

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 Thirteenth Legislature
OF THE
State Of Maine

VOLUME I
FIRST REGULAR SESSION
December 3, 1986 to May 22, 1987

continuous service in the State Senate, being in his 7th term and not having had to go through that training down in the other Body like some other members had to.

The Chair would like to recognize the former Senator from Lincoln, Margaret Sproul. Please rise and accept the greetings of the Senate.

On motion by Senator BRAWN of Knox, ADJOURNED until Thursday, April 16, 1987, at 12:00 noon.

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTEENTH MAINE LEGISLATURE
FIRST REGULAR SESSION
50th Legislative Day
Thursday, April 16, 1987

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

Prayer by Reverend Russell Chase, Methodist Minister (Retired), North Vassalboro.

The Journal of Wednesday, April 15, 1987, was read and approved.

Quorum call was held.

SENATE PAPERS

Bill "An Act to Enhance the Maine Job Training Partnership Program" (S.P. 417) (L.D. 1275)

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

Was referred to the Committee on Economic Development in concurrence.

Bill "An Act to Clarify the Law Regarding Forfeiture of Property which Constitutes the Proceeds of Criminal Enterprise" (S.P. 414) (L.D. 1272)

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

Was referred to the Committee on Judiciary in concurrence.

Bill "An Act Concerning Radioactive Waste Disposal Facilities on Indian Territory" (S.P. 416) (L.D. 1274)

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

On motion of Representative Paradis of Augusta, was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

Bill "An Act to Maintain Lifeguard Services in State Government" (S.P. 415) (L.D. 1273)

Came from the Senate, referred to the Committee on State and Local Government and Ordered Printed.

Was referred to the Committee on State and Local Government in concurrence.

Unanimous Ought Not To Pass

Report of the Committee on Aging, Retirement and Veterans reporting "Ought Not to Pass" on Bill "An Act Concerning Veterans' Benefits" (S.P. 344) (L.D. 999)

Report of the Committee on Banking and Insurance reporting "Ought Not to Pass" on Bill "An Act to Require that Casualty Insurance Companies Offer Insurance for Unusual Risks" (S.P. 228) (L.D. 622)

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

Unanimous Leave to Withdraw

Report of the Committee on Agriculture reporting "Leave to Withdraw" on Bill "An Act to Amend the Law Concerning the Maine Milk Commission" (S.P. 345) (L.D. 1037)

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

Ought to Pass in New Draft

Report of the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act to Assure Proper Notice of Workers' Compensation Claims" (S.P. 79) (L.D. 165) reporting "Ought to Pass" in New Draft (S.P. 413) (L.D. 1271)

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

Report was read and accepted, the New Draft given its first reading and assigned for second reading Tuesday, April 21, 1987.

Ought to Pass in New Draft

Report of the Committee on Banking and Insurance on Bill "An Act to Amend the Requirements for Individual Public Self-insurers under the Workers' Compensation Act" (S.P. 63) (L.D. 130) reporting "Ought to Pass" in New Draft (S.P. 412) (L.D. 1270)

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

Report was read and accepted, the New Draft given its first reading and assigned for second reading Tuesday, April 21, 1987.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Allow Drunk Drivers to be Sued for Punitive Damages" (H.P. 879) (L.D. 1180) which was referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs in the House on April 10, 1987.

Came from the Senate, referred to the Committee on Judiciary in non-concurrence.

The House voted to recede and concur.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Unanimous Ought Not to Pass

Representative POULIOT from the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act to Permit the Use of Speed Bumps" (H.P. 424) (L.D. 569) reporting "Ought Not to Pass"

Representative MOHOLLAND from the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act to Reconstruct the Toll Bridge Between Perry and Eastport" (H.P. 376) (L.D. 497) reporting "Ought Not to Pass"

Representative SALSBURY from the Committee on Marine Resources on Bill "An Act to Amend the Marine Licensing Law" (H.P. 564) (L.D. 762) reporting "Ought Not to Pass"

Representative MOHOLLAND from the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act to Create a Municipal Designation of Scenic Roads" (H.P. 556) (L.D. 754) reporting "Ought Not to Pass"

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

Unanimous Leave to Withdraw

Representative WALKER from the Committee on Fisheries and Wildlife on Bill "An Act Providing for a Deer Allowance During Muzzle-loading Rifle Season" (H.P. 123) (L.D. 148) reporting "Leave to Withdraw"

Representative WALKER from the Committee on Fisheries and Wildlife on Bill "An Act Creating a Deer Allowance During Archery Season" (H.P. 120) (L.D. 145) reporting "Leave to Withdraw"

Representative LOOK from the Committee on Marine Resources on Bill "An Act Relating to Biodegradable Lobster Trap Vents" (Emergency) (H.P. 311) (L.D. 410) reporting "Leave to Withdraw"

Representative WARREN from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Concerning Probation

Revocation Proceedings in Maine" (H.P. 597) (L.D. 808) reporting "Leave to Withdraw"

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

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought Not to Pass" on Bill "An Act to Aid in Enforcement of Child Support Payments" (H.P. 258) (L.D. 341)

Signed:

Senators:

BLACK of Cumberland
BRANNIGAN of Cumberland
GAUVREAU of Androscoggin
MacBRIDE of Presque Isle
BEGLEY of Waldo
MARSANO of Belfast
CONLEY of Portland
THISTLE of Dover-Foxcroft

Representatives:

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting "Ought to Pass" in New Draft (H.P. 958) (L.D. 1287) on same Bill.

Signed:

Representatives:

PARADIS of Augusta
HANLEY of Paris
COTE of Auburn
VOSE of Eastport
WARREN of Scarborough

Reports were read.

