

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 Seventh Legislature

(First Special Session)

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1976

KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

sued through the Department of Manpower Affairs. I tried to explain to him that this report would ask for more than that which is included in the report that Mr. Levesque supplies to us. It seems to me that we should require the governor to deal with the issue of unemployment and that is why we wanted to try to keep the bill in its present form.

I don't have any objection at all to debating the amendment that Mr. Finemore wanted to put on, but the reason that I objected was to just try to save the bill in its present form.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore.

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I was not changing any part of the section the last speaker suggested. I was not changing anything. I was just changing the wording and where the report was coming from. With that I will close.

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

Mr. NORRIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I held this bill up because I wanted to look at it and then there was an amendment talked about and apparently the amendment is not going to be presented now. I really believe in what the gentleman from Portland is trying to do and I have no quarrel with him and I believe in what his committee is trying to do. But I am concerned about just putting another bill, another law, on the books, that really won't do anything, in my opinion. It just won't do any more than have another law on the books that won't provide any real useful purpose to anyone. That is my feeling on it and I know how the gentleman feels.

Everyone said I was going to move indefinite postponement. I am not going to move indefinite postponement. I am going to ask for a division on the passage and I am perfectly willing to listen to any more debate on the thing, but in my own mind, I can't see that the bill will accomplish anything for the citizens of the State of Maine at this time.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is passage to be enacted. All in favor of passage to be enacted will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

67 having voted in the affirmative and 26 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

Thereupon, the Bill was signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

The Chair laid before the House the fourth item of Unfinished Business:

Bill, "An Act Relating to the Registration of Voters." (H. P. 2039) (L. D. 2212)

Tabled — (Till Later Today) March 23 by Mr. Higgins of Scarborough.

Pending — Motion of the same gentleman to Reconsider Acceptance of the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report.

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

Mr. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have no notions of delaying the apparent death of this bill, but I did see it was a divided report on the calendar yesterday, 8 to 5, and I had received some correspondence from my town's people that they were in favor of this. When I saw it go without debate, I wondered what the problem was. Since then I have talked with people who even signed the "ought to pass" report and they have assured me, I guess, that the bill is no good and so if they signed it out "ought to pass" and then think then it isn't that great, then I guess it isn't that great, so I withdraw my motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Scarborough, Mr. Higgins, withdraws his motion to reconsider.

Sent up for concurrence.

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

House Divided Report — Majority (9) "Ought Not to Pass" — Minority (2) "Ought to Pass" as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-1007) — Committee on Labor on Bill, "An Act Relating to the Effective Date of Each Individual Establishing a Benefit Year under the Unemployment Law" (Emergency) (H. P. 2145) (L. D. 2285)

Tabled — March 22 by Mr. Mills of Eastport.

Pending — Acceptance of Either Report.

On motion of Mr. Mills of Eastport the Minority "Ought to Pass." Report was accepted.

The Bill was read once. Committee Amendment "A" (H-1007) was read by the Clerk and adopted, and the Bill assigned for second reading tomorrow.

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

House Divided Report — Report "A" (7) "Ought Not to Pass" — Report "B" (5) "Ought to Pass" in New Draft Under New Title Bill, "An Act to Strengthen Litter Laws and Improve Solid Waste Management in this State" (H. P. 2225) (L. D. 2315) — Report "C" (1) "Ought to Pass" as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-1015) — Committee on Taxation on Bill, "An Act to Improve Solid Waste Management" (H. P. 2090) (L. D. 2249)

Tabled — March 22 by Mrs. Najarian of Portland.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Drigotas of Auburn to Accept Report "A" "Ought Not to Pass".

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

Mr. MCKERNAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would oppose the motion to accept the majority "ought not to pass" report on this bill.

I am going to be very brief, I talked too long on a subject earlier today and I think this particular item has been debated in the past, at least the controversial aspect of the bill.

As you all know, this is a bill that came out of a study by the Natural Resources Committee. It dealt with solid waste and litter in this state. It has been reported out by the committee, at least a minority of that committee, in new draft. That new draft contains strengthened litter laws and a returnable beverage container bill, as well as a referendum clause on that section of the bill, to send it out and let the people vote on it.

