote no now because I don't like the tone, I don't like the annual accusations of being obstructionists, of being partisan, of playing politics, of not having the good will and the interests of the people of the State of Maine at heart.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Canaan, Representative McGowan.

Representative MCGOWAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I guess I would at this time apologize to the Representative from Scarborough for actions taken at a previous time.

I would pose a question to him -- if we, as we sit in our committees and use the rules that we run this legislature with, we send something out unanimously, are we, in fact, not doing the same thing?

The SPEAKER: Representative McGowan of Canaan has posed a question through the Chair to the Representative from Scarborough, Representative

Higgins, who may respond if he so desires.

The Chair recognizes that Representative.

Representative HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The answer is yes.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is enactment. In accordance with the provisions of Section 14 of Article IX of the Constitution, a two-thirds vote of the House is necessary. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

93 having voted in the affirmative and 53 in the negative with 5 being absent, the Bond Issue failed of enactment.

(See Roll Call No. 325)

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

FINALLY PASSED

RESOLVE, in Favor of Edgar Warren, of Portland, for Injuries Received While He was a Ward of the State (H.P. 1377) (L.D. 1940) (H. "A" H-739 to Com. of Conf. "A" S-487)

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

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

PAPER FROM THE SENATE

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Provide Community Education and Family Health Services" (S.P. 835) (L.D. 2124) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-494) in the House on April 12, 1986.

Came from the Senate passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-494) as amended by Senate Amendments "A" (S-537) and "C" (S-547) thereto in non-concurrence.

The House voted to recede and concur.

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 10 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

PASSED TO BE ENACTED

Emergency Measure

An Act to Fund and Implement a Certain Collective Bargaining Agreement (H.P. 1684) (L.D. 2373)

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. 127 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.

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 14 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

PASSED TO BE ENACTED

Emergency Measure

An Act to Reorganize the Department of Finance and Administration and the Department of Personnel (S.P. 954) (L.D. 2392) (H. "A" H-721; S. "A" S-530 to S. "A" S-527)

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

Representative Attean of the Penobscot Nation was granted unanimous consent to address the House:

Representative ATTEAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Before you enact this bill, I would like to offer a few comments. I rise today, not in opposition to this bill, but to clarify why L.D. 2392 was amended by House Amendment "A" (H-721).

This amendment removes Section 109 from the bill. Section 109 would have amended the Maine Indian Land Claims Treaty. As the Indian Representative to this body it is my responsibility to protest the inclusion of any part of the settlement act in any omnibus bill such as L.D. 2392.

Although the changes to the settlement act were minor and the intent of the treaty was not violated, I still must protest. This is the second time an error such as this has occurred. The first error took legislative action to correct it.

The section which was amended by House Amendment "A" would have required congressional approval as well as tribal. I might add that Section 109 was also in violation of Joint Rule 36-A. There does exist an established procedure to amend the settlement act. It requires the expressed approval of both state and tribe.

Mr. Speaker, may I pose a question?

If this bill had been enacted by both bodies and if both bodies had adjourned without day, and if this bill had reached the Governor's desk before this error was discovered, what then would be the status of this bill if the Governor, in good conscience, could not sign it? What would be the status of the bill if the error was not discovered and the Governor did sign it?

This bill would have contained a section which would have been in direct conflict with existing state and federal law.

This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 130 voted in favor of the same and 3 against and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon requiring Senate concurrence were ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

The following items appearing on Supplement No. 15 were taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act to Provide for a Clean-up Program Concerning Natural Die-off of Fish in the Coastal Waters of the State (H.P. 1383) (L.D. 1952) which was Passed to be Enacted in the House on March 10, 1986.

Came from the Senate, Passed to be Engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-539) in non-concurrence.

The House voted to recede and concur.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act to Authorize Additional Facilities for Long-term Care (S.P. 913) (L.D. 2280) which was Passed to be Enacted in the House on April 12, 1986.

Came from the Senate, Passed to be Engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "B" (S-538) in non-concurrence.

The House voted to recede and concur.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon requiring Senate concurrence were ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

The Chair laid before the House the following matter: An Act to Authorize a General Fund Bond Issue in the Amount of \$10,000,000 for Coastal Access, Harbor Improvements, Maine State Ferry Improvements, and Marine Laboratory Improvements (Bond Issue) (S.P. 895) (L.D. 2250) (H. "B" H-737 to C. "B" S-490) which was tabled earlier in the day and later today assigned pending passage to be enacted, a roll call having been ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Eastport, Representative Vose.

Representative VOSE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am not used to speaking on the bond issues but, on this particular one, I feel that I must.

This bond issue has a direct effect on Washington County and others I am sure. My friend, Representative Randall, our delegation, and I are very concerned about this in that Jonesport has been working for some time, almost seven years or longer as a matter of fact, to have a breakwater in their harbor. That is a very necessary thing for the fishermen and for the people in that community.

They, in turn, are prepared to borrow \$300,000 as their share for the breakwater. It has been approved by the Army Corps of Engineers.

The state's matching share out of this bond issue would be \$1.7 million and the federal government is going to match that with \$8 million for the

construction of this breakwater. If this bond issue doesn't pass this year and we don't match the funds, I am afraid we are going to lose out entirely.

In Bucks Harbor, there is a fish pier there operated by a cooperative, mainly by a gentleman whose name is Harley Flynn. It might be interesting to know that Harley and I are very good friends, although he led a charge last time against me because one bill caused my landslide election, but he and I have patched up those differences and I have been working very hard for him with the Department of Transportation for the Cooperative Fish Pier down there. It is no big amount but it is out of this, it is \$150,000 and this will serve around 60 fishing vessels in that harbor.

There is a like amount for the Lubec Pier, which has been rather disappointing to the people of Lubec. It does need some repair work down there because of the very strong tides. The Department of Transportation has looked at it and has agreed that this is a necessary thing.

I hope that in the spirit of looking at the bond issue itself and based on the merits of the bond issue and what it is being used for, I hope that this body would see fit to approve this one.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Stonington, Representative Rice.

Representative RICE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I originally was asked to cosponsor this bond issue by the Governor's Office and I refused because of some concerns about the coastal access. I have resolved those questions in my mind and I would urge you today to support this bond issue.

The Maine State Ferry Service needs our help. The Marine Laboratory in Boothbay needs our help. The harbor improvements are much needed. I hope you will support this bond issue.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from East Machias, Representative Randall.

Representative RANDALL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I appreciate the kind words from the Representative from Eastport explaining the somewhat parochial interests in \$1.75 million in regard to a town in my area, Jonesport, Maine, which will receive \$8 million in federal funding to match that \$1.75 million of the state funding contribution.

If there is any reasonableness in concentration on the issues, I do hope that the members of this body today will focus on the issues as we deal with this vote.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from St. George, Representative Scarpino.

Representative SCARPINO: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I would like to bring to your attention something about this bond issue that my friend from Eastport and my friend from East Machias have't brought up. As everyone is aware, on the coast, as far as boat transport goes, we are apparently in crisis. We are losing our railroads and, in all likelihood, the individual that was going to purchase the shortline that runs the coast, is now not going to do that. We have tremendous need for cheap bulk transport of products both into this state and out of this state.

The only system that we have left that we can utilize is sea transport. The part of this bond issue that deals with harbor improvements that will

enable sea transport to be used effectively and to its fullest potential would benefit this state in all areas in reduction of costs to businesses and reduction of prices to consumers. I would urge your support of it.

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is passage to be enacted. In accordance with the provisions of Section 14 of Article IX of the Constitution, a two-thirds vote of the House is necessary. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

98 having voted in the affirmative and 45 in the negative with 8 being absent, the bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

(See Roll Call No. 326)

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon requiring Senate concurrence were ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

(Off Record Remarks)

(At Ease to the Gong)

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chair laid before the House the following matter: An Act to Authorize a General Fund Bond Issue in the Amount of \$6,000,000 for Energy Improvements in State Facilities (Bond Issue) (H.P. 1590) (L.D. 2243) (S. "A" S-532; C. "A" H-688) which was tabled earlier in the day and later today assigned pending passage to be enacted. (roll call having been ordered)

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is passage to be enacted. In accordance with the provisions of Section 14 of Article IX of the Constitution, a two-thirds vote of the House is necessary. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

83 having voted in the affirmative and 54 in the negative with 14 being absent, the Bond Issue failed of enactment.

Sent up for concurrence.

(See Roll Call No. 327)

The Chair laid before the House the following matter: An Act to Provide Funding for the Court Mediation Service through Fees (H.P. 1703) (L.D. 2398) which was tabled earlier in the day and later today assigned pending passage to be enacted.

On motion of Representative Foster of Ellsworth, under suspensions of the rules, the House reconsidered

its action whereby the L.D. 2398 was passed to be engrossed.