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

Representative CONLEY: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House accept the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: You received a handout this morning explaining what this bill would do. It is a piece of paper that would allow the State Department of Human Services, in particular, to publish the names of those people allegedly to be in arrears on child support.

In speaking for the majority of the committee, I would like to relate to this body a number of concerns which we have. First of all, I think that we felt to publish the names of alleged people in debt would potentially stigmatize the children of these people. The whereabouts of these people may not be known and we felt, if the names of fathers, as is in most cases, were published, would stigmatize the children who are in school. A further form of child abuse, I guess, would be their friends talking to them about the fact that their father has not paid child support payments.

The second thing we talked about was the fact that this bill would apply only to people who have been found to be in arrears by the Department of Human Services, not to private parties involved in divorces. I guess I would pose to this body -- would this body want to see private parties being able to publish the names of those people who supposedly had not paid their arrearages to them? We are giving the Department the authority to do this and I would suggest that this is a pretty classless way to go about collecting a debt.

I would further say to this body that it should be aware that the Department of Human Services often finds these people in arrears without ever having a court order or having a court determine that these people are in arrears. It is a very important point -- the debtor is often not present for these particular hearings.

Finally, a major point and major concern of the people on the majority, would be that a major piece

of legislation passed in this body two years ago giving the Department incredible powers in this area. They not only can confiscate tax returns but they can now confiscate people's motor vehicles. This again is another provision which would give them more power, more power than even a game warden, I might suggest.

I think we need to draw the line here and we should see how this last piece of legislation is going to work so I would urge this body to accept the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report.

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

Representative DUFFY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I urge you to vote no on the Majority Report so that we can accept the Minority Report, L.D. 1287. I had distributed to you an advertisement from the state of Texas where they have had this program. They have doubled their receipts from \$25 million to \$50 million. The Representative from Portland didn't tell you that, in order to qualify to be put in the newspaper, according to L.D. 1287, you have to have not paid anything for three years. You have to have a court order stating that you are in arrears and that the court is looking for you and that you have to have a minimum of \$5,000 owed.

This state, right now, has \$80 million in uncollected child support payments. They say that we are doing well, we are fifth in the country. They say that we gain about \$17 to \$20 million of the \$100 million debt. We may be top in percentages but we certainly are not top in collecting money.

As I put on this advertisement, I do believe that failure to pay child support is another form of child abuse. One of the arguments against this bill is that the children will be affected. I have talked to a great number of women who have told me that the children know when they don't have the money to do this or to do that or have new clothes. They felt that their children would be less affected by seeing their father's name in the paper, whom they haven't seen for three years and haven't collected any money from him, than not being able to have enough money for school lunch. Or the women, themselves, may have the extra money if they were given the child support to go to work because they could afford child care.

Quite honestly, \$80 million is a lot of money. I know that this is a bold step and I know that it is a new initiative for us. L.D. 1287 watered down a lot of this bill and it also watered down the employer part of the process that said, — today, right now, they can send out an inquiry to find out if a person is working for them or not and they can throw it in the wastebasket. This bill says that they at least have to respond to the question of whether or not they are working for an employer somewhere and can get back to them to at least begin a communication process.

This does not affect people who try to pay their child support. It doesn't affect people that pay randomly or just in the communication with their wives or the Department so they can make arrangements in the future when they get back on their feet. The protections are built in. I don't suppose I want to tell you that we should adopt anything that another state does — I only brought this to the point that they are doing it somewhere else in the country and have been effective with it.

I would like to believe, by this publicity, we can get the people out there to say, "I don't want to be a part of this program, I don't want to be in the newspaper, I want to get on the stick and put some money into the Department so that doesn't happen to

me." I would like to believe that people are going to get off welfare and AFDC because they finally are getting the money that they deserve for their kids.

I know that this is a difficult step but it is pretty difficult out there when you understand there is \$80 million in the State of Maine. In the State of Maine, we pride ourselves in being good, quality people but \$80 million is a lot of money.

I would just urge you again to vote no on L.D. 341, to vote no on the Majority Report so that we can accept L.D. 1287 and maybe get some money back. Also, all of the dollars and cents, by the way, that we do collect there is a 6 percent bonus given by the federal government. If we raise an additional \$10 million, it would be around \$600,000 so they could employ more people, the caseloads would be down, we would have more people doing more effective work.

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

Representative RACINE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hope that you will vote against the pending motion simply because I believe the time is now here to send out a message that those individuals that father children cannot just walk away and let somebody else pay for their upkeep.

I think the time has come where we must tell those individuals out there, that once they get married they assume a responsibility for the upbringing of their family. In the first place, if you look at the paper on some of your divorces that have been recorded, you will find that your judges seem to be very lenient when it comes to paying for child support. In most cases, it turns out that the individuals that are involved, the wife and children are the ones to suffer and are required to go on welfare to be able to make ends meet, not to live in luxury, but to make ends meet. I think the time has come where we take a stand and force those individuals that have a responsibility for the upbringing of their children, that they pay what they have been assessed in a divorce proceeding.

You may find that certain people are objecting to this because it would affect professional people who have the financial ability to pay for the support of their children but are avoiding it. I don't have to mention names — you know who those individuals are.

I think that this is the time to say that "He who dances must pay the fiddler."

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

Representative MACBRIDE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hope you will accept the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report. This bill is certainly well-intentioned. There is no question about that. I am sure that we all want to make sure that the child support is paid and paid as much as possibly can be — 100 percent if we can ever achieve that. I strongly support the effort that our support enforcement department team is making to collect that child support. Under the new bill that we passed last year, I think they are really making great strides in that collection and will continue to do so.