I don't want to get into specifics of the merits or demerits of the so-called bottle bill. As I have said, we have debated this subject at length in the regular session. It is obvious from the debate that passage of such a bill will reduce litter, reduce solid waste, reduce the amount of energy consumed by the beverage industry and also reduce the cost of beverages to consumers.

We can sit here and haggle over just how much it is going to reduce litter or how much it is going to reduce everything, but I am not sure that serves any purpose.

My feeling on this bill is simply that we have made some mistakes here in trying to convince the people of this state that we are, in fact, acting in their best interest. I think a lot of people feel alienated by the whole political process and government in general.

This is an opportunity to allow the people to vote on something that they are very concerned about and that they favor. I would hope you would not vote to accept the majority "ought not to pass" report and that we would allow this bill to be accepted as Report "B" so the people of the State of Maine could have a chance to vote on whether or not they want returnable containers.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Orland, Mr. Churchill.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I wholeheartedly support Report "B". This is a question that you must ask yourself, will returnable containers reduce litter? The answer is definitely, yes. It has been proven by the states which now have returnables. Oregon and Vermont now have 75 to 80 percent less litter than they did previously. The savings in container costs are more than enough to offset increases in the handling costs to grocers and distributors. Maine has no beverage container manufacturers, so any decrease in containers manufacturing will not affect Maine labor forces. If anything, jobs should be created to handle the returnables.

The latest poll conducted in Maine indicates that 75 percent of the Maine people favor returnables, so lets pass out this Report "B" and allow the housewives and all the citizens of the state to vote whether they want this bill or not.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to escort the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Greenlaw, to the rostrum to act as Speaker pro tem.

Thereupon, Mr. Greenlaw assumed the Chair as Speaker pro tem and Speaker Martin retired from the Hall.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Perham, Mr. McBreairey.

Mr. MCBREAIRTY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Last year in the regular session, a Joint Order was put through that required the Natural Resources Committee to make a study of solid waste. I am going to read that order.

"WHEREAS, this is an age of increasing scarcity of energy and of natural resources; and

"WHEREAS, the recycling and reuse of consumer and industrial goods is one of the chief methods of conserving the limited supply of energy and natural resources; and

"WHEREAS, the Legislature recognizes that a comprehensive system of recycling and reuse of consumer and industrial goods is only economically feasible on a state-wide scale; and

"WHEREAS, such recycling and reuse would also have the advantage of significantly decreasing the amount of litter which presently despoils Maine's natural beauty; now, therefore, be it

"ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Council is authorized, through the Joint Standing Committee on Natural Resources, to study the economic, social and environmental feasibility of instituting a state-wide, comprehensive system of recycling consumer and industrial goods and materials; and be it further

"ORDERED, that the experience of other states, especially Massachusetts, in attempting to establish a state-wide system of reuse and recycling be studied in an effort to learn from the efforts of others; and be it further

"ORDERED, that the Council report the results of its findings, together with any proposed recommendations and final drafts of necessary implementing legislation, to the next special or regular session of the Legislature; and be it further

"ORDERED, upon passage in concurrence, that suitable copies of this Order be transmitted forthwith to said agencies as notice of this directive."

The Natural Resources Committee met several times at a considerable expense to the taxpayers of this state. Public hearings were held on three Comprehensive Solid Waste bills which were intended to give the legislature a choice of three different price ranges. I think the intent of the study order was much broader

than to bring back a warmed-over version of Jock's last year's bottle bill. I strongly believe that Committee Report C will do more for all solid waste and litter, than a well-drafted bottle bill. I think it will be a great waste of the thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money put into the solid waste study, if you accept this bottle bill you have before you today.

I strongly feel it is terribly wrong to use a several thousand dollar study order to circumvent Rule 28 and allow anyone to bring back a last year bottle bill in this special session.

I am going to go through this bill that you have before you as briefly as possible. On the first page, I think it is section 2, it makes very unfair competition because it says that the agencies must buy or purchase equipment that has parts to recycle, this could mean a typewriter key or a button, it could force the agencies to buy from a company.