The same Representative offered House Amendment "C" (H-742) and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "C" (H-742) was read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Ellsworth, Representative Foster.

Representative FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: A few years ago, we started a mandatory mediation program in the court system, although for many years, there had already been a court mediation service. It had been used by Small Claims Court and, at times, judges did send people to mediation in regard to divorces. At the time we did this, there was a great deal of feeling that this would help with court time. It would free up court time and free up judge time. Mediation time was not as expensive and it would not bog down the courts.

At that time, we also looked at putting a fee on mediation and decided against it because of the fact that, not only the people that were getting a divorce used mediation, but people in the Small Claims Courts used mediation.

We talked to the Judiciary and they thought it was within their budget to take care of this mandatory mediation.

This year when the court budget could no longer sustain itself, mandatory mediation was put on hold. That was about 10 weeks ago.

Now the court is in a problem financially because we have not really given them enough money. They are also in a financial problem because court appointed attorney fees are over-budgeted. But what did they cut? They cut mediation, mediation to people with children trying to get a divorce in a humane way.

I spoke to you on the family court and I said I disapprove of interfering with fees telling the Judiciary what fees they shall assess.

The bill that I have amended has a fee in there that the court shall assess. The amendment that I have does also because I have a financial responsibility to the citizens of Maine and you members of the legislature because the money stemming from L.D. 2398 is already in the budget figures. That money has been spent. It is not my intention ever to send anyone back to any table or budget looking for money. Therefore, the fiscal note on the amendment that I have before you, raises \$6,490 more than really needed. I want to tell you why I have done that. I think it is a matter of fairness. If you have a court mediation service in place, and just because you are getting a divorce and have children and are mandated to go to mediation, that when you go, you pay \$60. You can be sent back again and its another \$60. Yet, if you have a Small Claims Court matter pending, you can go to this mediation service and chances are it could be the same mediator and you pay nothing.

The amendment that I present to you in order to keep the budget process in place puts a filing fee of \$52 on all divorces filed in the state and goes along with what the committee has said in regards to \$25 for small claims.

In order for this piece of legislation to pass, I shall be up front as I always try to be, that with my amendment for the committee bill, we must have 101 votes; together somehow, we shall.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from South Portland, Representative Kane.

Representative KANE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Let me start off by recognizing Representative Foster's long standing interest in this matter, particularly in mediation. I think it is fair to call her the mother of mediation in Maine, if one is so inclined, but she expressed this concern over the last couple of months, the mediation not paying for itself.

The fact is that this compromise bill before you now, the one that has the mediation fees in it, is really not anyone's property, there is no pride of authorship in that on the part of any individual. It is the result of a couple of months of long, painstaking negotiating between the Judiciary Committee, the Appropriations Committee and the Judicial Department, represented by one justice at one time and another justice at another time. The deal was like this, that if the Appropriations Committee was going to help the Judicial Department out of its budgetary crisis, mediation had to pay for itself.

At one time, the Supreme Judicial Court was, quite frankly, considering just ordering people to pay mediation as they went along. I don't think that the idea is that problematical to them. So, the idea was that mediation would pay for itself. That is the one that the court in its crisis decided to cut. The other part was that the court, with a gun held to its collective head by the legislature, would double Superior Court fees.

The third part was that then the Appropriations Committee and the legislature would come up with money to fund the remainder of their budget and avert further crisis. That was the understanding.

It is not as if people on the Appropriations Committee, the Judiciary Committee and from the Judicial Department didn't look over this bill and discover and really agonize over it but this was the best arrangement we could come up with.

I couldn't agree more with Representative Foster's remarks of last week in opposition to the Family Court Bill, namely that the court should set fees. In the mind of the court, there is a big, big difference between the legislature saying mediation, which is a legislatively created function and a legislatively mandated function in some circumstances, will now have a legislative fee attached to it. In their eyes, that is a very different thing than saying, and further, we will set the fees from the House and the Senate for all judicial proceedings in District Court and in Superior Court. They find that very offensive. The court feels very strongly that it ought to be able to maintain the authority to set its own fees and I agree with them.

There were a couple of things said that I think are a little misleading. One is on the children. Representative Foster suggests that if one comes in to a divorce situation and you have children, it is going to cost you more than if you don't have children. If you go to mediation, you are going to have to pay for it. If you do come in and you have settled everything, it is an uncontested matter, and everything is all arranged, you don't go to mediation whether you have children or not, and you don't pay. If you come in without children and you have not settled everything, the court is more than likely now to order mediation before you get to contest the marriage in court. Then you go and pay for the mediator.

The reason why small claims does not have this fee is that, generally, divorce is regarded as a very very different action than a small claims action.

My biggest problem in this bill is that I think small claims ought to be free. That is the way I feel but you know we weren't able to prevail on that.

The thing is, you can't have a \$60 fee on small claims and somebody goes in there litigating an \$80 matter on overdue rent for one week — something like that. If a person goes and gets divorced, it is going to cost them a lot, lot more than \$60 just on his legal fees and I think that mediation has worked especially well in one regard, namely it has saved a lot of people a lot of money by not having lots of lawyer time eating up in contested matters within the court.

With regard to Representative Foster's proposed amendment of what we went through, I and several other members of the committee, spent a good five hours yesterday on it and a few more hours today, called the whole committee together and considered it every which way we possibly could. The fact is, when all is said and done, it is hopeless in the other body, so the danger that this amendment has is that it could unravel the whole budget and this has been a long, long process putting these things together and it could wind up in non-concurrence.

I really don't think that anybody on my committee could have given Representative Foster any more polite treatment than we have over the last couple of days on this issue, including at the request of the minority leaders, everyone declining to object to the motion to reconsider this so that she could get to offer an amendment and we could discuss the issue and all that. I think that there are minority members on my committee who don't feel like speaking on this today but who feel that it is really just a little late in the game for this.

I guess what I am really asking you is to accept the good will and the good faith efforts of everybody on those two committees and within the Judicial Department who have hammered this thing out. Please accept my assurances that the Judicial Department finds this far, far more offensive than they do a fee on mediation.

I urge you to vote against the motion.

Mr. Speaker, I would move to indefinitely postpone this amendment and ask you to vote for that motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Ellsworth, Representative Foster.

Representative FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: We could have had mediation in the court ten to twelve weeks ago. The court, at that time, was willing to increase the fee in the divorce court. They have done it in the Superior Court, it is \$100 on May 1st. It is \$25 in the District Court.

Because of bills that have been in the Judiciary Committee, they have sat back and not increased the fee. This bill did not have a public hearing. If it had, I would have been there.

I do ask that you consider this issue. If you think that this is a good amendment, that you vote on it the way you think and we can send it down to the Senate and if they don't like it, fine, it will be back and we won't let the budget go under.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Winslow, Representative Carter.

Representative CARTER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and

Gentlemen of the House: I would urge you to vote for indefinite postponement of this amendment for fear that the funding package that we have put together to fund the court appropriations bill will become unraveled.

I will be the first one to admit that we have problems with the Judicial budget and we have been wrestling with it for several months. We think we are working towards solutions but they take time.

We have in L.D. 2390, which is the Supplemental Appropriations Act for the Judicial Department, created a five member subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee to look into the operations and the relationship of the Judicial, Executive and Legislative branches of government.

It is my hope that through the efforts of this subcommittee we might be able to achieve a type of communication that is really necessary between the three branches of government to assure that we get the biggest bang for our buck. It is not an easy thing to solve. There are differences of opinion and I expect that is probably the way it should be.

The package that I refer to provides \$1.26 million for the Judicial Branch to complete the balance of this fiscal year and fund most of the needs of the next year of the biennium.

There have been statements made that the court system is underfunded for this fiscal year. I disagree with that. We really don't know for sure whether they are or not. We received a memo from the court administrator telling us that they had implemented cost saving measures because they were running low on operational funds. That was back in December. They were having problems with mediation.

In our investigation, we determined that mediation costs were running somewhere around \$30,000 a month. It was our hope that the particular bill that is before us would be funded on an emergency basis to begin on the first of April. Here we are, it is the 16th of April, and the bill has not yet been enacted. However, in our Appropriations Bill, we have appropriated monies to cover the last three months of this fiscal year. So, we know there is a balance there.

With the cost savings measures that have been instituted or put in place by the court administrator, they should be able to end this fiscal year without a deficit. As far as the second year of the biennium goes, we will be back here in January, but hopefully before that takes place the subcommittee will have an opportunity to do its work and if fees have to be increased, then we could recommend to the Judicial Department or direct them if we have to, to raise the fees rather than have the legislature do it. I think that would be more acceptable to the courts. I think Representative Foster will agree to that and it would be my hope that we would vote along with the motion of Representative Kane to indefinitely postpone this amendment so that we can get on with our work as the day is getting short.

