

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
House of Representatives
One Hundred and Nineteenth Legislature
State of Maine

Volume I

First Regular Session

December 2, 1998 – May 12, 1999

YEA - Ahearne, Bagley, Baker, Belanger, Berry RL, Boiduc, Bouffard, Brennan, Brooks, Bruno, Bryant, Bull, Chizmar, Clark, Colwell, Cote, Cowger, Davidson, Desmond, Dudley, Dugay, Dunlap, Duplessie, Etnier, Fisher, Frechette, Fuller, Gagne, Gagnon, Glynn, Goodwin, Green, Hatch, Jabar, Jacobs, Kane, LaVerdiere, Lemoine, Mailhot, Martin, Matthews, McDonough, McGlocklin, McKee, Mitchell, Muse, Norbert, O'Neal, O'Neil, Perkins, Perry, Pieh, Povich, Powers, Quint, Richard, Richardson J, Rines, Samson, Sanborn, Savage W, Saxl JW, Saxl MV, Sherman, Shiah, Sirois, Skoglund, Stanley, Stevens, Sullivan, Tessier, Thompson, Townsend, Tracy, Tripp, Tuttle, Twomey, Usher, Volenik, Watson, Wheeler GJ, Williams, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Andrews, Berry DP, Bowles, Buck, Bumps, Cameron, Campbell, Carr, Chick, Cianchette, Clough, Collins, Cross, Daigle, Davis, Duncan, Foster, Gerry, Gillis, Gooley, Heidrich, Honey, Jodrey, Jones, Joy, Kasprzak, Kneeland, Labrecque, Lemont, Lindahl, Lovett, MacDougall, Mack, Madore, Marvin, Mayo, McKenney, McNeil, Mendros, Murphy E, Murphy T, Nass, Nutting, O'Brien, Peavey, Pinkham, Plowman, Richardson E, Rosen, Savage C, Schneider, Shields, Snowe-Mello, Stanwood, Stedman, Tobin J, Trahan, Treadwell, True, Waterhouse, Wheeler EM, Winsor.

ABSENT - Bragdon, McAlevey, Shorey, Tobin D, Weston.
Yes, 83; No, 62; Absent, 5; Excused, 0.

83 having voted in the affirmative and 62 voted in the negative, with 5 being absent, the House Order was **INDEFINITELY POSTPONED**.

TABLED AND TODAY ASSIGNED

HOUSE DIVIDED REPORT - Majority (7) **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-71)** - Minority (6) **Ought Not to Pass** - Committee on **STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT** on RESOLUTION, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of Maine to Require a Referendum for a People's Veto to Be Held at a Primary or General Election

(H.P. 166) (L.D. 228)

TABLED - March 25, 1999 by Representative AHEARNE of Madawaska.

PENDING - Motion of same Representative to **ACCEPT** the Minority **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report.

On motion of Representative AHEARNE of Madawaska, **TABLED** pending his motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report and specially assigned for Wednesday, March 31, 1999.

The following item was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

**ENACTORS
Emergency Measure**

An Act to Fulfill the Requirements of the Electric Restructuring Act

(H.P. 1393) (L.D. 1998)

(C. "A" H-112)

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. 143 voted in favor of the same and 0 against, and accordingly the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate. **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH.**

SENATE REPORT - **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-24)** - Committee on **LEGAL AND VETERANS AFFAIRS** on RESOLUTION, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of Maine to Amend the Timing of Elections Following the Submission of a Petition for People's Veto

(S.P. 52) (L.D. 122)

- In Senate, Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-24).**

TABLED - March 25, 1999 by Representative SHIAH of Bowdoinham.

PENDING - **ACCEPTANCE** of **COMMITTEE REPORT.**

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Madawaska, Representative Ahearne.