However, this bill does have some problems, I believe. Under federal law, it is illegal to identify AFDC parents. If I were an AFDC parent and you were not, then your name would be published in the paper but my name could not be. I think that that is discrimination and I think that is not fair.

Furthermore, as has been mentioned, the name of the parent who is delinquent in paying child support for three years and owes more than \$5,000, would have his name published in the paper. You would have published the name of the parent, the address, the

age and the ages of the children. Prior to publication also, there would be published in the media a statement that this publication of names was going to take place and that parent would have that information readily before him. I feel that if a parent is so insensitive and uncaring that he would not have paid that child support payment, he will not have listened to the media coverage -- that just publishing his name in the paper is not going to make him want to pay his child support.

I think the one person who will be hurt in this case is the child. Probably the child's parents will not get the support payment and the child will have the name of his parents published in the paper where he could be taunted or teased by the other children and that is one of the things that happens. Because of these things, I hope you will accept the "Ought Not to Pass" Report.

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

Representative MCHENRY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I must congratulate the good Representative from Bangor to be able to bring up the subject and be able to pass it through the Judiciary Committee and bring it onto the floor of the House. I hope that you people will vote against the pending motion and support the good gentleman from Bangor, Representative Duffy.

I have proposed three proposals -- I have been here 13 years and I have proposed a lot of things to try to slow down the divorce rate, to try to keep the family together and every time, they get shot down. Each time we take a micrometer of a step, it gets shot down. I think that it is time we do something. It is a very small step but it is a positive step to try to keep the family together, to try to make the people who should be paying, not the taxpayers of the State of Maine, but the fathers of these children.

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

Representative ANTHONY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have spent a good part of my professional life seeking out and pursuing absent parents on behalf of women who are left with children to support. A good part of my life has been spent in the divorce practice and enforcement of decrees. I am sorely tempted by this bill but I am really troubled as I look at the bill and think about the effect it has on children. Ultimately, I guess I would have to say that I do not think that L.D. 1287 deserves our support and would urge support for the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report.

I think the fact that children will be traumatized, will be stigmatized, by this publishing of the name of their father in the paper is enough in itself to sway me. When I look at the bill itself, I see there is a very clear and obvious loophole in that bill. Anybody who is smart enough to read could see that and you cannot convince me that that loophole will not get out and be known. It says, "You have not made any child support payments in at least three years" -- all a man has to do is to make one payment during the course of the three year period and that name cannot be published in the paper. So we are not really doing anything effective to get these people to pay. All we are doing is playing one more game with them. I am not against anything that is, in fact, effective to enforce child support payments because that is badly needed. Nobody is against the feminization of poverty any more than I am but this is not the vehicle to do it, unfortunately, both for what it does to the children

involved and because of the obvious loophole within the bill.

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

Representative DUFFY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I don't mean to take too much of your time but I am going to. I may not be a lawyer, I may not be smart enough to read between the lines, but I am sure that this is not a lawyer's bill by any stretch of the imagination. To say that we don't get one more payment because somebody is slick enough to slide a payment in in three years is a bad thing and I take offense to that. I take offense to the fact that you have to be a lawyer here to write a bill.

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

Representative MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I just rise today to say that I agree with Representative Duffy from Bangor. Maybe this bill isn't perfect but it is sure a beginning to tell people out there that they have responsibilities to these children and that we expect them to take care of their responsibilities.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Rockland, Representative Melendy.

Representative MELENDY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As a sponsor of last year's omnibus bill on child support, I will be supporting the "Ought Not to Pass" Report on this. I have already heard of some of the problems that the omnibus bill has caused. It was a good bill that we passed last year but it needs amending. It is going to be reaching for what we really need. I do not feel that this bill is necessary and could cause even more problems than we currently have.

I hope your support of the "Ought Not to Pass" Report could be strong.

Representative Duffy of Bangor 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 Washington, Representative Allen.

Representative ALLEN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hesitated to get up this morning but felt compelled to do so.

Having served two years on the Judiciary Committee, also serving on a sub-committee that dealt with child support, it was an issue that I was deeply interested in. I was deeply interested because I am directly affected by whatever kind of child support legislation passes this House and the other body, as are many others of you, because of one situation or another. If it is not you, perhaps your son or daughter has been through a divorce or your grandchild or whatever -- but somehow divorce has impacted our lives, either the lives of ourselves or of our friends. I certainly don't stand today to defend those absent parents who fail to meet their obligations to support their children.

One side of the argument that hasn't been mentioned today that we took into careful consideration when we crafted the omnibus bill (let me back up just a little bit) -- the federal law changed and told the state legislatures that they had to get into compliance with the federal law, which is

why the omnibus bill was submitted to us in the first place. At the federal level, there was a raising of consciousness. The federal people believed that child support was, in fact, a major problem. The state level agreed with that so the feds passed certain laws that enabled us to, not only go after people who still resided in our state but also allowed us to go after people who resided outside of the state. It set up ways that states could cooperate with one another in order to facilitate child support payments. It also set up mechanisms to be able to attach the pay of people who served in the military so, not only people who are not living in the particular state where the action commences, but also those people who are in the military and, for some reason, serving outside of the country. So, as a result of all those changes and as a result of being asked to comply with federal law, we did pass an omnibus bill. We not only did what the feds asked us to do but we also went above and beyond that — we provided mechanisms for the state and the Department of Human Services to attach wages, we penalize employers who fail to disclose the fact that someone is working for them and trying to hide the fact that they are paying them wages, we tried to reach those people who were so-called working under the table. We set up mechanisms that your income tax returns could be attached, your automobile, your home, liens, you name it and we felt that we did it in ways that could be enforced. It could be enforced through the Department and through the courts. The problem with this bill is that it doesn't take into consideration the effect of other children and those children are children of the new family. More people who get divorced than not, remarry, and those absent parents have other children so they have children living with them in the home.

