

# 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*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1975

KENNEBEC JOURNAL  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

the gentlewoman from Auburn, Mrs. Snowe.

Mrs. SNOWE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I called the Department of Health and Welfare to see how many nursing homes would qualify under this amendment, which stipulates that at least 30 percent of the occupants or proposed occupants of such facility shall be state aid recipients. There are 6,780 beds for intermediate care in this state and 4,363 of state aid recipients. In other words, 99 percent of the nursing homes in this state would qualify under this bill. I think at this time we are leaving the door wide open, and I don't think the Maine Housing Authority should be getting into this area until we carefully perceive.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Livermore Falls, Mr. Lynch.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think this is one problem, but there is another associated with it. On the federal and state level we are so all wise in devising rules and regulations that we are forcing many of these people out of business, we are forcing many small businesses to the brink of bankruptcy, and I think we ought to address ourselves to those problems as well as financing new homes.

Mr. Cooney of Sabattus was granted permission to speak a third time.

Mr. COONEY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the gentleman from Bath, what would keep your out-of-state supermarket nursing home firms from getting the same assistance as the people you feel should get it?

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Madison, Mrs. Berry.

Mrs. BERRY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think there is another end of this that we should look at. I was talking with the department yesterday in regards to one of my constituents who is ready to buy a home. He has had it inspected and is ready to be licensed when he signs the deeds and then he goes back to the department and says, when can I get my Pineland patients, and they say, well, we can't guarantee that you are going to. He is just looking for two to six, so I don't believe the department is going to guarantee any of these homes the clients right away. I think it is too bad that if there are that many that need to go out and the department says we just can't guarantee. I think we should look at this end of it.

The SPEAKER: 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: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Sabattus, Mr. Cooney, that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report on Bill "An Act to Provide Low Cost Financing through the Maine State Housing Authority for Nursing Homes and Similar Facilities for Persons of Low Incomes," House Paper 756, L. D. 926. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Berry, G. W.; Birt, Bowie, Burns, Byers, Call, Cooney, Doak,

Drigotas, Farnham, Fraser, Garsoe, Gauthier, Goodwin, H.; Hewes, Higgins, Hinds, Hunter, Immonen, Jackson, Laverty, Lewis, Lizotte, Lovell, Lunt, Lynch, Martin, A.; McBreairty, Morin, Morton, Nadeau, Palmer, Peterson, P.; Pierce, Raymond, Rideout, Rollins, Snow, Snowe, Sprowl, Strout, Stubbs, Torrey, Truman, Twitchell, Walker, Webber.

NAY — Albert, Ault, Bachrach, Bagley, Bennett, Berry, P. P.; Berube, Blodgett, Boudreau, Bustin, Carpenter, Carroll, Carter, Chonko, Churchill, Clark, Connors, Connolly, Cote, Cox, Curran, P.; Curran, R.; Dam, Davies, DeVane, Dow, Dudley, Durgin, Dyer, Farley, Fenlason, Finemore, Flanagan, Goodwin, K.; Gould, Greenlaw, Hall, Henderson, Hennessey, Hughes, Hutchings, Ingegneri, Jacques, Jensen, Joyce, Kany, Kauffman, Kelleher, Kelley, Kennedy, Laffin, LaPointe, LeBlanc, Lewin, MacEachern, MacLeod, Mahany, Martin, R.; Maxwell, McMahan, Mills, Miskavage, Mitchell, Mulkern, Najarian, Norris, Peakes, Pelosi, Perkins, T.; Peterson, T.; Post, Powell, Quinn, Rolde, Saunders, Shute, Silverman, Smith, Spencer, Susi, Talbot, Tarr, Teague, Theriault, Tierney, Tozier, Tyndale, Usher, Wilfong, Winship, The Speaker.

ABSENT — Carey, Curtis, Faucher, Gray, Hobbins, Jalbert, Leonard, Littlefield, Mackel, McKernan, Perkins, S.; Wagner.

Yes, 47; No, 91; Absent, 12.

The SPEAKER: Forty-seven having voted in the affirmative and ninety-one in the negative, with twelve being absent, the motion does not prevail.

Thereupon, the Minority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted and the Bill read once. Committee Amendment "A" (H-183) was read by the Clerk and adopted and the Bill assigned for second reading tomorrow.