Representative Kane of South Portland requested a roll call.

The SPEAKER: 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.

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is the motion of the Representative from South Portland, Representative Kane, that House Amendment "C" be indefinitely postponed. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

46 having voted in the affirmative and 95 in the negative with 10 being absent, the motion did not prevail.

Subsequently, House Amendment "C" was adopted.

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

(See Roll Call No. 328)

(At Ease)

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 18 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

PASSED TO BE ENACTED

An Act Relating to Medical and Legal Professional Liability (S.P. 958) (L.D. 2400) (S. "A" S-521 and S. "C" S-543)

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

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon requiring Senate concurrence were ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

(At Ease)

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chair laid before the House the following matter: Bill "An Act to Establish the Maine Business Opportunity and Job Development Program (BOND ISSUE) (S.P. 952) (L.D. 2387) (H. "A" H-703) which was tabled earlier in the day and later today assigned pending further consideration.

(Failed passage to be enacted in the House on April 15, 1986.)

(Came from the Senate passed to be enacted in non-concurrence.)

Representative Diamond of Bangor moved that the

House recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Caribou, Representative Ayer.

Representative AYER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would ask for a roll call.

This piece of legislation, in my opinion, represents perhaps the most important piece of business legislation that I have seen in the short period of time that I have had the privilege to sit in this chair. I think it is especially important because the outcome of this bond issue will act as a signal to tell the world about the healthy economic environment that we would like to see our state put in.

This bond will create a revolving fund to be loaned out on a 50-50 basis to those people that qualify to leverage further funding for the development of new business in our state and also for the expansion of existing businesses. This bond will create new jobs. The estimates, which I am sure you have from the letter that you received from FAME that is before you, would indicate that perhaps within the next five year period we could anticipate 700 or so new jobs in our state as a result of this type funding program. Additionally, I don't need to remind anybody that with new jobs, you create a larger tax base in your communities to provide for more revenue for your municipalities.

The design of this program (and I will be very brief about it because you have all had an opportunity to read the L.D.) primarily is designed to target areas that have geographically distressed economic conditions. It also is targeted to take care of distressed industries among other things. However, the bond funding is available throughout the entire state, it is not specific for a particular area. The bond will work as well in South Portland or Portland as it will in Aroostook County, Washington County, Knox, or the other counties.

This money is available through this bond for small and medium sized businesses. I might remind you that a medium size business by FAME'S definition (and they will be the one administering this program) require that they have less than 100 employees and I believe something in the area of less than \$10 million in sales on an annual basis.

Again, it is a revolving fund. This money, once it is raised via the bonding route, becomes an equity for the state to be used again and again to create new business. You might ask why is this type of legislation or program necessary? You have all heard and I am sure very familiar with the thought that the SBA type of program, the EDA types of programs are being very dramatically and drastically curtailed at the federal level. The Farmers Home Administration, Business and Industry Loan Program also is being sharply curtailed.

I don't need to remind you that the IDB's, the Industrial Development Bonds that are currently serviced by FAME by statute now federally, are going to be something in the area of \$24 million available for small business this year. They already have \$50 million in requests. Last year alone, they serviced \$121 million worth of this type of bonding. FAME will administer this (Finance Authority of Maine). Finance Authority of Maine if not necessarily a loaner of last resort as I have heard some people say, but rather they act as a catalyst in our state to help precipitate guarantee programs, help service

IDB's, etc.

I won't go into a great deal of detail, but to give you just a little bit of background in that, since FAME was enacted back in 1983, they have serviced something in the area of \$400 million worth of guarantees, bondings and so forth in our state. They have created over 20,000 new jobs, not only created but currently retained in our communities. They have provided something in the area of \$20 million for these investments and provided \$20 million into your tax base. They have done this with less than a 5 percent default factor.

There is some thought that we don't want the state getting involved in what banks currently do. I am the first to agree with that. Very briefly, this is a matching fund type thing, only up to 50 percent. It does provide long term fixed rate financing. Again, without going into a great deal of detail, I am sure those of you who have borrowed money here recently know that long term fixed rate financing is pretty much a thing of the past as far as the banking industry is concerned for a variety of reasons. This is a very necessary program, it replaces programs that currently are going out of existence. It will serve our state well and I am sure it will be administrated properly. I hope that, in this particular instance, we will all recognize the importance of this very, very important bonding referendum, send it out so the voters can decide that we need this type of program.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Mars Hill, Representative Smith.

Representative SMITH: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: I just want to echo Mr. Ayer's comments and I feel that this is a very necessary piece of legislation and very beneficial to the economic relief, especially up in my area. Due to the federal cutbacks coming down in regards to SBA, etc., I just feel that this is a very worthwhile piece of legislation to pass.

I might just add just a few comments to some of the criteria on which the loans are being made. They will be set up on a competitive basis and based on that -- giving the awards in this way, levies of distress and project area, amount of private sector financial revenue, project feasibility, social objectives, amount of real property, and other taxes generated in preference to export based companies.

I hope you will go along with this piece of legislation.

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

Representative HAYDEN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The last two speakers from Caribou and Mars Hill should provide ample proof to all of us this is a bill that rises above the partisan warfare that we can slip into on occasion during this session. It is a bill that gives unique, at least from Maine's perspective, help to small businesses in their effort to start up and in their effort to expand.

I can remember from the first year that I was in the legislature, talking to the small business people in my district, particularly in Lisbon Falls, and their cry even before facing the federal cutbacks, which all of us face now, was, the trouble with SBA is, if you are a small business, you can't get any help. It's a program, however well intended, that if you are small, you just can't get into. Since that time, because of pending federal legislation, we are

facing as much as a \$24 million cutback in those funds that really weren't very useful to small businesses anyway, even though they were intended to be.

By having a program like this that is revolving, involves matching funds to keep our banks and financial institutions involved, we have a chance, not just to sustain some of the loan programs that we have, but to come closer to attaining their stated purpose where the organizations that were supervised and run by the federal government weren't able to succeed in doing.

It's no coincidence, I think, that the first two speakers have spoken from areas that have a particular crying need for this type of assistance. This isn't a bill that is just for Aroostook County, this isn't just a bill that is just for Androscoggin County, this is a bill for any place that has small business people that are fighting to retain their independence and fighting to establish the kind of financing they need in this very fluid economy. As a matter of fact, we are in a time right now where interest rates are very low. The opportunity to get fixed rate loans for any investor at this time is a once in a decade opportunity.

I think if ever there is a bill that we owe to our hard working constituents, who want to establish an economic base that's going to take care of our neighbors, this is it. It's a bill that has met resounding support in the Senate, it's a bill frankly that I have a difficult time seeing how it can meet anything but resounding support here.

I urge you to follow the lead of the gentlemen from Caribou and from Mars Hill in supporting this legislation.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Paris, Representative Bell.

Representative BELL: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: This particular bond issue came out of committee divided even though there have been other bond issues that with a Majority and Minority Report, this particular one came out divided. It was a 10 to 3 Report from Appropriations and I was one of the people who voted "Ought Not to Pass" on this piece of legislation and would just like to explain to this body the reasoning behind that.

My first opposition to this particular bill was using bonding to fund a particular program. The program may have some merit and it may be the decision of the State of Maine to institute such a program but to use bonding to finance this particular program really concerned me.

In addition to the total amount of bonds that we were offering at this time, it was an attempt on my part to reduce the limit of bonding. Also, in this piece of legislation, L.D. 2387, there is a particular section of this bill which talks about a number of social criteria that is intended to be funded. On Page 4, it talks about the authority "shall establish incentives, encourage effective and efficient use of money from the fund to stimulate a number of different purposes." While those purposes are well meaning, I guess my question is, if a business is having a difficult time getting financing in the first place, going to a bank, getting the initial loan and then receiving the match from FAME, in addition to struggling to make money in that business, meeting a number of other social criteria at the same time, I really question the wisdom of doing that.

I would hope that the body would vote against this bond issue at this time.

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

Representative HAYDEN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think there is a straightforward answer to that, particularly to the last concern raised by the gentlelady from South Paris and that is, why should there be any particular requirements on the type of business seeking this loan, particularly in the instance of a business struggling with its own balance sheet at the time?

The answer to the question is, the reason that there are requirements on this type of financing is to give some direction to the authority that is issuing these bonds to make sure that this is a good risk, to make sure that is a risk that also is in line with the type of businesses, the type of industries that we want to give incentives to. I don't think that there is anything unusual, anything risky, about making a decision that we want to give incentives to the type of businesses that we consider most beneficial and most needy to our economy.