The bill that we passed last year crafted allowances for those children so, not only were we taking into consideration the children of the absent parent who are living with the responsible parent, but we are taking into consideration the children of the new family. In doing that, we thought we were meeting the needs of all those kids. I guess the bottom line for everyone that served on that child support sub-committee, though we all came from different perspectives, was the welfare of the child, that was our bottom line.

One important flaw in the bill you have before you is, as Representative MacBride has pointed out, those people who are on AFDC, names cannot be published so that eliminates everybody on AFDC. I might point out that the majority of people who go to the Department for collection are AFDC recipients. Those of us who are not on AFDC can go to the Department but we tend not to, we tend to use the court as our legal recourse. We just wring our hands in frustration or whatever but we tend not to use the Department. Perhaps there is a lack of knowledge out there that you can use the Department so you have eliminated all of those AFDC people — then you allow the Department to arbitrarily select ten names, eenie, meenie, minie, you — it could be that there are 500 people delinquent \$5,000 for three years, it could be there are 50, but you in power, who ever is in charge of that Division of Department of Human Services, can arbitrarily pick those 10 names. Whether or not that information is 100 percent accurate or not, that can always be challenged, but once your name appears in the paper, you are stigmatized. If it is inaccurate information, you know the correction and where it is going to appear, it is going to appear buried on Page 48 and no one is going to see that "Oh gee, we have made a mistake and

it really isn't George Jones, it is Peter Jones and he really lives in such and such a town." You have to realize the personal implications to the person whose name might appear.

It has already been mentioned once but I can't stress it enough — the effect of the child who goes to school the next morning and the entire class says: "I saw your father's name in the paper." Any of you who have had children or grandchildren know full-well that the pressures of our kids going to school these days and the kinds of torments that they put upon each other is unbelievable. To add something else is inexcusable.

I suppose it would be excusable if this bill would be an effective mechanism of collecting that money. If it truly had that effect, then I suppose we could justify it and say it was worth it but it is not going to have that effect. It has too many loopholes. We have an effective law and I will point out that, even before the feds passed their law, Maine had one of the best records of child support collection. We didn't have to make that many changes because the laws that they were saying we had to make were already on the books. We have been a leader in this area. This bill goes above and beyond and it is unnecessary, ineffective, and I think it is going to cause more problems than it is worth.

I urge you to support the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report.

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

Representative MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Speaking as the Representative from Kennebunk, the gentlelady is correct, we have a national reputation in terms of being able to have people meet their obligations. Those of you who serve as municipal officers and overseers of the poor, those of you in your constituent work, know that there are failures. Those failures are reflected in human terms.

When I first saw the title of the bill, I was concerned because we all know that the Department or any department can make mistakes but there is a safeguard in there in terms of \$5,000 and three years. \$5,000 is the minimum money that should have gone into that family's budget in terms of maintaining their quality of life. You know from the local level or you know as a State Representative that when that money that's promised (and this is not an informal agreement, this is a court order) doesn't arrive, the quality of life is impacted and that means the quality of clothing, the food on the table, and the shelter. To see a woman and a family, who have a budget with a monthly promise made in terms of money coming in, have to turn and go on the town or on the state, because someone isn't meeting their court order obligation to their children, is not right.

Based on the ad that we see from Texas, that ad is more than just public acknowledgement of a name, it is a search. They are trying to find someone who is destroying the aspirations and the promise of children. There may be loopholes or there may be flaws but I am sure that out of a 151 members in this body, we can correct those loopholes when we reach the second reading.

I have women in my district who are on the town, who cannot collect from their husbands. Reference was made to the other family — in terms of one case, the father driving a Mercedes and living in very luxurious housing and she cannot touch that income and that is up to \$15,000 or \$20,000 that was suppose to be in her budget. So we are talking about, yes, it is embarrassing; yes, it might be embarrassing for

a child to see the name but that child in terms of food and shelter is paying a price every single day and being stigmatized in terms of being on the town or on the state.

I would urge that we defeat this motion before us so we could accept the "Ought to Pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Shapleigh, Representative Ridley.

Representative RIDLEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I didn't intend to speak on this but my good seat member over there did remind me of something that I was involved with on many occasions being a selectman and overseer of the poor.

It is true that it might be humiliating for a child to see his father's name in the paper that he hasn't been keeping up his payment but, because he hasn't been keeping up his payments, it is quite humiliating for that same child and also his mother to have to go on the town for support, whether it be in the form of groceries or direct compensation from the town. I have seen many occasions where people are just too proud to call on the town for help. Rather than do that, they would go without. So maybe it is humiliating but I think it is more so for a lot of them to go to the town and ask for help for the simple reason that their husband is not living up to an order from the court.

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

Representative HANLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question through the Chair.

The point has been brought up by my colleagues, Representative Allen and Representative MacBride that those who are AFDC recipient parents would not be able to be listed in the paper as far as owing or being in arrears for this amount of money. My question is, is it only that these names be listed with the fact that they are AFDC or can they be listed without any reference of receiving any AFDC support? Would it be possible for someone who is on AFDC to have received a speeding ticket or parking violation and their name not appear in the court records and then being passed onto newspapers?

The SPEAKER: The Representative from Paris, Representative Hanley, has posed a question through the Chair to anyone who may respond if they so desire.

The Chair recognizes the Representative from Bangor, Representative Duffy.