On Page 2, subsection 4, this exempts motorcycles, farm implements and snowmobiles from section 7, which is terribly wrong, because they can litter from snowmobiles and motorcycles just as well as any other equipment.

On Page 5, Section 2273, does absolutely nothing because it says that they "may," if they have the money, do such and such and certain things. On Page 6, Definition, this does nothing for wine, liquor bottles in any way.

Now we get down into a refund value. All this bill says is that you have to have a refund value. It does not in any way say that you have to charge this refund value. When you take Section 1863, saying that all you have to have is a refund value, you don't have to charge it, then you go down to Section 1866, it says that you can refuse the returned bottle, so this bottle bill, the way it is written, does absolutely nothing with dealers, and distributors against the bill and saying that they don't have to ask for a refund value and they don't have to accept the bottles or give it back, it does nothing.

It says in Subsection 3 of 1866, that one cent will be paid to the dealer for handling. The one cent that is being paid to the dealer for handling will amount to \$4 million. Also, the slippage of the bottles that won't be returned will amount to another \$2 million, so there is a price tag on this bill of \$6 million.

The last page of flip tops and detachable plastic container carriers, there is absolutely no lead time. When this becomes law, I don't know what they will do with all these flip top cans that will be left on hand.

Several weeks ago, in order to get first-hand information on how well Vermont's bottle bill was cleaning up the litter along the highways, I spent a good part of my weekend in Vermont. Between Lancaster, New Hampshire and St. Johnsbury, Vermont, I picked up three large trash bags of litter. A good part was New Hampshire bottles, brought in New Hampshire by Vermont people, and thrown out in Vermont.

Believe me, Vermont's bottle bill is still just as controversial as L. D. 1994 is here in Maine. While in Vermont, I visited a farm, small restaurant, a home, a Mom and Pop country store, two supermarkets, and filling stations. I talked with waitresses, customers in stores, State Police, and finally with a District Highway Engineer. Everyone seemed anxious to express their opinion of the bottle bill. I have several written testimonies, one from the highway engineer, I am going to read.

"Dear Sir: The State of Vermont has in recent years, passed a "Bottle Bill" aimed at reducing the litter on state highways. Since it is part of my duty to maintain the state highway, which includes the collection of trash along side the roadways, I offer my personal observations in favor of, and objections to, our present legislation.

"It has been our observation, the number of glass containers has been reduced noticeably.

However, we do have some Vermont beverage bottles, a great deal of containers from other states or Canadian provinces, ferrous and non-ferrous metals, and paper of every description. In general, while the volume of bottles has been reduced somewhat, the volume of trash is noticeably the same.

"Secondly, the cost of trash removal before the "Bottle Bill" was in the vicinity of \$16,000 for the 300 miles of state highway we patrol. Granted, we have experienced higher operating costs in the last few years, but last year our cost was \$18,000, with the "Bottle Bill" in effect. So, no saving in money was affected in maintenance.

"Third, in this section of the state, it is the universal opinion that the retail stores suffer greatly from the loss of business to New Hampshire, for without the taxes on containers and the lower cost of gasoline, it is more profitable to shop across the line for all the weekly groceries. It is evident the stores suffer in Vermont and are gaining in New Hampshire. We, therefore, lose income taxes and business taxes, but also gasoline taxes which pay for our roadside litter program.

"Since my viewpoint is provincial, I would suggest you contact Mr. John A. Durkee, Maintenance Management Engineer, Vermont Department of Highways, Montpelier, Vermont 05602, who would have a broader state-wide assessment and state-wide cost figures on litter collection.

"I am sincerely sorry I was unable to meet with you on February 7th, but I did appreciate your call and admire your perseverance to resolve the problem in your state."

A copy of this letter went to Mr. John Durkee and I tried to reach him. I reached his assistant and to be fair, he did say that it did help somewhat more further inland but still it did not help on the other litter.

I have a statement here that says that Governor Thomson of New Hampshire publicly states opposition to the beverage law. The Governor publicly thanked those people in Montpelier who continue to pass such legislation as the deposit law that drives business out of Vermont into his state and he hopes that they keep on re-electing those people who do so much for New Hampshire instead of considering the needs of their own state.