This bill wouldn't be so important if this financing were available without legislation of this type. The fact is, it is filling a void, not competing with other types of financing. It is certainly not competing with financial institutions, which in discussing this bill with some members of this House previous to this debate, I have heard was a concern. The financial institutions in this state don't feel they are in a position to offer fixed rate financing of this type. It's why, even healthy businesses aren't able to get the type of financing to help them expand, even though they are a good risk by any definition of the term.

What this does, it puts banks in Androscoggin County, York County and Aroostook County in a position to participate with the commercial development of the small businesses in their area. So what we see here is not a program that brings the state in as a competitor, it's not a program that brings the state into high risk types of financing that otherwise institutions wouldn't participate in, it's a program instead that gives a chance for the businesses and the financial institutions in those regions to begin to work together in a way that is going to make them strong without the help from the state.

For that reason, I can't see any way that we can be fulfilling our responsibility here if we say no to this opportunity to give the help that farmers, businessmen and banks need. This is why it's good legislation, this is why I urge you to follow the lights of the gentleman from Caribou, the gentleman from Mars Hill and my own.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Winslow, Representative Carter.

Representative CARTER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would, indeed, urge you to follow the light of the gentleman from Caribou, Representative Ayer, and vote for the passage of this bond issue, a bond issue which I think is vitally needed in this state to fill a void, as has been pointed out, that does not now exist to assist areas in economic distress. If someone were to ask me what was the most significant thing that took place in the 112th Second Regular Session, I wouldn't hesitate to tell them that it's the emphasis that was placed on economic development. I think one of the major pieces

of legislation that came out of this session was the one that phases out sales tax on electricity used in manufacturing processes -- a major piece of legislation.

I would especially urge those who voted for that piece to also vote for this piece because they go hand in hand. Let's not just help the top, let's help all the industries in Maine. Let's not forget that we are on the tail end of the highway, the economic highway in this country. This piece of legislation is badly needed and we should support it wholeheartedly and I would urge you to do so.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Lewiston, Representative Nadeau.

Representative NADEAU: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I, too, would ask you to support this legislation today. The gentleman from Caribou, Representative Ayer, mentioned industrial development bonds or IDB's.

One thing that I want you to consider as sort of a different twist on this issue is, you are somewhat familiar with the problem we have right now presently with the Tax Reform Act in Washington and the cloud that has been passed over Industrial Revenue Bonds -- we are now basically operating under the provisions of the Tax Reform Act on a temporary basis awaiting the decision as to whether it will be retroactive or not. Industrial Development Bonds in this state have been, I think, the single biggest economic development tool in the last two years and have provided millions and millions of dollars worth of economic growth to this state.

With the cloud that we are facing with IRB's, this program becomes particularly significant for a couple of reasons. Number one, IRB's are, as I said, an incredibly important tool in this state for economic development but they are not for everyone. A sort of a rule of thumb with IRB's, I think, is if it's anything less than \$300,000 to \$500,000, it really doesn't make sense to go that route, primarily because of the costs involved in an industrial revenue bond application, bond counsel fees, and those sorts of things.

If you are talking a project that is \$300,000 or less, has a lot of merit that can create the jobs which is obviously what we are all looking for, there has to be some other pool that businesses can go to and that is precisely what this bond issue wants to address -- small, medium sized businesses. Banks in this state and across the country have had a reputation of being kind of conservative and I think interstate banking will loosen that up some. There is a little bit more capital available in Maine but they still have the traditional banker's code. New businesses trying to start out have a very difficult time getting banks to back them 100 percent.

We have got a company in Lewiston that went the IRB route, they are going to provide something like 50 jobs. They took over an old shoe plant and they make plastic molding -- just a new company, brand new jobs because of the assistance of a program like in terms of Industrial Development Bonds, they were able to get on line. Those jobs are being provided and it is obviously very good for the community. I would like to see this same concept applied to the small or medium sized businesses, give them the opportunity. This money in the form of a bond issue to address the concerns of Representative Bell, I think, will be paid back many, many times over once these companies are on line with employees paying taxes and companies

paying taxes. It is an investment that I think we will get a much bigger return on.

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

Representative BEAULIEU: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I certainly urge you to vote for this bond issue. I would like to tell you that this isn't a program only for economically distressed areas. This is the kind of program that will help the small businesses for example in my own community.

All of you who went on the economic tour were very well impressed by the Taj Mahal's that were being built to house the banking industry and what not, but what you don't know is the number of times I have accompanied constituents or people in my community to the small business loan meetings trying to help them secure \$50,000 and \$70,000 loans only to be turned down, and money (\$300,000 and \$400,000) going to ski areas.

I have often wondered and I have challenged the leadership of the Small Business Administration as to just how small a business needed to be. What did those words mean, because those people have been turned down, over and over. I think this is a vitally important program, it will help those people that I represent who are trying to open a small store in a neighborhood and those who might just simply cannot get the financing at a decent rate.

I certainly hope you will adopt this bond proposal.

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

Representative STETSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: You know, I look at this particular issue with kind of mixed feelings because I think it is a very lofty purpose but I have had the unfortunate experience of seeing how these programs work or don't work as the case may be. Perhaps in four years, as the assistant United States Attorney in Bangor, I saw the losers, the failed businesses that had been financed by the taxpayers money.

Among those businesses, I recall Fred Vahlsing, the sugar beet enterprise, and I recall the windjammer, Nathaniel Bowditch, with an \$80,000 small business loan to fit out the Bowditch for a fancy ship's school for children from rather affluent families. As a matter of fact, that project went down the drain during one of our recessions in the 1980's because the families could no longer afford to send their children on these expensive school enterprises.

I also saw the motels along the coast down there around Belfast that went broke. I asked my friends in the Small Business Administration, "why is it we are seeing all these losers?" They said, "actually, these people are bound to be losers, they just couldn't get the money anywhere else and that's why they are losers."

I look at this particular bond issue and I begin to wonder, is it going to accomplish what it is supposed to accomplish. I would like to see the winners. Unfortunately, I haven't seen them. So, it is with reluctance, I am going to have to vote no on this particular issue.

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

Representative GWADOSKY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Comments from the

Representative from Damariscotta, Representative Stetson, brought me to my feet because those of us who have been familiar with the old MGA and FAME over the last several years have witnessed this growth of a new finance agency which is quite a bit different from the old MGA. I think it is pretty easy, whenever you are trying to criticize a particular department or state agency, you try to associate the particular problem or default that they are most famous for. Certainly, the sugar beet factory seems to be the one thing everyone thinks about when you think of MGA or FAME. I will say that if you look at the default rate of the old MGA, the Maine Guarantee Authority, before it was transferred, I think it had approximately a 25 percent default rate. However, if you take three projects out of that total default rate, their percentage would be around 4 percent.

I think if you are looking for reasons that the old MGA didn't work efficiently was essentially because they were a very small office, they didn't have the staff, they didn't have the expertise. That is one of the reasons why, three or four years ago, we created the Finance Authority of Maine. We created what we thought was going to be a high breed organization. We unclassified some employees, we allowed them to attract the professionals that they needed in finance and other areas so that they could take these various projects, weigh the benefits to each project, and make a decision.

I think anyone who takes a look at the track record, since the MGA has been transformed into the Finance Authority of Maine, will agree that they have done one heck of a job.

This particular bill that we are discussing today was a bill that went before Appropriations. I think some of us on the State Government Committee perhaps wished it would have gone to the State Government Committee because we would have liked to kind of pursue the economic development consequences of a bill like this. We really don't have a problem with the bill or supporting it because the fact is there is a need for these types of direct loans to be made by FAME. There is an incredible amount of distressed industries, distressed areas in the state and the intent of these monies are to hit directly those distressed industries, those distressed firms.

There are a couple of other interesting areas of this bill that perhaps have been mentioned but I think need to be repeated. There are also some incentives in this bill, that when we offer money under FAME to these businesses, there is going to be an incentive that somewhere during the midterm of that particular loan, there is a possibility that that interest rate could be reduced if they meet certain standards and certain qualifications.

If you look at the bill, I am talking about things such as developing quality and well paying jobs, if they have done some work in the areas of minimizing adverse environmental impact, if they have done some things in providing employee safety; in other words, we are not just loaning money and saying, here is the money, run with it. We are going to loan them some money but we are also going to put some incentive in there and say, if you do a good job and you take care of things and you take care of the people like you should be doing, we are also going to reward you with a lower interest rate later on, so it is really an incentive. It is kind of an innovative, progressive type of idea, something perhaps we should have had a number of years ago but, in the development

of FAME, it is going to take a couple of years for some of these programs to get on board. I think that this type of project is a good project, has tremendous impact for Aroostook County, as Representative Ayer has said, but it also has impact on those distressed industries, the shoe industry and particularly those distressed businesses that are facing a contract now.