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

Resolution, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Provide for Annual Sessions of the Legislature and to Change the Date of Convening of the Legislature (H. P. 1510) (L. D. 1827)

Tabled — April 21, by Mr. Birt of East Millinocket.

Pending — Passage to be Engrossed.

Mr. Birt of East Millinocket offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" (H-184) was read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt.

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This amendment is a federal concept to the State Constitution, which you are now considering that provides for annual sessions of the legislature. We have been having annual sessions in some degree for quite some years, but they were actually being done under a province of special session, which the Constitution allows us to do. Personally, I believe that we should face up to this problem and establish an annual session in the Constitution, but I am not convinced that the people in the state want an amendment to the Constitution which has no guidelines on the second session whereby the legislature convenes and actually could bring up any legislation that came before the first session.

There is a general practice throughout most of the states in the country that there are guidelines in the Constitution as to how

the sessions of the legislature will be convened. In fact, many states have guidelines in there as to the number of days they can meet in the first annual session, or what would be so-called the regular session.

I realize that in some cases there are evasions of this, that they do such things as cover the clocks and things of that nature, but there are still compelling pressures on the legislatures to conclude their business and get it done in a reasonable order.

This amendment which I propose to the bill before you would require that the second regular session be limited to four matters: Budgetary matters, and this would allow us to go into an annual budget if we want to instead of the biennial budget, and it may be one of the more compelling reasons as to why we should have annual sessions. It allows legislation which is in the governor's call, which presently can be done and is in the Constitution, whereby the governor can call the legislature into session at any time it desires and will specify usually what it is called for. It also requires legislation of an emergency nature admitted by the legislature. Now we can do this by statute or we can do it by joint rules, but if we allow this laxness in there, what kind of guidelines do we have? Eventually they will become looser and looser and we will be finding more and more legislation introduced.

I believe that if we are going to do this, we should do it right and put it in the Constitution where it belongs so the guidelines are as tight as possible. It does leave a fourth area in that allows bills to be referred to committees and then come back. The committee report will automatically the study reports being done in the interim between legislative sessions will be allowed to be introduced into the legislature.

I frankly think this is the direction the people in the State of Maine prefer to go, and I would hope you would adopt this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sabattus, Mr. Cooney.

Mr. COONEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I move indefinite postponement of House Amendment "A" and would speak briefly.

Mr. Birt has explained to you the general subject area, and I think the question boils down to what should be in the Constitution and what should be elsewhere.

The Committee on State Government has reported out, I think it was an 11 to 2 "ought to pass" report on this favoring a very general amendment to the Constitution providing for annual sessions.

Why should we limit the session? Well, Mr. Birt has just given you some good suggestions, and I don't disagree with him. The question is, should those limitations be in the State Constitution? I think that the committee feels that they should not, that the place you want to put limitations is into the statutes or into the joint rules, and I might point out to you that Joint Rule 28 that we now operate under has to do with measures rejected at a regular session and says that no measure which has been introduced and finally rejected in the regular biennial session should be introduced at any special session of the same legislature, except by a vote of two thirds of both houses. That is the kind of thing that can obligate us in trying to be responsive to what should be and what shouldn't be accepted into a special session of the legislature.

It seemed to the committee, and I hope it seems to you, that the more restrictions that you put into the Constitution, the shorter the life of the amendment that we are talking about. If you put restrictions into the Constitution, it just begs abuse, and I don't want to put things into the Constitution that are going to beg our abuse, and I think we all know of states that have time limitations and do turn back clocks or do hang cloths over the clocks; let's not do that here.

We know of states that have a limitation for the special session that says they must have a budgetary importance. Well, we could put a dollar on every bill and abuse that, and I don't want to see these things abused. I want to see the Constitution validate what we are in fact doing, having annual sessions, and let us, as times change, change our laws or joint rules, but let's have our Constitution be a more permanent and lasting document.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. McMAHON.

Mr. McMAHON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise to support Mr. Birt's amendment. I would remind the good gentleman, Mr. Cooney, that it does not propose a time limit, one that would necessitate covering clocks and so on, but a limit only on what might be introduced.

After listening to our Governor outline our current financial problems yesterday, I am sure that whatever the action of this legislature might be, the people of this state will not approve annual sessions in any event. They will certainly not approve them without some kind of time limit or limitation on what might be introduced.