The Governor also stated that should a New Hampshire legislature consider a deposit law, it would stop at his desk. This clearly indicates that Governor Thomson would veto any New Hampshire deposit law and there is a clear reason for this. The following represents the latest data regarding tax receipts. In the State of Vermont, from September 1, 1973 to October of 1974, our state has lost \$340,000 in beer and excise taxes over the preceding year. In the same period, New Hampshire, picked up about the same amount.

After visiting Vermont and Canada and getting the information I did, I can, in no way, vote for any bottle bill.

This bottle bill, if it did work, with the one cent for handling, and the slippage, or the bottles that will be broken or never returned, has a price tag to the consumer of about \$6 million. Four million will go to the retailer and two million will go to the distributor. This is over \$5 million more in cost to the consumer than the Natural Resources Committee Report C.

I believe we already have driven enough business to New Hampshire and Canada.

One thing I feel many times is done here in Augusta is when the legislature finds a problem, they over-react. If you had a headache, you wouldn't take aspirin, bufferin and anacin all at the same time. I am sure you all realize that an overdose could be fatal, which would be much worse than the headache you started with.

I hope you might first take a couple aspirin by seriously considering Report C. This way, we won't risk a fatality. In two or three years, if our problem isn't taken care of, we can increase the dosage by adding a bottle bill.

I think a good example of how a great problem can sometimes be solved by a very inexpensive simple method, is the way the fatality rate was decreased on our highways. For years we tried many complicated expensive methods. Finally, the energy crunch came, we decreased the speed, and now we are saving thousands of lives.

I urge you to kill this bottle bill, and if you want to really work on recycling and cleaning up our litter, consider the Natural Resources Committee Report C.

Report C is the only bill left to come before you that will generate any money to work on our solid waste and litter problems as a whole by educating and helping towns with recycling and solid waste problems and better state-wide clean-up programs. All I ask is that you give Report C a chance.

When the committee reports back to the legislature in 1978, as the bill calls for, if I am still here, I will be one of the first who will be willing to try something else if we still haven't taken care of the problem.

This last weekend, I drove 30 some miles from my home, I went into Canada. I went across from Van Buren into St. Leonard. I bought a case of coke, which I have under my desk right now. I paid \$4.31 for this case of coke. In Van Buren, just across the bridge in the United States, the price was \$5.25. If you add the cost of the handling, add the deposit, you will drive the price up in Van Buren to \$6.89. This is a difference of \$2.58. We have a Canadian border that nearly surrounds us — you take the New Hampshire and Canadian border that nearly surrounds us and if we pass a bottle bill, we will drive thousands of dollars of business to Canada and New Hampshire.

Mr. McKernan of Bangor requested a roll call.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Windham, Mr. Peterson.

Mr. PETERSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I want to go on the record in support of Report B, which is the minority "ought to pass" report. I won't take too much time on this because I think the pro's and con's of this were well debated in the regular session and the arguments are familiar but one of the pressing things that the Natural Resources Committee found was that a large portion, at least 20 percent of the solid wastes that goes into our local dumps, our solid landfills, are bottles and beverage containers. There has to be an incentive for our society to reuse and recycle beverage containers and other articles that are in commerce, and this bill will go a long ways towards getting our citizenry to thinking in terms of reusing and not just burying and wasting.

This bill creates an incentive for people to return beverage containers. It also assists in reducing the volume of solid waste that is generated by our dumps. If we can reduce that volume, it means less land that we are going to have to use to bury our solid waste. It is essential that we take some step.

Now, this bill is a lot less than the Natural Resources Committee passed out as a study report — it is a lot less. It was steered to Taxation because one of the studies had a two-cent disposal charge which was considered to be a tax and that any new tax in this legislature would have rough sledding. So that provision has been taken out of this legislation.

I think that what we have is something less than what I would like to see, but I think it gets us headed in the right direction. It may seem discriminatory that we pick on the beverage

container, but it is one of the items that is most frequently along our roadsides and which contributes greatly to the amount of solid waste that we have to bury. If there is any way that we can reduce that cost to the property taxpayers of your communities, I think this is one of the ways, because we are going to be reducing the total volume of solid waste that goes into our dumps.