Representative DUFFY: Mr. Speaker, I asked the Attorney General's Office for an opinion specifically on that AFDC listed issue — as long as we do not, in the paper or any other means, signify one way or the other that they are AFDC recipients, there is nothing to prevent us from putting either non-AFDC or AFDC in the paper.

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

ROLL CALL NO. 24

YEA - Allen, Anderson, Anthony, Baker, Begley, Bost, Boutilier, Carroll, Cashman, Clark, H.; Clark, M.; Coles, Conley, Connolly, Crowley, Curran, Diamond, Dore, Erwin, P.; Farren, Foster, Garland, Gould, R. A.; Gurney, Gwadosky, Handy, Harper, Hoggund, Holt, Hussey, Ketover, Kilkelly, MacBride, Macomber, Mahany, Manning, Marsano, McSweeney, Melendy, Michaud, Mitchell, Nadeau, G. G.; O'Gara, Paradis, J.; Paul, Priest, Rolde, Rydell, Seavey, Simpson, Strout, B.; Taylor, Thistle, Tupper, Whitcomb.

NAY - Aliberti, Armstrong, Bailey, Bickford, Bott, Bragg, Brown, Carter, Chonko, Cote, Dexter,

Duffy, Dutremble, L.; Foss, Greenlaw, Hale, Hanley, Heppburn, Hichborn, Hickey, Higgins, Hillock, Holloway, Jackson, Jacques, Joseph, Lacroix, Lawrence, Lebowitz, Lisnik, Look, Lord, Martin, H.; Matthews, K.; Mayo, McGowan, McHenry, McPherson, Mills, Moholland, Murphy, E.; Murphy, T.; Nicholson, Norton, Nutting, Paradis, E.; Paradis, P.; Parent, Perry, Pines, Pouliot, Racine, Rand, Reed, Richard, Ridley, Rotondi, Ruhlin, Salsbury, Scarpino, Sheltra, Sherburne, Smith, Soucy, Sproul, Stanley, Stevens, A.; Stevens, P.; Stevenson, Strout, D.; Swazey, Tamaro, Tardy, Telow, Tracy, Vose, Walker, Warren, Webster, M.; Wentworth, Weymouth, Willey, Zirnkilton, The Speaker.

ABSENT - Callahan, Davis, Dellert, Farnum, Ingraham, Jalbert, Kimball, LaPointe, Nadeau, G. R.; Reeves, Rice, Small.

Yes, 55; No, 84; Absent, 12; Paired, 0; Excused, 0.

55 having voted in the affirmative and 84 in the negative with 12 being absent, the motion did not prevail.

Subsequently, the Minority "Ought to Pass" Report was accepted, the New Draft given its first reading and assigned for second reading Tuesday, April 21, 1987.

CONSENT CALENDAR

First Day

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

(H.P. 259) (L.D. 342) Bill "An Act to Strengthen Local Planning Abilities Through Regional Councils" Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-66)

(H.P. 327) (L.D. 426) Bill "An Act to Clarify the Emergency Rule-Making Authority of the Commissioner of Marine Resources" Committee on Marine Resources reporting "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-67)

There being no objections, the above items were ordered to appear on the Consent Calendar of Tuesday, April 21, 1987, under the listing of Second Day.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Second Day

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

(H.P. 218) (L.D. 270) Bill "An Act for Timely Construction of Water Main Extensions"

(H.P. 466) (L.D. 633) Bill "An Act Relating to Conferring Degrees by the University of New England in Biddeford"

(H.P. 71) (L.D. 74) Bill "An Act Concerning the Approval of Voting Devices" (C. "A" H-65)

No objections having been noted at the end of the Second Legislative Day, the House Papers were Passed to be Engrossed or Passed to be Engrossed as Amended and sent up for concurrence.

PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED

Bill "An Act Relating to a Vocational Region as Defined by Law" (H.P. 957) (L.D. 1286)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Second Reading, read the second time, Passed to be Engrossed, and sent up for concurrence.

PASSED TO BE ENACTED
Emergency Measure

An Act to Exempt Certain Eating Establishments from the Requirements to Provide a Public Toilet Facility (S.P. 371) (L.D. 1106) (S. "C" S-30)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Kennebunkport, Representative Seavey.

Representative SEAVEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I oppose this legislation and urge you to vote no on enactment.

We passed legislation in the 112th that required all restaurants to provide one toilet facility for use by its patrons, not for the public-at-large mind you, but only for its patrons.

This legislation before you would exempt restaurants, under 13 seats from the requirement, to provide a toilet. It also has a provision to get an exemption if you have up to 25 seats. I submit to you that any establishment has a responsibility and obligation to provide for access for this basic human need. If you or your young children or your elderly parents or anyone has a need to use a rest room, after patronizing the establishment, one should be provided for them.

This health issue should not be decided upon whether or not you had steak or salad bar at the restaurant or beans and franks -- neither should it be decided upon by how many seats a restaurant has. I know that it has the unanimous vote of the committee and they are well-intentioned but good intentions does not always make for good legislation.

I know complaints have come from some very small establishments that say the requirement would be hard to implement. They make it seem like if a pharmacy or some small lunch counter had 6 stools or 6 seats, that this toilet would get the same use that they have at the Boston Gardens or Fenway Park. A six seat lunch counter could just as easily and adequately provide for its patrons by simply providing the use of the same toilet that is required for its employees.

I think this legislature should see to it that restaurants each provide toilet facilities long before they provide a smoking and non-smoking section.

I would request a roll call, Mr. Speaker, and I urge your no vote.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Freeport, Representative Mitchell.

Representative MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to pose a question through the Chair to the people who are opposed to the bill.

If we fail to enact this bill today, would the bill that addressed this issue passed in the last session, requiring all restaurants regardless of the number of seats to have toilets, remain in effect?

