

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-Hundredth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1961

**DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE**

ship, St. George or Warren to Form a School Administrative District." (H. P. 668) (L. D. 946) amended by Committee Amendment "A" (Filing H-150)

Resolve, Regulating Fishing in Certain Waters in Androscoggin County. (H. P. 810) (L. D. 1124) amended by Committee Amendment "A" (Filing H-142)

Bill, "An Act Relating to Eminent Domain Under Slum Clearance and Redevelopment Authority Law." (H. P. 815) (L. D. 1130) amended by Committee Amendment "A" (Filing H-148)

Bill, "An Act to Regulate Credit Life and Credit Accident and Health Insurance." (H. P. 870) (L. D. 1205) amended by House Amendment "C" (Filing H-151)

Which were read a second time and passed to be engrossed, as amended, in concurrence.

Senate

Bill, "An Act Authorizing Municipal Construction of Industrial Buildings." (S. P. 42) (L. D. 102)

(On motion by Mr. Farris of Kennebec, tabled pending passage to be engrossed.)

Resolve, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Authorizing the Construction of Industrial Buildings. (S. P. 362) (L. D. 1095)

Mr. EDGAR of Hancock: Mr. President, I rise in connection with Item 7-27, L. D. 1095. Before saying anything else, I want to make perfectly clear that I do not oppose this bill. In fact, when it comes up for vote, I shall vote for it. I ask you now to look at L. D. 1095 if you will.

If you will look at Section 8-A will find that it authorizes the registered voters of any municipality by majority vote to authorize the issuance of notes or bonds in the name of the municipality for the purpose of constructing buildings for industrial use. Now if you will turn the page and look at the top two lines, which recite the question upon which the voters will be asked to vote at public referendum, and read that question: "Shall the Constitution be amended as proposed by a Resolution of the Legislature authorizing the construction of industrial buildings?"

I ask you: If you had not been a member of the Legislature and if you go to the polls next fall or whenever it is that this referendum would be put to the public, would you have any idea what you were voting on? Would you know that this authorized the voters of a municipality to bond the municipality in the name of the municipality to build these buildings? Would you know that it is not the State that wants to build these buildings or that it would be State money that would be used?

Again, I do not object to this bill, but it highlights something that has bothered me for some time and that is the wording of these questions that go out to referendum. I contend, and I think I am right when I say that for two reasons the voters who vote on these questions by and large have no idea what is involved or what they are voting on. One reason is that I do not believe that a great many of the voters ever see or read the bill or pay much attention to the reporting of the proposition in the newspapers prior to the referendum; and, secondly, I contend that these questions as they are worded and put out to the people do not provide the voter with any information to indicate the nature of the bill.

Now if the Senate feels that I am being picayune about this and do not have a valid point I will make no motion in connection with this, but if the Senate feels that this point is worth exploring and that the wording of the question to be voted on should be a little more specific and a little more in detail, then I will move that this bill be tabled so that I may have an opportunity to amend the wording of the question, but I am not making that motion at this time. I would like to hear particularly from the sponsor of the bill in connection with this point.

Mr. LOVELL of York: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I have no objection to the Senator from Hancock, Senator Edgar, changing the wording. Actually, I did not word that myself; that was worded by the Director of Legislative Research, Mr. Slosberg, and I certainly felt that, he being a law-

yer and I only a layman, he knew far more than I did in regard to wording a question on a Constitutional amendment going out to referendum. As far as I am concerned, I think that the people should have the information. I have gone to the polls myself at times in years gone by and did not know exactly what I was voting on, and in that case I would generally vote "No." I didn't know what I was voting on so I wouldn't vote for it. So, actually, I have no objection to changing the wording if Senator Edgar so wishes.

Mr. MARDEN of Kennebec: Mr. President, I concur with the feeling of Senator Edgar of Hancock and hope that he will make his motion.

Mr. BOARDMAN of Washington: Mr. President, my statement is really similar to that of Senator Marden. I feel that in many cases in regard to these questions they are altogether too short. Many people do not actually read the bill, they depend more or less on what the statement is and if they read the statement suddenly they will vote yes or no. This is unfortunate but nevertheless there is not too much we can do about it. I hope that the Senator does ask for an amendment to this bill.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair himself has heard many complaints in regard to this matter.

Mr. EDGAR: Mr. President, I realize that the wording of this question is what might be called a standard from that which is contained in all the constitutional amendments. In proposing to change the wording in this particular bill I am not attacking this bill but I am trying to rectify what I think is a fault common to all public referendum questions. So, with the Senate's permission, I would table this bill pending engrossment and especially assign it for Wednesday of next week.

The motion prevailed and the bill was so tabled.

As Amended

Bill, "An Act Relating to Disability Benefits Under Maine State Retirement System." (S. P. 203) (L. D. 536) amended by Committee Amendment "A" (Filing S-88)

Which was read a second time and passed to be engrossed as amended.

Sent down for concurrence.

Bill, "An Act Declaring Uncovered Excavations to be Nuisances." (S. P. 348) (L. D. 1081) amended by Committee Amendment "A" (Filing S-65)

Which was read a second time and Committee Amendment A was read and adopted.

Mr. Boardman of Washington presented Senate Amendment A and moved its adoption.

The Secretary read Senate Amendment A.

Which amendment was adopted, and the bill as amended was passed to be engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

Enactors

The Committee on Engrossed Bills reported as truly and strictly engrossed the following Bills and Resolves:

Bill, "An Act Relating to Use of Artificial Lights for Lighting Game." (H. P. 112) (L. D. 152)

Bill, "An Act Relating to Use of Motor Boats on Jerry Pond, Penobscot County." (H. P. 323) (L. D. 475)

Bill, "An Act to Provide for the Sale of Attached Personal Property." (H. P. 398) (L. D. 573)

Bill, "An Act Classifying the Renewal of Motor Vehicle Operators' Licenses." (H. P. 444) (L. D. 619)

Bill, "An Act Prohibiting Wrongful Removal of Fish from Private Ponds." (H. P. 497) (L. D. 696)

(On motion by Mr. Mayo of Sagadahoc, tabled pending passage to be enacted, and especially assigned for Tuesday next.)

Bill, "An Act Relating to Settlement of Inheritance Taxes When Computation is Impossible." (H. P. 502) (L. D. 701)

Bill, "An Act Relating to Contracts of Minors in Furthering their Higher Education." (H. P. 601) (L. D. 821)

Bill, "An Act Prohibiting the Taking of Certain Land Products." (H. P. 756) (L. D. 1042)

Bill, "An Act to Create the Gorham Sewerage District." (H. P. 771) (L. D. 1068)