The SPEAKER pro tem: A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call, it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All those desiring a roll call vote will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

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

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Perham, Mr. McBrearty.

Mr. MCBREARTY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have here a report that was given to me yesterday. It is a little hard to understand why I was given this report, because it was given to me by a fellow who three weeks ago was a hundred percent in favor of the bottle bill and this doesn't seem to add any strength to it.

This is an environmental protection publication in the solid waste management series. This was drafted by Mr. Loeb. He is with the Resource Recovery Division Office of Solid Waste Management Programs, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. I am just going to pick a few subjects as briefly as I can from this. It says: "The actual number of litter beverage containers declined from a monthly average of 12,721 before the law to 4,191 after the law, a decrease of 67 percent or more than 8,500 a month. Although beverage containers in litter since enactment of the law, 26 percent were deposit containers. The remainder were non-returnable, presumably purchased outside the state.

"Price increases from 20 to 40 cents per case were later passed on to consumers. One distributor increased prices by 35 percent per case on February 21, 1974, five months after implementation of the act, and others followed soon after. The increase is said to cover one cent, the 24 cents per case handling charge that distributors must allow by law to pay for the increased handling costs, in addition, 6 to 16 cents per case to cover distributor increased handling costs. Additional increase may occur at the retail level.

"Beer prices: Price increases occurred as soon as the legislation became effective. Wholesalers increased prices from 40 to 60 percent per case. This increase was said to cover (1) the 24 percent per case handling charge paid to the retailer and (2) an additional 16 to 36 cents per case for costs of handling by the wholesaler. Retail stores added up to 15 cents per case as a handling charge above the 24 cents per case required by the law from the wholesaler.

"The state attorney investigated the reasons for these price increases. No charges were filed.

"In the case of the soft drink prices, various costs were increased during this time and, therefore, the price increases could not be attributed to any single cause.

"In summary, price increases occurred both for beer and soft drinks. The prices of soft drinks increased 20 to 40 cents per case, while the price of beer per case jumped almost immediately, September 1, 1973, by around 60 cents per case. This is in addition to the 5 cents for bottle deposits or \$1.20 per case the consumer must initially give.

"The State of Vermont has had about a 10 per-

cent decline in projected overall tax receipts for fiscal year 1974. Data on sales, specifically since September 1973, when the law went into effect, were not generally available. An exception was dated from the Coca Cola Bottling Company, which accounts for slightly one fourth of coca cola sales in Vermont or about one twelfth of the total soft drink market. Their sales for September through August 1973-74 show a three and one tenth percent decline compared with sales for the same month in 1972-73. For the year 1973, the company reported a 10 and 8 percent increase in sales. The Coca Cola Bottling Company of Burlington accounting for slightly less than half of coca cola sales reported a 6 percent sales decline for the 1973 year.

"It is obvious that beer sales in Vermont declined about 10 percent in the first year in sales. On May 1, 1973, four brewers representing eight brands chose not to renew their certificates of approval for Vermont's sales.

"One final comment is required concerning the impact of the price increase on the sales of beer. Even before the law, due to Vermont taxes, beer was cheaper in adjacent states. The Vermont tax per case was about 57 cents, compared with about 10 cents for New York, 17 cents for Massachusetts and 27 cents for New Hampshire. Vermont retailers, by law, cannot sell beer below their cost to bring people into their stores. New Hampshire retailers, near the border, can and do run specials on beer. In fact, one survey, only one, show a 47 percent decline. Budweiser brand, beer sales in Vermont near the New Hampshire border during the first four months of the law, was affected compared to the previous year."

I am not going to take any more of your time, but I could read you many more sections that would go right along with what I have already read.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. McKernan.

Mr. MCKERNAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Just to clear it up for the members, Report A is the "ought not to pass" report. I would oppose that.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Morton.

Mr. MORTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I just want to make sure everybody does understand that 2249 that is posted on the tote board there is really not the bill we should be looking at. We should be looking at 2314, 2315, in that area, which are Reports A and B of 2249.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from York, Mr. Rolde.