Now if the truth were known, I favor annual sessions, and I favor them with a time limit in each year, but I realize the arguments of Mr. Cooney in that respect are quite valid, but I think Mr. Birt's amendment is a realistic and a reasonable one, and I hope it gets our support.

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is my fourth term in this honorable body, and it will be the first time that I am going to support annual sessions. Because of the complexities of governmental operation, I have to agree with the gentleman from Sabattus, Mr. Cooney, that Mr. Birt's amendment should be indefinitely postponed. It is rather a trying experience for myself as a legislator and particularly for you freshmen that are legislators that will be putting bills in at a special session to go before the Reference of Bills Committee and have them review your request. And believe me, it is not an easy thing to get bills in.

Government today, as we all know, can't be run on a two-year basis, as we have been doing it here in the State of Maine, that each and every bill that is presented before the Reference of Bills Committee at a special session deserves the utmost consideration. They may not be of any importance to me or to you, but they are to the members that are presenting them for their constituents and for their community. So I think that we should not put a real limitation on us legislators and particularly the constituents that we represent by accepting Representative Birt's amendment. I can see merit to his amendment, but the overall considering, I think this house should indefinitely postpone it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gorham, Mr. Quinn.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a signer of the majority report, I rise also to support the gentleman from Sabattus. The Ten Commandments were something like a hundred words, and the Magna Charta was something like 500 words. The U.S. Constitution is in the vicinity of a couple thousand and the State of Maine's Constitution is already beginning to look like a serial. I don't think we need this kind of limitation. I don't think we are sufficiently wise in 1975 to be prescribing what the needs in 1985 might be in this kind of restrictive limitation.

I am perfectly willing to put my faith and trust in the good sense of the rules that each succeeding legislature will make for itself, and I am forced to take exception with the gentleman from Kennebunk. I also feel that the people of Maine most certainly would support the proposed amendment to the Constitution without this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Auburn, Mrs. Snowe.

Mrs. SNOWE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and gentlemen of the House: I, too, am a signer of the majority "Ought to Pass" report. However, I too cannot go along with the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Birt's, amendment.

One of the most frequently recurring themes of the movement for legislative improvement has been an attempt to increase both the amount and flexibility of time available to the legislature. A substantial majority of states have instituted annual sessions because of the flexibility it allows. Special sessions have only served to encourage circumventing our Constitution. On the other hand, certainly there have been sound and meritorious reasons for this transgression. Times have changed — the workload of the legislature has greatly increased. The complexity of matters before us are time consuming, and the demands on us as individual legislators have multiplied.

Adoption of annual sessions would also be an attempt aimed at improving the legislative process in its overall time frame of conducting business. We would probably have a well balanced workload between both sessions rather than trying to concentrate on every major issue in one session.

If, in order to maintain a citizen legislature, and we do not alter the size of the House, we should decide sometime in the future, if this measure passes, to limit the length of the second year of the session. However, the legislature should do this by placing a realistic restriction, based on experience and evaluation of the needs of the state, either by rule or by statute. But to place this limitation on the legislature by constitutional amendment, because of its arbitrary nature, would be an unnecessary imposition on the responsibilities of the legislature for the management of its own affairs.

I do think, however, our deliberations on limitations in the second year session, be it budget or length of time, should be carefully considered so as not to put us in a position of circumventing the constitution or finding ways to legally and satisfactorily completing our duties as they should be.

In terms of subject matter restrictions in the second year of the biennium, most legislatures are moving away from that type of limitation, because of the

emergence of other issues, aside from budgetary matters that require immediate consideration by the legislature which would be in the best interest of the state and its people.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley.

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I see some need for some kind of restrictions. I agree, I think, with Mr. Birt. I know he is attempting to do what I would like to do, but I don't know if the amendment will do it or not.

Let me tell you that I have been here for many years, as probably a lot of you know by now; I have said it so many times you must believe it. Year after year, we consistently waste time on the same bills and most of them still never pass. Now, I think this is wrong. This is costing the people, the taxpayers of Maine a lot of money. Another thing when I was first here, bills, a lot of them, were never assigned to a committee; now everything goes to committee and it brings the opponents and the proponents, who have to drive way from Fort Kent or Kittery to oppose or send their lobbyists to look after their interests. Now, I think this wrong. If this body thinks a bill in their judgment is not good and shouldn't be considered, it should be thrown out instead of assigned to a committee. We don't do that any more, but in my opinion, a lot of them should be, and a lot of them get to committee and have these people, we had some before our committee yesterday, leave to withdraw, after these people come miles to testify either for or against.