Representative **AHEARNE**: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hope you'll vote and vote against accepting this report. This is a very important issue and as you all can see that we had two difference of opinions from two different committees and had this piece of legislation been properly channeled to the right committee, certainly we wouldn't be in this dilemma and most likely wouldn't be unanimous. But I ask you to follow my light and vote against the pending motion. The process to initiate and follow through with the peoples' veto can be complex. Complex in that there are several deadlines and requirements to an initiator who must go through this process and this does not include the plethora of other forces that possibly could be thrown into the mix of the peoples veto process. One must file with the Secretary of State within ten days after adjournment of the Legislature with the intent to veto a law passed and signed by the Chief Executive of that Legislative session. Once the Secretary of State has received the application, the Secretary of State has 10 days to provide a ballot question. The signatures must be gathered within 90 days after the adjournment of the Legislature. The number of signatures required is 10 percent of the total number of votes cast in the last gubernatorial election. Presently the number of signatures needed is just under 43,000.

This is an important fact which needs to be emphasized. If the full 10 days in order to file an application is taken and the Secretary of State takes the full 10 days to provide a ballot question, than the number of days to gather those signatures has now dropped from 90 days to 70 days. Maine Constitution specifically states that the signatures must be acquired within 90 days after the adjournment of the Legislature not within 90 days from the date when the Secretary of State receives the application or provides the ballot question.

I have not personally participated in gathering signatures for either the peoples initiatives or vetoes, however, to gather over 40,000 signatures without duplication, without errors, in 70 or even 90 days is a momentous task. Since 1995, four attempts were made for a people's veto, but for whatever reason the initiators did not follow it through. The last successful attempt at a people's veto was in 1998. The previous successful attempt was in 1980. Two successful attempts at a people's veto in 18 years does not indicate that this process is a problem requiring corrective action. I therefore contend that the people's veto is rarely used and that the requirement to make the process more restrictive to discourage the initiation of frivolous vetoes make this legislation unnecessarily and clearly not required.

We are asked to amend the Constitution of Maine. I have yet to hear any compelling reasons to do so. If we are concerned with the low voter participation, do we then immediately amend the Constitution of Maine to fix it? Isn't the cost of a special election a local municipality that concerns us? If it is, when did we begin to place a price on democracy? As I have outlined, the process to initiate a people's veto is difficult, as well it should be, and need not to be altered. As the saying goes, if it ain't broke, don't fix it. I ask you to vote against the pending motion.

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

Representative **TUTTLE**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. Let me try to bring the issue back into order here. Essentially what this LD is proposing is a resolution that will require a petition for a people's veto be submitted to people either at a regular statewide or a general election. By doing that, Mr. Speaker and men and women of the House, we would encourage greater voter participation. This resolution eliminates language of the Constitution of Maine that authorizes the Governor to call a special election for the purposes of submitting a petition for a people's veto with the voters. As you have heard, the opponents to this bill feel that this bill could result in a veto question waiting many months to get on the ballot. They feel that this is in direct conflict of due process. They also feel that tampering with the voters rights is wrong, as you heard the good Representative from Madawaska tell you. Also, they feel, as you have heard, that connecting voter turnout with democracy could be very dangerous.

As many of us are aware, unanimous reports of committees have from time to time, been called to jeopardy in the Legislature in the session. I am hoping I can convince you why this is a good bill. The bill, in my opinion, is an attempt to save municipalities from undue costs and hassles. As many of us are aware, the February 10, 1998 election costs to municipalities was in excess of \$350,000. When we stray from the June/November voting, we see very low voter turnout, which I have some concern about. The veto on the budget issues is a red herring, which can be accepted in the law. We have seen that citizen initiative process increase. We can assume, based upon debate in this session, that the veto process will too.

Often municipalities do not own polling places, thus these buildings they use plan their schedules around the scheduled election, which really makes it very difficult for municipalities to deal with. Proponents at the public hearings, those who spoke in favor of the bill, were the Secretary of State's Office, the Municipal Clerk's Association, the Maine Municipal Association and there was also testimony from the Town Clerk of York, Maine. Those speaking in opposition were Representative Gerry from Auburn and a gentleman by the name of Julien Holmes from Wayne.