These loans will be made in conjunction with bank loans and there is a cap that applies in terms of the maximum amount of money that can be loaned out. I think it is a good idea and think it is unfortunate that somebody would try to cloud this particular issue with sugarbeets or anything else that happened a long time ago under a different financing organization. I certainly urge you to support this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Stockton Springs, Representative Crowley.

Representative CROWLEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Just to clarify or maybe blow our own horn a little in Waldo County -- in previous testimony referring to the failures of businesses in the Belfast area, last year a new industry, innovative industry, with new processing of potatoes, a man by the name of Mr. Starrett won the Small Business Award of the Year and was honored by President Ronald Reagan for being an outstanding businessman of the year in the State of Maine. I know he got his loan through small business arrangements.

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

Representative STETSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I just have to add to that, that Mr. Starrett is one of the wealthiest men in Waldo County.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Lewiston, Representative Boutilier.

Representative BOUTILIER: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: Just a couple of quick comments. Being a freshman legislator and coming in the year when Reagan is President and hearing his comments on new federalism and how we should eliminate as much federal bureaucracy and pass those programs on to the states, I see this bond issue as not just a referendum on \$5 million for a start up program, I see it as a referendum also on whether the state should pick up the slack for these types of programs, whether the responsibility really does lie at the state level or the federal level.

I would have to comment on President Reagan's own committee on industrial competition which said that access to capital at reasonable rates is the single most important factor in increasing competitiveness of American businesses. They also found a direct link between access to this capital and increases in productivity.

A majority of states have passed similar programs and Maine being a capital poor state is in dire need, more so than any of those states previously enacting types of programs similar to this.

Finally, I would just like to say that I believe there will be many programs similar to this that will take over projects and endeavors that have been given up in the federal government in the guise of letting the state have the responsibility.

I would hope you would vote in favor of this bond issue with that in mind.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Lewiston, Representative Telow.

Representative TELOW: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have been sitting here kind of quiet because I think that I have quite a little experience in regards to what we are talking about here today.

Representative Sue Bell and I belong on the Augusta Advisory Committee for the SBA. She receives the communications in regards for what the future looks like for the SBA. It is in doubt that the administrator that they had has been now replaced with somebody that is more close to the (I hate to say this) the President who is not looking too much in favor of keeping the SBA.

However, what I want to say is this, not only being associated with the SBA for quite a few years, I have also been a member of SCORE between 10 and 15 years and I do worry about the fact that if the SBA is phased out and they, with the loan program that they had, then who picks up the slack to take that over?

On the SBA loans, I know that my friend, Representative Stetson, brought up about the loan problem but, if you will check with the SBA, the State of Maine has an excellent record on low losses. Their percentage of uncollected loans is one of the lowest in the country. I think if you check with McGillicuddy, he will verify that. I do want to bring up at this time that somebody has got to pick up the slack if the SBA is phased out and they discontinue the loans.

In my years on SCORE, I think I have worked with many, many new companies. Right now, we have a new company in Auburn that is going to receive the small businessman award for the year. Again, I just want to make those few remarks to straighten it out because I have had experience in this field.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Scarborough, Representative Higgins.

Representative HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As one of the three members that did sign this bill out "Ought Not to Pass", I felt that I should at least explain briefly why I did so.

I know that economic development seems to be a very catchy term or phrase in this legislature as it is throughout the state. In anything that wants to be glorified, we tend to put the phrase "economic development" beside it in hopes that it will pass.

While I think that this may be helpful in creating some jobs in some areas, the concern that I had with it and one of the reasons why I signed it out the way I did, is because I didn't feel the state should be obligating full faith and credit, issuing bonds which would then be reissued, if you will, to probably the least likely or least credit worthy people in the state.

If a person can only get a loan for 50 percent of the value of whatever it is they are trying to buy or produce from conventional sources, then I think that it would stand to reason that those same people are going to be the ones that are the most likely to fail. I may be wrong about that but I have a real problem with guaranteeing 100 percent loan and that is what this is going to do. I, as an individual, would be able to go to a bank and borrow 50 percent

of what I want, once I have done that, I can then go to FAME and borrow the other 50 percent. So, I don't have anything in it and I don't stand to lose anything other than the state's money first and then the bank's money after. That is the concern that I have. I think that I should share that with you.

The other point that I would bring out is interest rates are at the lowest that they have been in the last 10 or 15 years, 10 years anyway. I believe that if someone wants to go out and borrow money under conventional methods that, number one, the rates aren't going to be very high and they are going to be able to get that money because there seems to be plenty of it around. We are not facing the same sort of credit crunch that we were several years ago.

While I can appreciate the intent behind it, it just seems to me that the economic situation that we are in now does not indicate that that situation is necessary and I have a real problem with the state backing loans for those people who are only able to get 50 percent conventional financing.

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

Representative BRANNIGAN: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I just wanted to clarify an issue for the Representative from Scarborough -- my understanding is that, although this will only deal with 50 percent of a loan, it doesn't mean the other 50 percent comes from a bank. It may very well be that it comes from one's own assets or borrowing from some other place.

Even though interest rates are low right now, as Representative Ayer said, and it is very true, that to get fixed term, long term money is very hard in the commercial area and that is very necessary. It is a very strengthening piece for any beginning or new experienced company. That is one of the strengths of this piece.

The problem I am having -- Representative Boutilier said, are we or are we not going to take the new federalism that is being (whether we like it or not) put upon us -- are we going to begin to fill that gap, begin to help where help is needed, to begin to stimulate where the federal government has been doing it. Supposedly, we can do it better so why don't we begin? This is one opportunity for us to begin to show it. As Representative Boutilier said, capital is one of the most important relationships for productivity, capital fixed and long term is just as important as the dickins for a new company. This encourages groups who are going to do some work in stressed areas, clean for the environment, training, safety -- I just think it is a very fine piece and we shouldn't be passing it up because it does send a signal.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Sanford, Representative Hale.

Representative HALE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to address one remark that the Representative from Scarborough made about having a concern about an individual not investing capital of their own -- this situation exists today, although funds are not available, it was through UDAG loans, which are issued to distressed area, businesses within a distressed area if they could expand their business to increase their personnel with a combination of IRB's. In fact, a business can be built on no income at all being

invested from a business person if they know how to utilize these funds.

This L.D. before you, as the Representatives before myself have urged you to support, is one of the best pieces of legislation that will come out of the House to stimulate economic development. We, the the 112th Legislature, have provided funds for retraining our people that no longer have jobs to get them back into the work market, to make them a member of the work force. This may very well be the instrument they use to utilize the skills that they are trained for. They may become a small business owner, 20 or less, or medium, 100 or less. I urge you to support 2387.

The SPEAKER: 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.

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is the motion of Representative Diamond of Bangor that the House recede and concur. In accordance with the provisions of Section 14 of Article IX of the Constitution, a two-thirds vote of the House is necessary. Those in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

88 having voted in the affirmative and 56 in the negative with 7 being absent, the motion did not prevail.

(See Roll Call No. 329)

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Biddeford, Representative Rioux.

Representative RIOUX: Mr. Speaker, on the last vote, I should have voted yes -- could that be corrected in the Record, please?

The SPEAKER: His comments will be on the Record.

At this point, the rules were suspended for the purpose of removing jackets for the remainder of today's session.

On motion of Representative Ayer of Caribou, the House voted to recede.

Representative Ayer of Caribou offered House Amendment "B" (H-740) and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "B" (H-740) was read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Caribou, Representative Ayer.

Representative AYER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I offer this amendment a little bit reluctantly because it in part restricts the ability of some significant number of businesses currently in this state from utilizing this program. However, I feel that the need is so great for this program that I am happy to do this under these conditions.

The amendment simply restricts the utilization of this program to those businesses that are categorized

as small by the Financial Authority of Maine. The definition of small is 20 or less employees with gross sales not to exceed \$2.5 million a year.

I know there is a real concern on the part of a significant number of people in this room that this program was not going to be properly utilized by the smaller businesses in our state and would be utilized excessively by some of the larger businesses. I hope that this amendment would clear up that concern that would create enough positive activity so that this bill would not be held captive.

I would like to reemphasize as well that we are not talking about risk financing here as some people may perhaps think. I don't know how the banks are down in this part of the state but I know the ones up home are very, very well secured when you go to do business with them. My experience with any state institution is also those people attempt to get every last signature that they can on their paper. We are not talking about risk financing here at all.

As far as economic development being a glory thing, in our part of the world, economic development is a necessity of life if our towns are going to survive with the increased tax loads that result from the greatest service that we try to give the cities of our community. So, I urge you again, please vote for my amendment and then the bill.