Now, this is not doing any service to the people of Maine and having them here year after year for the same bills, this is not doing the people of Maine any service. I think we should have a session and consider things very thoroughly. Then the next session would be limited to budgetary matters or something that you wouldn't have the same people down here for the same such bills as bottle bills and dozens of others very similar. They should have to wait two years before they are before us again. I hope in that in your judgment to send this to the people, if you do decide to send it to them, I don't see any need for it, because any Governor can call a special session and we made it so easy last session that the legislature can call a special session itself, so I see no need for this, really. There was a need before we could call ourselves, our leadership can now call a special session, the Governor can call a special session, what more do we need?

If we do put this out, we surely need some limitations. Otherwise, whoever is in the legislature is going to be year-round year after year, on the taxpayer and on the payroll of the state. I think this is unnecessary and I don't think the people in the state want that either, to be bothered to take a trip to Augusta every year, it is bad enough to make a trip down here every two years to oppose or speak for their favorite bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. McMAHON.

Mr. McMAHON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: To answer the good gentleman Mr. Quinn, people in other areas of the country have already begun to go back to biennial sessions and at least one state did so in this past election.

To answer the good lady from Auburn, Mr. Birt's amendment does not go against the idea of annual sessions for the state but

only places a restriction on the items that may be considered during the second year. Mr. Birt's amendment does not affect the consideration of an annual budget at all, and I think that is probably one thing that most of us in this body would agree is desirable. Maine is a small state and I am convinced that our people do not want unlimited legislative sessions, and if we do not adopt Mr. Birt's amendment, I am equally convinced that the people will turn down annual sessions altogether.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Farnham.

Mr. FARNHAM: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As one of the two persons that signed the "ought not to pass" report on this constitutional amendment, I think I should make a few brief remarks.

Until about six years ago, we were as we are now, with one session a year, and for a great many years previous to this, any special session called lasted at the most three days to a week. In fact, some of them lasted one day. Now, in the 104th, we got into a special session that lasted one month; the 105th, I guess it lasted about two months and I don't think any of you who were here in the 106th will forget the fiasco of last winter when we were here three months debating the bills that we had turned down in the regular session.

I am sure if this ever went out to the public and had to have the cost factor on it, such as we put on our bills when we introduce them, we have to show the loss of revenue or the increase in revenue, if we ever put the cost factor on what it costs to keep this body here, it would be turned down about 50 to 1. As far as I can see, about all we are going to accomplish here this year is that we are going to give the people a higher tax to pay.

Mr. Birt of East Millinocket requested a roll call vote.

The SPEAKER: 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: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley.

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I just want to make a brief comment. Without this amendment, I don't believe this bill can ever get a two thirds to get out of this House because there is an awful lot of us here who think it should be limited in some means, and if you get my vote and many others that I know, you will have to have the amendment so when you vote this next time on the roll call, keep that in mind. If you intend to get this out to the people in any form at all, I think you are going to need the amendment.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Sabattus, Mr. Cooney, that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed. Those in favor of indefinite postponement will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Ault, Bachrach, Bennett, Blodgett, Boudreau, Burns, Bustin, Byers, Call, Carey, Carroll, Chonko, Clark, Connolly, Cooney, Cote, Cox, Curran, R.; Davies, DeVane, Doak, Dow, Drigotas,

Flanagan, Fraser, Gauthier, Goodwin, H.; Goodwin, K.; Gray, Greenlaw, Hall, Henderson, Hennessey, Hewes, Higgins, Hughes, Ingegneri, Jackson, Jensen, Joyce, Kany, Kelleher, Kennedy, LaPointe, LeBlanc, Leonard, Lewin, Lizotte, Lunt, MacEachern, Mahany, Martin, A.; Martin, R.; Maxwell, Mills, Miskavage, Mitchell, Mulkern, Nadeau, Najarian, Palmer, Peakes, Pelosi, Peterson, T.; Pierce, Post, Powell, Quinn, Raymond, Rolde, Saunders, Silverman, Smith, Snow, Snowe, Spencer, Stubbs, Susi, Talbot, Tarr, Tierney, Tozier, Truman, Twitchell, Tyndale, Usher, Wilfong, Winship, The Speaker.