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

The Chair recognizes the Representative from Kennebunkport, Representative Seavey.

Representative SEAVEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: My understanding is, if this bill doesn't go through, the bill we passed last year would take effect July 1st. As you recall, earlier in the year, we postponed the requirement from January 1st of this year to July 1st. That is my understanding.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Freeport, Representative Mitchell.

Representative MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I hope that you will all join me and the gentleman from Kennebunkport in voting against this bill today. This is a very serious problem in my district. As you know, my district probably has experienced the most rapid commercial growth of any particular area in the state.

There have been about 85 stores and restaurants opened in Freeport since 1982 and there are only two rest rooms in the entire community that are open to the public. There is a restaurant and a gas station where you have to pay a quarter. One store in town, L. L. Bean, opened their rest rooms to the public. I work in that store, it is quite a problem for the company. Sometimes when it gets busy, the line to the Ladies Room extends so far out into the store that people can't get into the shoe department. On a busy day in the summer, the store consumes 390 rolls of toilet paper.

At a restaurant across the street that has 15 or 20 seats in it doesn't even have a place to go to the bathroom. I went over to one of them because I was kind of concerned and said, "Do you mind if I use your rest room?" They told me, "Go across the street to L. L. Bean, they have a place on the second floor." This is really a serious problem. We have all this growth and there is just no place for a person to use the rest room.

I hope you all vote to kill this bill today.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from York, Representative Rolde.

Representative ROLDE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hate to disagree with my seatmate but I am going to do it. This is what I call the Flo's Hot Dog Stand Bill. We have a very famous place on Route 1 in York, it is called Flo's Hot Dog Stand and it has seven seats in it. Flo is a very interesting person, she comes originally from Mercer, Maine. She is a very feisty lady, she makes the best hot dog in the State of Maine, the best hot sauce that goes with it and she also gives some real entertainment to the folks because she is very outspoken. There are seven seats in that restaurant -- if this bill dies, then poor Flo will either have to go out of business or build a toilet in that little hot dog stand on Route 1.

So, this bill does not really go as far as I would like to see it go. I have a bill in that would grandfather all the previous restaurants.

As for the point that the gentleman from Freeport makes, I just recently went to Europe, and in Europe, every single town has a public rest room for people.

In the town of York, we have a couple for the crowds that we get in the summer that are maintained by the municipality. Maybe Freeport should think about the same sort of thing. They are getting an awfully lot of tax money from the businesses that they are getting.

I don't think we should put it all on the restaurants, particularly the little restaurants that are already in existence, those restaurants that cannot expand, those restaurants that are in places where there already are facilities such as in shopping centers where there might be a facility next door and the restaurant shouldn't have to do it. I hope you will go along with the bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Mt. Desert, Representative Zirkilton.

Representative ZIRNKILTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question through the Chair.

I would like to ask whether or not any restaurant facility, regardless of the number of seats that it has on the premises, would be required to have a

bathroom facility if they allow alcoholic beverages to be consumed on the premises?

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

The Chair recognizes the Representative from Washington, Representative Allen.

Representative ALLEN: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: My committee had the dubious honor and pleasure of reporting this bill out of committee, unanimous.

First of all, I would like to answer the Representative's question -- it was amended in the other body to provide that all restaurants that allow on-premises consumption of liquor, whether they have a license and sell it or whether you bring liquor to that restaurant, if you allow on-premises consumption of liquor, you must have a rest room, no exception, you just have to have one.

With regards to this particular bill, it does in effect, if we don't pass this modification of the original bill passed last year, last year's bill does go into effect July 1, 1987.

The practical effect of that bill going into effect is one of two things, it is going to put businesses, small, very small restaurants, out of business. That is fine, if that is what you want to do, then by all means vote against this bill or it might severely affect a small business who has, say two or three bar stools and serves coffee and doughnuts in the morning. They, therefore, have to be licensed as a restaurant and, if you want to put that portion of this small mom and pop business out of business, then that is your choice also.

What the committee attempted to do is meet the needs of everyone. I don't think there is anyone on the committee that would dispute the fact that if you use a restaurant there is a likelihood that you or your child or whatever is going to have need of a toilet facility. So, in trying to deal with this very significant problem, we decided that, if you were a small establishment of 12 seats or fewer, we would allow an exception for you. But in doing so, we said that you had to do three things: you had to make sure that when someone walked into your restaurant, they knew that you didn't have public toilet facilities in your restaurant, so you are forewarned, so to speak, before you walk in there to eat.

We also made sure that, if there were facilities available -- say next door, you had worked out an arrangement with an adjoining store that your patrons could use their facilities, that you had to provide a sign that directed people to that rest room. And if you did have a rest room on your premises -- from the dining area you had to have a sign that people could say, "rest rooms that a way." So, we tried to meet the needs of everyone, the consuming public and the very small restaurateurs, and I use that term loosely because some of these places really can't be classified as restaurants. Think about some of the towns you live in and those little drug stores down on the corner and they have two or three bar stools and, all of a sudden, we pass a law that says they have to put in a toilet facility. Well, in some of those locations, there are toilet facilities. The problem is the law already prohibits someone passing from an eating area out in the front of a drug store through the prescription area, where all those drugs are stored, to the facility, so that there is no facility that can be used at that point.

Basically, what this law has done is tried to craft a law that meets the needs, both of the consuming public and of the very small business

owner. We also carved out an exception for restaurants that have 13 to 25 seats and that they can apply to the Department of Human Services for a waiver if, for instance, they are a member of an enclosed shopping mall and that shopping mall provides public rest room facilities. Or if they, as I said before, have worked out an agreement for someone to have off premises use. This bill doesn't impact the businesses in my district, we don't have businesses this small, any businesses in my district. You really have to think about the needs of the people that you represent and it was a unanimous committee report, it was one of the first bills that we heard and we worked on it for four months.