I will close with a testimony given by Maine Municipal. Maine Municipal said, "Their Legislative Policy Committee unanimously agreed to support this bill for two reasons. First, it eliminates the unbudgeted costs associated with holding special elections and second, it addresses the need to hold elections on significant or controversial matters at a time when a large percentage of the elector convenes. Its for that reason that I would ask that you would support this bill, it's a unanimous report, I believe it's a win, win situation not only for the citizens of Maine, but for municipalities and Mr. Speaker I would ask for a roll call.

Representative **TUTTLE** of Sanford **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the **COMMITTEE REPORT**.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Orono, Representative Williams.

Representative **WILLIAMS**: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As a sponsor of one of these bills, I would like to rise in support of this and let me just first begin by saying what this bill is not and what this bill is not going to do is change any of the filing deadlines with the Secretary of State, it doesn't attempt to tamper with any of the time frame set out. So, if this were to pass, nothing would change in terms of the number of days that it would take to get signatures and it would all remain the same. Also I think it's important to mention that this is not an issue driven bill. By that I mean, some have argued that well this is just sour grapes on behalf of the side that lost in the people's veto and I would point out that both sides of that particular issue have come out in support of this bill in addition to the number of people who were mentioned by Representative Tuttle who have supported this. Also, it's kind of interesting, and I would ask you to frame this question a little bit differently from the other kinds of votes that we take determining whether or not we think that something is worthy of becoming a law. This is not one of those votes. We're asking whether or not this question should be voted upon by the people to amend the Constitution. This is not whether or not we think this should become law. We're asked to consider whether or not this has merit to be voted on by the entire electorate of Maine and that's a little different. Let me just quickly tell you why I feel it does warrant that merit. The Representative from Madawaska, Representative Ahearne is correct. This is not something that has occurred a lot in the past years, however, I think it is broken and I'll tell you why I think it's broken. Since 1958 there have been five people's vetoes, five of them. Four of them have been stand alone elections, they have not taken place on a general or primary election. The average voter turnout was 26% and if we want to turn this into a debate about democracy, I would suggest that this process takes that democratic process and turns it upside down. Specifically, a minority of people setting policy for the majority. In the one people's veto that was held that did correspond to a general or primary election, the voter turnout was 52%. We also know that our municipalities and our town offices have very, very tight budgets. This past people's veto, the Maine Municipal Association estimated that over a quarter of a million dollars was spent to have to put on this special election, and not only just the money, but it's the time and the effort. We all know how difficult it is and what is involved in putting on an election.

I spoke with the Town Clerks in my district as well and they concurred that it wasn't just the money, that is was the time and the effort and volunteers and the set up that needed to be done to see this through. So I would ask that you again consider whether or not this question has merit to be voted upon by the people of the State of Maine and I would also just add for interest sake that since 1911 there have been many many proposals to amend the Constitution and I will say that Mainers in that time have decided to amend the Constitution upwards of 83% of the time. So they know when there is a problem, even though it may not be a big problem, it's a problem and it's broken and we should fix it. Thank you Mr. Speaker

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

Representative **MENDROS**: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise before you in opposition of this committee report. What concerns me, I've seen many bills in this session that seems to be attacking the initiative process and attacking the citizens of Maine and attacking their ability to make a decision, whether how many of them come out? There's lots of reasons why people come out and vote in an election. Maybe the ones that truly care are the ones that come out, the ones that don't, are we going to kick somebody out of office because they only got 10% of the vote, their district only had a 10% turn out? I really have a problem with any of these attacks on the initiative process which you'll see many of.

The second point I'd like to make is about the cost. Driving home, I went away this weekend, I was driving home, I drove by a cemetery and I saw some veterans that were in the cemetery, their gravestones with the little flags that were there. There's a price for democracy, our veterans, many of them paid that price with their lives and we can't pay a few thousand dollars for an election. Then when are we paying the price, we just expect them to pay that price with their lives. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from China, Representative Bumps.

Representative **BUMPS**: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I find myself in the unenviable position of standing between you and lunch and so I will be brief. I need to begin by sharing with the body my desire to have voted for a bill similar to the one that's before you and for that reason I would thank the sponsor and the cosponsors and the members of both committees who toiled for a long time with the various aspects of these bills.