Mr. ROLDE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pair my vote with the gentleman from Mapleton, Mr. Rideout, if he were here, he would be voting yes and I would be voting no.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from York, Mr. Rolde, wishes to pair his vote with the gentleman from Mapleton, Mr. Rideout. If Mr. Rideout was here, he would be voting yes and the gentleman from York, Mr. Rolde would be voting no.

At this point, Speaker Martin returned to the rostrum.

SPEAKER MARTIN: The Chair would thank the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Greenlaw, for acting as Speaker pro tem.

Thereupon, Mr. Greenlaw of Stonington was escorted to his seat by the Sergeant-at-Arms and Speaker Martin resumed the Chair.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Drigotas, that the House accept Report A, "Ought Not to Pass."

All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Albert, Berube, Boudreau, Call, Connors, Curtis, Dam, Drigotas, Durgin, Farley, Faucher, Fraser, Kauffman, Kelleher, Kelley, Lewis, Lizotte, Lunt, Lynch, MacLeod, Maxwell, McBrearty, Morin, Norris, Pearson, Perkins, T.; Peterson, P.; Raymond, Talbot, Tarr, Theriault, Truman, Twitchell, Walker, Webber.

NAY — Ault, Bachrach, Bagley, Bennett, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Birt, Blodgett, Bowie, Burns, Bustin, Byers, Carpenter, Carroll, Carter, Chonko, Churchill, Clark, Connolly, Cooney, Cox, Curran, P.; Davies, DeVane, Doak, Dow, Dudley, Farnham, Fenlason, Finemore, Flanagan, Garsoe, Gauthier, Goodwin, H.; Goodwin, K.; Gould, Gray, Greenlaw, Hall, Henderson, Hennessey, Hewes, Higgins, Hobbins, Hughes, Hunter, Hutchings, Immonen, Ingegnieri, Jackson, Jensen, Joyce, Kany, Kennedy, LaPointe, Laverty, Leonard, Lewin, Littlefield, Lovell, MacEachern, Mackel, Mahany, Martin, A.; Martin, R.; McKernan, McMahon, Mills, Miskavage, Mitchell, Morton, Nadeau, Najarian, Peakes, Pelosi, Perkins, S.; Peterson, T.; Pierce, Post, Powell, Rollins, Saunders, Shute, Silverman, Smith, Snow, Snowe, Spencer, Sprowl, Strout, Stubbs, Susi, Teague, Tierney, Torrey, Tyndale, Usher, Wagner, Wilfong, Winship, The Speaker.

ABSENT — Carey, Cote, Curran, R.; Dyer, Hinds, Jacques, Jalbert, Laffin, LeBlanc, Mulkern, Palmer, Quinn, Tozier.

PAIRED — Rideout, Rolde.

Yes, 35; No, 101; Absent, 13; Paired, 2.

The SPEAKER: Thirty-five having voted in the affirmative and one hundred one in the negative, with thirteen being absent and two paired, the motion does not prevail.

On motion of Mr. Susi of Pittsfield, the House accepted Report B "Ought to pass".

Thereupon, the New Draft was read once and assigned for second reading tomorrow.

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

House Divided Report — Majority (10) "Ought Not to Pass" — Minority (3) "Ought to Pass" in New Draft (H. P. 2224) (L. D. 2314) — Committee on Taxation on Bill, "An Act to Provide Funding for Action on Solid Waste Litter" (H. P. 2091) (L. D. 2250)

Tabled — March 22 by Mrs. Najarian of Portland.

Pending — Acceptance of either Report.

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

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

Bill, "An Act to Provide for more Effective Debt Management and for more Effective Administration of the State's Development Financing Capability" (H. P. 1816) (L. D. 1974) Tabled — March 22 by Mr. Cooney of Sabattus.

Pending — Passage to be Engrossed.

On motion of Mrs. Najarian of Portland, retabled pending passage to be engrossed and tomorrow assigned.

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

Joint Order Relative to study of several county jails. (H. P. 2218)

Tabled — March 23 by Mr. McKernan of Bangor.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Farley of Biddeford to indefinitely postpone.

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