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

Representative DILLENBACK: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I didn't speak on the original bill but I am going to speak on this amendment. 90 percent of all small businesses in the State of Maine have ten employees or less, that is the small business we have in the State of Maine.

I was on the original FAME bill when it was put out in 1983, one of the four sponsors. At that time, we had an allowance for people to borrow up to \$100,000 for small business and, if you were a veteran, you could borrow another \$100,000 or you could have a total of \$200,000. We have changed that law this year that a small businessman can now borrow \$500,000 and, if you are a veteran, you can borrow another \$100,000 so if you are both a small business man and a veteran, you can borrow \$600,000. It seems to me that that is sufficient for any small business in the State of Maine. That money that you borrow from the bank, FAME guarantees a percentage of it so the bank is willing to loan the money so it isn't a problem. We have had great success with our FAME program.

I do think that we are going a little too far when we add another program. There are several programs in there that I am not to happy with but at least we have sufficient programs to take care of the small businessmen in the State of Maine.

I ask for a roll call.

The SPEAKER: 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.

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is adoption of House Amendment "B". Those in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed

will vote no.

96 having voted in the affirmative and 44 in the negative with 11 being absent, the motion did prevail.

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

(See Roll Call No. 330)

By unanimous consent, ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 8 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

PASSED TO BE ENACTED

An Act to Maintain the Sanford and Madawaska Unemployment Offices (S.P. 942) (L.D. 2360) (S. "A" S-544; H. "A" H-741)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Hampden, Representative Willey.

Representative WILLEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This has been going around for a day or two and I may as well say a couple of words of explanation about it.

In the unemployment insurance offices, the administrative fees are supplied by the federal government. In the process of living with the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law, it has become necessary that these funds be cut along with everything else. They were cut in the instance of the State of Maine. As a result of that, the Madawaska and the Sanford Offices were supposed to be closed. Some sort of an arrangement was made so that the Madawaska Office remained open with two employees and the Sanford Office was closed. Now in order for these jobs to be funded, as it spells out in this, that there must be one full-time employee in Sanford and two in Madawaska, it seems to me that the funds must come from some place. I did check with the Department of Labor and was told that they didn't have any funds for it, that they were not legally sure if the funds could be transferred from some other account or whether they could not. To compound this, in the Fall, there will be further cuts in the administrative fees that relate to the Unemployment Compensation Fund. If these funds are going to have to come from the state, and this only occurred to me a few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question.

The SPEAKER: The Representative may pose his question.

Representative WILLEY: Then should a fiscal note be attached to this bill?

The SPEAKER: Is the Chair being asked that question?

Representative WILLEY: Yes.

The SPEAKER: Then the Chair would respond in the negative since we are dealing with federal funds and no state money is involved.

Representative WILLEY: Then I just don't understand where the funds are coming from since there are no federal funds involved and the state

doesn't have any for that purpose either. I am not trying to be argumentative but it is a question in my mind. I think that is going to become more prevalent in the Fall when further funds are cut from this and as other attachments may become attached to this too, which would encompass more and more of the offices. For that reason and for that reason alone, I urge you to vote against this measure and I ask for a roll call Mr. Speaker.

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

Representative BEAULIEU: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The issue before you is quite simple. Most of us as Representatives and particularly the Representatives from Aroostook County and York County found out about the elimination of the services in the Unemployment Compensation Fund through the media. They read about it in the newspaper.

A bill was brought before the Labor Committee to try and get something done about it. We found, for example, that out of the four people that were in the Madawaska area, an agreement had been reached with the department that at least two people would stay in place. The reasons were very valid, traveling -- the alternative for the people in that area who had to have reviews or file unemployment claims would have had to travel all the way to Presque Isle.

The committee was very pleased that that courtesy had been granted to that area of the state. However, it still left the Sanford area in abeyance with nobody in charge. The plan was to have all the people either go to Biddeford to take care of their unemployment problems or that someone might be sent to the Sanford area, maybe once or twice a week. I concur with the York County people who say that that is not going to provide adequate service to the people.

We need to remember that Sanford is a community of some 20,000 people. It has one of the highest unemployment rates in the region. For example, when we were questioning the department, we were told that in a one week period only 31 claims had been filed, and that could be done by mailing a card, or through the telephone, or by going to Biddeford. They forgot to tell us that there were almost 35 reviews done that same week, that's 70 bodies going through one office. They will be reduced from three full-time people and one transient worker to one full-time individual. I believe that that is what is needed there and so do the people that come from that area.

The commissioner indicates that she cannot fund them. We tried to negotiate with the department to try to get them to do it on a voluntary basis, apparently that has failed. I don't think we are through negotiating yet and I would like to ask you to allow this bill to go forward. I believe that there could be a shift of an individual from another area into the Sanford area for this purpose.

It boils down to a simple matter of, does that community and its surrounding small towns that feed into that community, deserve this kind of service from the Bureau of Labor? I say they do, the people who sit in this body who represent those areas say they do, I believe them and I am asking you to allow the bill to go forward.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Sanford, Representative Hale.

Representative HALE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and

Gentlemen of the House: This does not just entail the town of Sanford. As far as my constituency, my constituency is a very small portion of the claims that go through or utilize this service. My municipality is 1,000 less than the City of Augusta.

We go back and forth just on a transient basis to hotels, apartments while we are here, we know the number of people that are here -- could they be served by a transient once a week? The people that go through the Sanford Office are Wells, Ogunquit, Eliot, Kittery, York, North Berwick, South Berwick, Lebanon, Acton, Shapleigh, and West Newfield -- all of these places are serviced out of that office as I am sure many small towns are served out of the Augusta Office. The ones that will be hit the hardest are from South and North Berwick. They border the New Hampshire line to come to Sanford and that is some 20 miles as it is.

The costs of retaining space in this office is \$12,474 a year. This office is 2460 square feet. This could be reduced to accommodate a smaller staff.

I urge you to support this bill before you, not only for Sanford but for Madawaska. They have a greater distance to travel than would the other people that are serviced by the UI located in my municipality.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Waldoboro, Representative Begley.

Representative BEGLEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: There are a few points that I really think ought to be brought out on this just so you will have a little more understanding when you get ready to cast your vote.

A few weeks ago, Commissioner Pat McDonough, met down in the Labor Committee room with probably ten legislators, about five Republicans and five Democrats. I think each one of them would be honest in admitting that she handled herself very well. I do think she was honest and admit that perhaps that was a real goof not to have notified the legislators ahead of time and I certainly would agree with that. I think it was unfortunate that they found about this in the paper, through television or the radio. But she sat down and I thought did an excellent job myself. I do have to be honest and say that neither one of those areas are in my area. She did do an excellent job explaining that she had already had this cut and she was going to address the realities of what she was going to do about this. Also she is going to have another cut next October, another big one.

We have spoken with the Madawaska Office and my understanding is, and these are just a couple of facts, that there are going to be two people up there but I believe they are going to be going out of that office and serving some other communities. When we were first told that, I thought they were getting two people full-time, but my understanding is, that that is not the case, that they are going to be going from that office and serving some other communities.

I think that needs to be brought out and I think we also need to face the fact and look at the fact of what Pat McDonough has said about the Sanford Office. There will be some job training people there in the office so that the office will not be closed and one of those persons has had some training in this. That person will not be able to do full-time work but Pat McDonough did say that they would make sure that those people's needs were served by sending either one or two persons one day or two days a week,

or sending two people one day a week, which I realize is an inconvenience to all the people in that area to have to learn when they are going to come and that kind of thing but my understanding is that, at in no point in time, has she ever said that the Sanford office would be closed. She has no intention, in my understanding, of closing it. It will be open and they will have somebody there at least one or two days a week. That is going to vary in different seasons on what they need. I just wanted to bring out some of those facts for you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Berwick, Representative Murphy.

Representative MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I, too, am from the Sanford area and district of two towns, Berwick and Lebanon, border on New Hampshire. What Representative Hale has told you is true. They want to close down the office in Sanford to one day a week. Also they want to keep the Biddeford Office open.

Actually, Biddeford is on the coast, it is not in the center of our county, and we feel as though that in order to serve the people in the northern part of that county that we need an office open in Sanford. I guess we feel that the office should be in the center of the county anyhow instead of on the coast because it is the northern part of the county who utilizes these offices more than the southern part.

I would hope that you would vote today for us to be able to keep the Sanford Office open to take care of the people in our district.

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

Representative MCHENRY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: They have been cut by four percent and the bureau saw fit to take that four percent out of two communities in the state. I believe that is not a fair way of doing it. It is a little bit ironic that the Madawaska Office is being closed, or suggested that it will be closed, because right now the major employer in my area (which is Fraser Paper Ltd.) has suggested they might be laying off 68 people in Madawaska and 60 people in Edmundston. Actually Edmundston and Madawaska are one community -- Edmundston is in Canada -- but we do live as brothers and sisters. The business community throughout the valley is affected by whatever Fraser does.