Representative Ahearne and the other members of the State and Local Government Committee at least will attest to my own desire to vote for this legislation because I asked that it be scheduled multiple times for work sessions because I was trying to work through the very fine details of the timing of these issues so that we could be assured that the people's will would be done in special elections. There are a total of four reasons why I have chosen to oppose this committee report and the bill which will follow or which has now been tabled.

The first of those reasons is that only as you've heard, only five times since 1958 has a people's veto been put to the people - five times in 41 years. I ask you is five times a compelling reason to change the Constitution of Maine with regard to how these people's veto elections are carried out? The bill attempts to remove any political or subjective motivation essentially, that the executive might have for scheduling people's vetoes elections. I think that most of you are familiar with the process but once the signatures have been certified, the executive has to schedule a special election and he or she is required to schedule that election not less than 60 days but not more than 6 months. This is the constitutional provision, that the election can not be scheduled more than 6 months after those signatures have been verified. This bill attempts to remove any political motivation or any subjective motivation that might occur in the scheduling of that election and that's admirable. But I'd submit that it might do just the opposite. By setting in statute a date, essentially, for when these elections might be held, I would submit to you that the increase number of court challenges that might be filed to prevent elections from being held at one time or another or even the fact that the filing of the petition itself could be strategically timed so as to prevent the issue from being placed on the very next primary or general election. So to suggest that this removes the political or subjective maneuvering that could take

place with the timing or scheduling of an election. I think it is somewhat premature, if not misguided.

The third reason that I would suggest that you ought not to vote for this is that this bill allows for these elections to be held in primary elections. We heard in the committee, that could happen now, but this bill would have required that it be held in either a primary or in a general election. We heard in the committee that there are a number of people, if you are interested in participation, who choose not to vote in primary elections because they don't happen to be registered in one of the major political parties. So, if you are trying to engineer the turnout of voters, this may not do it either. However, the most compelling of all four of the reasons to vote against this bill and this is the one that caused me in the end to settle on my opposition. What we are talking about is staying a duly enacted act of the Legislature for a period, in my opinion, with the documentation that the Secretary of State's Office has provided to each committee for a period which could be as long as 18 months. This does not benefit the people on either side of the issue. There is nothing political about this. There is no, again, subjective motivation. It is simply the staying of an act duly enacted by the Legislature for a period of up to 15 months when there is going to be divisive campaigning on both sides of the issue. It is carried out for that extended period throughout the entire state.

There is no, in my opinion, a compelling reason to change the current process, five times in 41 years. I would ask that you vote against the committee report. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Bath, Representative Mayo.

Representative **MAYO**: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As the previous speaker, the good Representative from China said, we are interrupting people's lunch. This may, in fact, lead to a different vote than it should. I would remind you that the committee spent a lot of time on this issue and it is a unanimous vote of the committee to recommend what is taking place. Yes, it is possible that there would be a 14 month delay depending on when a petition was filed. That would be the rare instance. Normally it would be in a three to six month period if we looked back on the five that have been held in the last 40 years. I would also remind this body that currently, I believe, it is either five or six petitions out there circulating that, given what is currently allowed under the Constitution, could come forward and we could be facing four or five or six special elections. They are costly. They are time consuming. They are difficult. The last one that we had was in, I believe, February. It is not an easy time for people to get out to vote given the weather that we have in Maine during the winter. I personally feel and the committee felt that we were not adversely affecting the current process by allowing the people of this state an opportunity to vote on this particular change in the Constitution. They can vote it up or they can vote it down. We are not telling them what they have to do. We are just giving them an opportunity to make what we see is a very needed change in the Constitution of the State of Maine. I urge you to follow the committee recommendation. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Auburn, Representative Gerry.

Representative **GERRY**: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to the committee report. I rise in opposition not to repeat what has been said, but to support it. One of the things that wasn't brought up was the fact that if we prolong a people's veto from what is currently about a six month wait for a vote, our Legislature may be called

in to try to fix a problem with a piece of legislation that is very time sensitive. Not too long ago, a people's veto was timed for the budget. If the people that had organized the people's veto on the budget had got enough signatures, that would have staved the budget. We would have had to have been called into Special Session to float an emergency budget or enough money to carry the state through.