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 Wilton, Representative Armstrong.

Representative ARMSTRONG: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: Several people have sent me notes or asked me how I stand on the toilet bill, since I was the original sponsor of the bill requiring restaurants to have a toilet facility. I thought it was a good idea.

The original bill was a compromise. I put in a bill to require two bathrooms and be effective when the legislature adjourned. Working with the Maine Restaurant and Innkeepers Association and interested legislators, we limited the bill in committee to one unisex bathroom. We exempted the hot dog stands and the ice cream stands and the take-out places. We said that the restaurant only had to provide a toilet facility for its patrons, so if you had a restaurant on a beach, you didn't have to provide toilet facilities such as Old Orchard Beach. We set the effective date ahead to January 1, 1987. However, any time we pass a law in this body, there are always things -- at least I have found that to be true with things that I have been involved with -- that we just didn't think of.

My original bill said that anybody that serves food to be consumed on the premises has to have a bathroom. Since the bill was passed, there have been all kinds of other unique operations that have been pointed out to us that I think deserve some consideration. There is the drug store that has four or five stools, there is the eating place in a mall that doesn't have their own rest rooms because the mall provides rest rooms, and the booths in a general store next to a coffee machine. There are a number of places that the restaurant operation is a secondary operation to their unique type of business -- like a drug store.

There are also licensing problems. For instance in drug stores, the patrons are not supposed to go through the drug preparation area in order to get to the bathroom. So, I was a part of this compromise bill and it seems to me that it is a logical compromise. Basically, it says that those restaurants that don't serve alcoholic beverages and have 12 seats or less, which is three booths, three tables or 12 seats, can be exempt from this law. There are several requirements that they have to meet, one, they have to put a sign on the door saying, "Sorry folks, we don't have toilet facilities in this place, we have less than 13

seats, we are basically not a full-fledged restaurant operation," maybe part of a take-out or something else, so, the sign on the door says, "Don't come in here if you are going to need a bathroom because we don't have one."

Also this compromise bill exempts, as other people have said, restaurants of 25 seats or less, which were in effect prior to the enactment of the original bill requiring toilets. It says that the Department of Health and Engineering can grant specific exemptions to certain types of places like the small restaurant operation in a mall. You have all seen them, they are usually an open thing and they have got three tables in there, they have never had a bathroom on the premises because the mall's public rest room is two or three doors down.

This bill allows the Division of Health and Engineering to exempt that restaurant as long as they can prove that a public facility is available. It also allows the Division of Health and Engineering to exempt a restaurant if the owner can prove that he has made firm arrangements with the store next door or what not, someplace in the immediate vicinity, to offer rest room facilities.

So, as much as I hate to oppose my good friend from Kennebunkport, Representative Seavey, I would urge that you go along with this reasonable compromise. We are just talking 12 seats or less and we are allowing an appeal process for those restaurants under 25 seats to go to the Department of Health and Engineering. Yet I think we are, at the same time, maintaining the integrity of the original bill, that every restaurant in the state is going to have to have at least one bathroom available for its patrons. So, I would urge you to vote against the pending motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Kennebunkport, Representative Seavey.

Representative SEAVEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Just two quick points and I apologize for holding up all the hearings that are going on this afternoon. If you have a liquor license or allow liquor to be consumed on your premises, irregardless of seats, you need to provide a toilet. I ask, what is the difference between beer and a gin and tonic, or whether you are serving coffee and water, the need is still going to be there.

I don't see where these small businesses are going out of business at all. I don't think that is true at all. These pharmacies, gift shops, gas stations or whatever you have, if they think they can make a quick buck by setting up some stools, I just think that it is a health issue and a proper responsibility of the restaurant industry to provide this.

Again, I urge you to vote no.

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is passage to be enacted. This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of the House is necessary. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 25

YEA - Aliberti, Allen, Anderson, Anthony, Armstrong, Bailey, Baker, Begley, Bickford, Bost, Boutilier, Bragg, Carroll, Carter, Cashman, Chonko, Clark, H.; Clark, M.; Conley, Cote, Crowley, Diamond, Dore, Duffy, Dutremble, L.; Erwin, P.; Farren, Gould, R. A.; Gurney, Gwadosky, Hale, Hanley, Harper, Hepburn, Hichborn, Hillock, Hogle, Holt, Hussey, Jackson, Jacques, Joseph, Ketover, Kilkelly, Lawrence, Lebowitz, Lisnik, Look, MacBride, Mahany, Manning, Marsano, Matthews, K.;

Mayo, McGowan, McPherson, McSweeney, Melendy, Michaud, Mills, Moholland, Murphy, E.; Murphy, T.; Nadeau, G. G.; Nadeau, G. R.; Norton, O'Gara, Paradis, J.; Paradis, P.; Parent, Paul, Perry, Pouliot, Priest, Racine, Rand, Reed, Richard, Ridley, Rolde, Rotondi, Rydell, Salsbury, Scarpino, Sheltra, Simpson, Smith, Soucy, Sproul, Stevens, A.; Stevens, P.; Strout, B.; Strout, D.; Swazey, Tamaro, Taylor, Telow, Thistle, Tracy, Tupper, Vose, Walker, Warren, Wentworth, Zirkilton.

NAY - Bott, Coles, Connolly, Curran, Dexter, Foss, Foster, Garland, Greenlaw, Handy, Hickey, Higgins, Holloway, Lacroix, Lord, Macomber, Martin, H.; McHenry, Mitchell, Nicholson, Nutting, Paradis, E.; Ruhlin, Seavey, Sherburne, Stanley, Stevenson, Webster, M.; Weymouth, Whitcomb, Willey.