It is not only a matter of 68 people that are going to be laid off because that has a rippling effect on all the communities in the valley. As a matter of fact, Aroostook would be affected in the long run. I think it is not a good idea to close that office or reduce that office. I believe that we should pass this bill without any problem and help the communities involved.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Van Buren, Representative Martin.

Representative MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Men and Ladies of the House: I would like to add to what has been said about the Sanford Office. The Madawaska Office does not only serve Madawaska. It serves Hamlin, Van Buren, Cyr Plantation, Lille, Grand Isle, St. Agatha, Sinclair, along with Madawaska, and probably a few other towns that I am not aware of right now. So there is a lot more than Madawaska at stake.

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

Representative BEAULIEU: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and

Gentlemen of the House: I ask you to be mindful of two things as you vote. As of today, there is assurance that there will be at least two people in the Madawaska Unemployment Office. As of today, there is no one that will be in the Sanford Office if we don't try to pass this bill or get some amenities. The Sanford Office, in my understanding, is that person will no longer be there as of May 1st, which is why we have an emergency on it.

I think it is vital that you understand that the person that was referred to as currently being part of the job service program in Sanford, while she is knowledgeable in the area of unemployment compensation, she is not fully trained to provide all the services to an individual, including filing and review.

We have been trying to get some answers or the York County people at least have been trying to get some answers, and so far they have not gotten any.

I don't like the idea of having to legislate telling the commissioner what to do with her department and how to run it, but unfortunately, this is a critical issue. We have not been able to make any headway in trying to get the department to do it voluntarily so it is my hope that, as we forward this bill along, maybe something can be worked out yet. If not, then I will personally urge the Governor to sign it to make the department do this. I think it is important to people.

The SPEAKER: 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.

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is passage to be enacted. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

100 having voted in the affirmative and 44 in the negative with 7 being absent, the bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

(See Roll Call No. 331)

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 19 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

PAPER FROM THE SENATE

Ought to Pass in New Draft

Report of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act to Make Corrections of Errors and Inconsistencies in the Laws of Maine" (Emergency) (S.P. 905) (L.D. 2272) reporting "Ought to Pass" in New Draft (Emergency) (S.P. 965) (L.D. 2405)

Came from the Senate, with the report read and accepted and the New Draft passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendments "A" (S-546), "B" (S-548) and "C" (S-549).

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

Senate Amendment "A" (S-546) was read by the Clerk and adopted.

Senate Amendment "B" (S-548) was read by the Clerk and adopted.

Senate Amendment "C" (S-549) was read by the Clerk and adopted.

Under suspension of the rules, the New Draft was read a second time, passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendments "A" "B" and "C" in concurrence.

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 20 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

PAPER FROM THE SENATE

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Authorize the Issuance of a Bond not Exceeding \$8,000,000 for the Financing of the Maine Inland Fisheries and Wildlife Acquisition Fund" (S.P. 695) (L.D. 1781) (C. "A" S-481; H. "A" H-736) which Failed of Passage to be Enacted in the House on April 16, 1986.

Came from the Senate, Passed to be Engrossed in non-concurrence.

The House voted to recede and concur.

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

PASSED TO BE ENACTED

An Act to Provide Community Education and Family Health Services (S.P. 835) (L.D. 2124) (S. "A" S-537 and S. "C" S-547 to C. "A" S-494)

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 item appearing on Supplement No. 16 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

PASSED TO BE ENACTED

An Act to Authorize Additional Facilities for Long-term Care and Other Provisions Necessary for the Proper Operations of State Government (S.P. 913) (L.D. 2280) (S. "B" S-538)

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. 125 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.

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 17 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

PASSED TO BE ENACTED

An Act to Provide for a Clean-up Program Concerning Natural Die-off of Fish in the Coastal Waters of the State (H.P. 1383) (L.D. 1952) (S. "A" S-539)

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 item appearing on Supplement No. 6 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

PAPER FROM THE SENATE

The following Joint Resolution: (S.P. 966)

JOINT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO EVALUATE FURTHER THE HEALTH RISK FROM THE PRESENCE OF METHYLENE CHLORIDE AS A RESIDUE FROM ITS USE AS A SOLVENT IN THE EXTRACTION OF CAFFEINE FROM GREEN COFFEE BEANS

WE, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine, in the One Hundred and Twelfth Legislative Session assembled, most respectfully request and petition the Congress of the United States, as follows:

WHEREAS, certain brands of coffee are decaffeinated by a method which uses methylene chloride as a solvent, leaving a residue of methylene chloride in the dry coffee product; and

WHEREAS, the United States Food and Drug Administration has determined that methylene chloride is carcinogenic when used in aerosol products such as hair sprays; and

WHEREAS, the United States Food and Drug Administration has determined that methylene chloride may be present in coffee as a residue from its use as a solvent in the extraction of caffeine from green coffee beans at a level not to exceed 10 parts per million; and

WHEREAS, the methodologies used by the Environmental Protection Agency to evaluate cancer risks from methylene chloride have projected a risk that is 26 times greater than the United States Food and Drug Administration projections; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That We, your Memorialists, respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to request further testing and evaluation of the safety and advisability of the acceptable level, if any, of methylene chloride allowed in coffee as a residue from its use as a solvent in the extraction of caffeine from green coffee beans; and; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the disparity between safe levels of methylene chloride as recognized by the United

States Food and Drug Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency be reevaluated and explained; and be it further

RESOLVED: That copies of this Memorial, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be immediately transmitted by the Secretary of State to the Congress of the United States.

Came from the Senate, read and adopted.

Was read and adopted in concurrence.

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 22 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

ORDERS

On motion of Representative MOHOLLAND of Princeton, the following Joint Order: (H.P. 1711)

Ordered, the Senate concurring, that H.P. 1631, L.D. 2299, Bill, "AN ACT to Amend the Charter of the Passamaquoddy Water District," be recalled from the Governor's desk to the House.

Was read and passed and sent up for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

(At Ease)

(Off Record Remarks)

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 21 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

ENACTOR

Bond Issue

RECOMMITTED

An Act to Authorize the Issuance of a Bond not Exceeding \$8,000,000 for the Financing of the Maine Inland Fisheries and Wildlife Acquisition Fund (S.P. 695) (L.D. 1781)

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

On motion of Representative McGowan of Canaan, was recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, was ordered sent forthwith

to the Senate.

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 23 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

PASSED TO BE ENACTED

Emergency Measure

An Act to Make Corrections of Errors and Inconsistencies in the Laws of Maine (S.P. 905) (L.D. 2405) (S. "A" S-546; S. "B" S-548; S "C" S-549)

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. 125 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.

(At Ease)

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 9 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

ENACTOR

Bond Issue

RECOMMITTED

An Act to Establish the Maine Business Opportunity and Job Development Program (S.P. 952) (L.D. 2387) (H. "A" H-703 and H. "B" H-740)

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

On motion of Representative Diamond of Bangor, recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 26 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

RECALLED FROM GOVERNOR

(Pursuant to Joint Order - House Paper 1711)

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

- In House, Passed to be Enacted on April 4, 1986.
- In Senate, Passed to be Enacted on April 7, 1986.

On motion of Representative Diamond of Bangor, under suspension of the rules, the House reconsidered its action whereby L.D. 2299 was passed to be enacted.

On further motion of the same Representative, under suspension of the rules, the House reconsidered its action whereby L.D. 2299 was passed to be engrossed.

On further motion of the same Representative, the House voted to recommit to the Committee on Utilities in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon requiring Senate concurrence were ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

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

ORDERS

On motion of Representative DIAMOND of Bangor, the following Joint Order: (H.P. 1712)

Ordered, the Senate concurring, that H.P. 1631, L.D. 2299, "AN ACT to Amend the Charter of the Passamaquoddy Water District," be carried over to the Second Special Session of the 112th Legislature.

Was read and passed.

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

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 28 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

PAPERS FROM THE SENATE

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Revise the Energy Building Standards Act" (H.P. 1385) (L.D. 1954) on which the Committee of Conference Report was read and rejected in the House on April 16, 1986.

Came from the Senate with the Committee of Conference Report read and accepted in non-concurrence.

The House voted to recede and concur.

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 25 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

PAPER FROM THE SENATE

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Authorize a General Fund Bond Issue in the Amount of \$6,000,000 for Energy Improvements in State Facilities" (H.P. 1590) (L.D. 2243) (C. "A" H-688; S. "A" S-532) which Failed of

Passage to be Enacted in the House on April 16, 1986.