NAY — Albert, Bagley, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Berube, Birt, Bowie, Carpenter, Carter, Churchill, Dam, Dudley, Durgin, Dyer, Farley, Farnham, Fenlason, Finemore, Garsoe, Gould, Hinds, Hunter, Hutchings, Immonen, Jacques, Kauffman, Kelley, Laffin, Laverty, Lewis, Littlefield, Lovell, Lynch, MacLeod, McBairty, McMahon, Morin, Morton, Norris, Perkins, T.; Peterson, P.; Rideout, Rollins, Shute, Sprowl, Strout, Teague, Theriault, Torrey, Walker, Webber.

ABSENT — Conners, Curran, P.; Curtis, Faucher, Hobbins, Jalbert, Mackel, McKernan, Perkins, S.; Wagner.

Yes, 89; No, 51; Absent, 10.

The SPEAKER: Eighty-nine having voted in the affirmative and fifty-one in the negative, with ten being absent, the motion does prevail.

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

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

An Act Prohibiting Increase of Finance Charges on Outstanding Balances of Open-end Accounts under the Consumer Credit Code (H. P. 600) (L. D. 743)

— Tabled — April 21, by Mr. Palmer of Nobleboro.

Pending — Passage to be Enacted.

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

Mr. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise today in hopes that I can explain this bill a little bit better than I did the one yesterday on the filing requirements for mobile homes. It went down the chute quicker than you could say consumer credit code.

I think the best explanation would be to give you an example of how the law presently works. If an individual went in to finance, for example, a television set over a period of a couple of years on an open end basis at a given percentage rate of, for example again, 12 percent, the law now reads that this rate could be increased by giving the consumer a 90-day notice on three separate occasions. So, if I went into buy a television set on the first of May, say the payments were \$30 a month for the duration of the loan, within a month from that time the economy might be such that the interest rates might go up enough so that on June 1, I would get a notice from the creditor saying that their rate was going from 12 percent to 18 percent in 90 days. So that would give me 90 days to do one of three things — (1) to either pre-pay the loan or (2) stay with that particular creditor at a higher interest rate or (3) find another source for borrowing this money. I think you will agree that this is not quite fair to the consumer if he buys goods today and borrows the money at a particular rate today, he should not be subject to any

fluctuations in the interest market once he has signed that note. What this bill with the committee amendment does is allow that individual to go to the creditor and set up a closed-end transaction whereby his payments would remain the same as if he were under the existing interest rate when he signed the loan.

I will read you a part of it and it says in the Committee Amendment "A" that creditor includes in the above described notice of change an offer to finance by a separate loan arrangement the outstanding, unpaid balance as of the effective date of such change at the same rate of interest with the same repayment schedule as applies to such open-end credit accounts.

The existing plan would obviously raise that rate. He might be paying \$30 a month under the existing plan and without this bill, that rate could be raised to maybe \$32 a month, depending on what the outstanding balance was at the given period.

I think the bill is a good one. It was favored by John Quinn of the Consumer Credit Division. It was favored by the bankers themselves, because they would rather have a closed-end account than to have to work some computer system up so that one balance is kept at 12 percent and any subsequent purchases as of the effective date of the rate change were at another rate. So, it seems like a fair bill to me. I think it is fair to the people of the state, and I would hope that you would enact this bill today. I hope that I have answered the good gentleman from Farmington's questions.

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

Mr. MORTON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Just one quick question. Then I do understand that the amendment is on the bill, is that correct?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Morton, has posed a question through the Chair to anyone who may care to answer.

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

Mr. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As far as I know, yes.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on passage to be enacted. This being an emergency measure, it requires a two-thirds vote of all the member elected to the House. All those in favor of this Bill being passed to be enacted as an emergency measure will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

122 having voted in the affirmative and one having voted in the negative, the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

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

An Act Increasing the Number of Associate Justices the Supreme Judicial Court (S. P. 147) (L. D. 510)

— Tabled — April 21, by Mr. Gauthier of Sanford.

Pending — Passage to be Engrossed.

Mr. Gauthier of Sanford offered House Amendment "B" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "B" (H-190) was read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Hewes.

Mr. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I do not oppose