ABSENT - Brown, Callahan, Davis, Dellert, Farnum, Ingraham, Jalbert, Kimball, LaPointe, Pines, Reeves, Rice, Small, Tardy, The Speaker.

Yes, 105; No, 31; Absent, 15; Paired, 0; Excused, 0.

105 having voted in the affirmative and 31 in the negative with 15 being absent, the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

PASSED TO BE ENACTED
Emergency Measure

An Act to Create a Youth Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Education Program (H.P. 862) (L.D. 1155) (H. "A" H-59)

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. 122 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.

FINALLY PASSED
Emergency Measure

RESOLVE, for Laying of the County Taxes and Authorizing Expenditures of Franklin County for the Year 1987 (H.P. 858) (L.D. 1152) (S. "A" S-29)

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. 118 voted in favor of the same and none against and accordingly the Resolve was finally passed, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

FINALLY PASSED
Emergency Measure

RESOLVE, Clarifying the Harbor Management Jurisdictions of the Towns of Bar Harbor and Gouldsboro (H.P. 926) (L.D. 1238)

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. 121 voted in favor of the same and none against and accordingly the Resolve was finally passed, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

PASSED TO BE ENACTED

An Act Relating to Active Retired Judges in the Administrative Court (S.P. 190) (L.D. 517) (C. "A" S-27)

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.

ORDERS OF THE DAY
UNFINISHED BUSINESS

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.

TABLED AND ASSIGNED

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

HOUSE DIVIDED REPORT - Majority (8) "Ought Not to Pass" - Minority (5) "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-56) - Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act Providing for the Use of Spendable Earnings as a Basis for Calculating Workers' Compensation Benefits" (H.P. 398) (L.D. 532)
TABLED - April 14, 1987 by Representative MCHENRY of Madawaska.

PENDING - Motion of Representative RUHLIN of Brewer to accept the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report.

On motion of Representative Diamond of Bangor, retabled pending the motion of Representative Rhulin of Brewer to accept the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 21, 1987.

TABLED AND TODAY ASSIGNED

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

Bill "An Act to Create Regional Detention and Evaluation Centers for the Secure Confinement of Juveniles" (H.P. 950) (L.D. 1279)
(Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs suggested)

TABLED - April 15, 1987 by Representative CARTER of Winslow.

PENDING - Reference

Representative Carter of Winslow moved the bill be referred to the Committee on Human Resources.

On motion of Representative Manning of Portland, tabled pending the motion of Representative Carter of Winslow to refer L.D. 1279 to the Committee on Human Resources and specially assigned for Tuesday, April, 21, 1987.

(Off Record Remarks)

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

SENATE PAPER

The following Joint Order: (S.P. 418)
ORDERED, the House concurring, that when the House and Senate adjourn, they do so until Tuesday, April 21, 1987, at 10 o'clock in the morning.

Came from the Senate, read and passed.

Was read and passed in concurrence.

(Off Record Remarks)

On motion of Representative McGowan of Canaan, Adjourned until Tuesday, April 21, 1987, at ten o'clock in the morning pursuant to Joint Order.

STATE OF MAINE
ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTEENTH LEGISLATURE
FIRST REGULAR SESSION
JOURNAL OF THE SENATE

In Senate Chamber
Thursday
April 16, 1987

Senate called to Order by the President.

Prayer by Reverend Richard Lloyd of the Faith Baptist Church in Kittery.

REVEREND LLOYD: Shall we pray. Heavenly Father, we come to You with thankful hearts for this privilege of dedicating a few moments to Thee, as the Senate begins its meeting this afternoon. We are aware, Father, that You rule and over rule the affairs of mankind. We thank You for each Senator here, for the skills that You have given to them. For the committee work that is going on and in other cases, that have already gone on. Lord, we would ask for Your direction and blessing during this hour. We commit this time to Thee. We ask that the decisions made today would be those decisions that are right decisions for the State of Maine and the residents here. We thank You for this in Jesus Name. Amen.

Reading of the Journal of Yesterday.

PAPERS FROM THE HOUSE

Non-concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Encourage Sport Fisheries on the Lower Kennebec and Androscoggin Rivers"
H.P. 937 L.D. 1253

Committee on FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE suggested and ORDERED PRINTED.

In House, April 13, 1987, referred to the Committee on MARINE RESOURCES and ORDERED PRINTED.

In Senate, April 14, 1987, referred to the Committee on FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE and ORDERED PRINTED in NON-CONCURRENCE.

Comes from the House, that Body INSISTED.

The Senate RECEDED and CONCURRED.

House Papers

Bill "An Act to Provide Remuneration for Physician Services for Involuntary Commitment of Patients for Psychiatric Hospital Care"
H.P. 949 L.D. 1278

Comes from the House referred to the Committee on BANKING AND INSURANCE and ORDERED PRINTED.

Which was referred to the Committee on BANKING AND INSURANCE and ORDERED PRINTED, in concurrence.

Bill "An Act to Create a Maine Post-Secondary Educational Loan Program"
H.P. 954 L.D. 1283

Comes from the House referred to the Committee on EDUCATION and ORDERED PRINTED.

Which was referred to the Committee on EDUCATION and ORDERED PRINTED, in concurrence.

Bill "An Act to Provide a Comprehensive Growth Management Plan for the State"
H.P. 955 L.D. 1284

Comes from the House referred to the Committee on ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES and ORDERED PRINTED.

Which was referred to the Committee on ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES and ORDERED PRINTED, in concurrence.