Came from the Senate, Passed to be Enacted in non-concurrence.

Representative Diamond of Bangor moved the House recede and concur and further requested a roll call.

The SPEAKER: 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.

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is the motion of Representative Diamond of Bangor that the House recede and concur. In accordance with the provisions of Section 14 of Article IX of the Constitution, a two-thirds vote of the House is necessary. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

84 having voted in the affirmative and 59 in the negative with 8 being absent, the motion did not prevail.

Subsequently, the House voted to adhere.

(See Roll Call No. 332)

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 29 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

PAPER FROM THE SENATE

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Provide Funding for the Court Mediation Service through Fees" (Emergency) (H.P. 1703) (L.D. 2398) which was Passed to be Engrossed as amended by House Amendment "C" (H-742) in the House on April 16, 1986.

Came from the Senate with that Body having Adhered to its former action whereby this Bill was Passed to be Engrossed in non-concurrence.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Winslow, Representative Carter.

Representative CARTER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I move that the House recede and concur.

I would like to relay to the House that if we do not recede and concur, the Judicial appropriation bill, L.D. 2390, will be \$370,000 short; thereby, unbalancing our balanced budget. I would urge you to vote for the motion to recede and concur.

As I stated in earlier debate, L.D. 2390 has a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which is specifically going to look into the relationship between the Judicial, Executive and Legislative branches of government and it is going to concentrate on the fee structure and pay immediate attention to the mediation fees and district court fees. I would

urge you to support the motion to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Ellsworth, Representative Foster.

Representative FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Well, here we are the last day of the session and the Senate doesn't agree with us. I think we sent them a rather loud message and, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, you can bet that I will be in there fighting to take the fee off mediation. Meanwhile, let's pass the bill and we might go home very soon but we need 101.

Subsequently, the House voted to recede and concur.

This, being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 130 voted in favor of the same and 5 against and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Representative Kane of South Portland was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Representative KANE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We have already passed the Errors and Inconsistencies Act and I would just like to make a couple of comments on the Record at the request of Representative MacBride.

The Judiciary Committee, in the last two years, has been particularly very, very careful not to allow anything in that was substantive of any nature in the Errors and Inconsistencies Bill just so that everybody can feel comfortable with it and not have to scrutinize it looking for something to be slipped in.

There was one Senate Amendment which both parties have passed to the Errors and Inconsistencies Bill which was endorsed by leadership and was added to the bill in the Senate in order to relieve the Office of the Revisor of Statutes and the Office of Legislative Assistants, whatever their new name is, from a rather ticklish problem about rules of construction, whether or not it was gender neutral in one title and not in the other. The amendment to it just reads that whenever reasonable is determined by the Advisor of Statutes, nouns rather than pronouns, shall be used to refer to persons in order to avoid gender identification.

This will give the Office of the Revisor of Statutes the ability, and sort of the authority, to have a consistent policy on this matter. They have been badgered and have spent a lot of time and money just trying to keep everybody happy on this issue. It is a policy judgment and we had to make it and I think everybody agrees on it.

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 30 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

PAPER FROM THE SENATE

The following Joint Order: (S.P. 967)

ORDERED, the House concurring, that S.P. 952, L.D. 2387, Bill, "AN ACT to Establish the Maine Business Opportunity and Job Development Program" and all its accompanying papers be carried over to the

Second Special Session of the 112th Legislature.

Came from the Senate, read and passed.

Was read and passed in concurrence.

(At Ease)

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

(Off Record Remarks)

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 31 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

PAPERS FROM THE SENATE

The following Joint Order: (S.P. 968)

ORDERED, the House concurring, that S.P. 695, L.D. 1781, Bill, "AN ACT to Authorize the Issuance of a Bond not Exceeding \$8,000,000 for the Financing of the Maine Inland Fisheries and Wildlife Acquisition Fund" be carried over to the Second Special Session of the 112th Legislature.

Came from the Senate, read and passed.

Was read and passed in concurrence.

Wednesday, April 16, 1985

COMMUNICATIONS

(2-1) The following Communication:

STATE OF MAINE
ONE HUNDRED AND TWELFTH LEGISLATURE
COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

April 14, 1986

The Honorable John L. Martin
Speaker of the House
112th Legislature

Dear Speaker Martin:

We are pleased to report that all business which was placed before the Committee on Taxation during the Second Regular Session of the 112th Legislature has been completed. The breakdown of bills referred to our committee follows:

Total number of bills received 51

Unanimous reports	46
Leave to Withdraw	8
Ought to Pass	4
Ought Not to Pass	11
Ought to Pass as Amended	8
Ought to Pass in New Draft	15
Divided reports	5

Respectfully submitted,

S/R. Donald Twitchell
Senate Chair

S/John A. Cashman
House Chair

The Speaker appointed Representative DIAMOND of Bangor on the part of the House to Inform the Senate that the House had transacted all business before it and is ready to adjourn without day.

Subsequently, Representative DIAMOND of Bangor reported that he had delivered the message with which he was charged.

The Chair appointed the following members on the part of the House to wait upon His Excellency, Governor Joseph E. Brennan, and inform him that the House has transacted all business before it and is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

Representatives: CARTER of Winslow
CHONKO of Topsham
CONNOLLY of Portland
LISNIK of Presque Isle
NADEAU of Lewiston
McGOWAN of Canaan
SMITH of Mars Hill
BELL of Paris
HIGGINS of Scarborough
FOSTER of Ellsworth

Subsequently, the Committee reported that they had delivered the message with which they were charged.

(Off Record Remarks)

Subsequently, His Excellency, the Honorable Joseph E. Brennan entered the Hall of the House amid applause, the members rising.

The Governor addressed the House as follows:

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I always have to come to the House before the Senate to say goodbye because the House members are always a little quicker at getting away, all except Speaker John Martin. He hangs around here for a few days after you all go in sort of a terrible mope, feeling unwanted and bored. I just hope, in the next couple of months, that some of you go out of your way and go up to Eagle Lake to visit him; otherwise, I am stuck with him all the time.

I think in the judgment of many, the session started out not looking like it was going to be a good session but, in my judgment, it has turned into a very productive session. I wish to congratulate all of you for your hard work, especially in the last week, when you had to work sometimes late into the night and, indeed, far into the weekend. I believe that that effort has truly paid off.

The 112th Legislature can now claim to its credit important coastal legislation providing for better management, new piers, and new access. The beginnings of reform in liability law such as the Dram Shop Act and the malpractice laws and the municipal liability self-insurance pools, reforms and professional licensing boards, streamlining of state computer operations, some new group homes for the mentally retarded and an energy sales tax exemption for manufacturers, research in teaching and Canadian trade, the land trades that now complete the Bigelow Preserve, programs for truants and drop outs and an extension of the season at the state parks and many, many more accomplishments truly too numerous to mention.

Most important of all, you have addressed the needs of the University of Maine. This is the first critical step and it is the hardest step but with your farsighted act, years of discord are put behind us. You have planted the seed of the new University of Maine at every campus in this state. (applause)

The ground work is now complete for an educational renaissance in our state. In the last few years, you have reinvigorated pre-school, primary, secondary, vocational and now higher education in Maine. I believe that this is unprecedented in the history of this state. You truly have opened a thousand opportunities to our young as Joshua Chamberlain had hoped for and by Aristotle's test that education should be the legislator's chief concern, you have acquitted yourselves admirably.

I especially commend this 112th Legislature for showing the courage to raise money in an election year to make these reforms possible. The plain fact is that a good education costs money. If that money hadn't come this year, the momentum for university reform would surely have been lost. You faced some tough choices and you came through and I truly want to congratulate you.

There is one more tough issue that we must face together before this legislature's work is done and that is the issue of corrections. I intend to call a Special Session on this subject in the very near future. I am confident that together we can fashion some long term answers to this very difficult problem.

Now all of you can head home for a very well deserved rest. Many of you have a long drive ahead of you. I urge you to drive safely, and even though it is not mandatory, (applause) -- yes, even though it is not mandatory, I think I got the message,

buckle up, we want you back. Thank you very much.

Subsequently, the Governor withdrew amid prolonged applause, the members rising.

(Off Record Remarks)

At this point, a message came from the Senate borne by Senator Clark of Cumberland informing the House that the Senate had transacted all business before it and was ready to adjourn without day.

The Chair recognizes the Representative from Wells, Representative WENTWORTH.

Representative WENTWORTH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to wish everyone a very happy summer. Good luck in campaigning and I hope I will see you all at the next session.

I move the House adjourn Sine Die.

The SPEAKER: The Representative from Wells, Representative Wentworth, moves that the House adjourn sine die. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and at 6:56 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, Wednesday, April 16, 1986, the Speaker declared the House adjourned without day.