There are other issues that the Legislature convened as time sensitive. Are we always going to make an exception if the people go after them to call us into Special Session and let other matters that we don't deem maybe slightly sensitive to hold off for 12 months to a year? I think not. It is the right of the people for a quick process of law where their grievance to us if we enact a law that they object to, that it should go back to the people for their voice or their concern. I rise in opposition, as I said. I ask the members to vote against this bill. Thank you.

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

Representative **TWOMEY**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I was not going to rise to speak on this, but I was asked to, so I will. I rise in support of this legislation. No one has spoken more eloquently for the people's veto seeing that I have been out on those streets having circulated petitions time and time again. I truly believe having sat in State and Local Government Committee and listening to all the points of view and talking to my town office and my city clerk that this a good idea. It will save money. I am not always one for saving money for democracy because sometimes democracy costs money. I truly, truly believe this is not going to impede in anyone's democratic rights. I truly believe this is good legislation. I would not ask you to follow my light. I would ask you to shine your own light on this. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Bridgton, Representative Waterhouse.

Representative **WATERHOUSE**: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I will be very brief. I have heard a lot of comments. I will refer back to the original speaker, if it isn't broken, don't try to fix it. It is interesting that in the Constitution, the way it was set up, I am sure the people who put the language in the Constitution knew there was going to be an extra cost to having these elections at a separate time than the general election or the primary. The thing you really have to reflect back to the original speaker is how many times does this happen and how expensive is it? Who is asking to have it changed? Is it the citizens who initiate these people's vetoes and is it a daunting task? Have they run up here or have they come to your door and said to you that they don't like the way it is set up, we wish you would make it easier or we wish you would put it on a general election time frame or a primary? The other question you would have to ask is if the election recently on the people's veto had gone a different direction, would we have this issue before us? It is my gut feeling that we would not.

The citizen's veto is very special thing to me. I really get inspired by people's vetoes because it is the people who come out and say we don't like what you did. We feel so strongly about it that we are going to make this tremendous Herculean effort to overturn what you did. I see no need to change it. The argument that we don't get enough people out to vote on these things is a bogus argument. After all, we have a group of people here that feel so strongly about what we did, that they went out and did that hard work and got this initiative started. They got the signatures for it. If we feel opposite from what they feel, then we can get off our couch or wherever we are and go down

and vote. The idea that not enough people vote on these things is a really bogus argument. I urge you to not accept the pending motion. Thank you.

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

Representative **TUTTLE**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I will be brief. The good gentleman from Bridgton, Representative Waterhouse, does make good points as he always does. The question he asked, if the people's veto would have gone the other way would this issue still have been here? Having been one of those that supported the veto, I would guess that that issue would be before us Mr. Speaker. I would just reiterate that in 1988 municipalities spent over \$350 to hold a February 10th special election. The cost of the people's veto would have been absorbed in cost if we would have held it in the general election.

Second, with any special election held outside the regular scheduled elections, in my opinion, having a general election for a decision or in a primary to vote should have been held in a time when a broader electorate is convened. It is for that reason that I would ask that you would support the bill and it will eliminate the costs of unscheduled budget decisions as well as preserve, I think, the best interest of all Maine citizens by holding these important veto elections when a larger percentage of the registered voters are available and accustomed to vote, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is acceptance of the Committee Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 49

YEA - Andrews, Bagley, Baker, Belanger, Berry RL, Bolduc, Bowles, Brennan, Brooks, Bruno, Bryant, Bull, Cameron, Chick, Chizmar, Colwell, Cote, Cowger, Davidson, Dudley, Dugay, Duncan, Dunlap, Duplessie, Fisher, Frechette, Fuller, Gagne, Gagnon, Gillis, Goodwin, Gooley, Green, Hatch, Heidrich, Honey, Jacobs, Jodrey, Kane, Labrecque, LaVerdiere, Lemoine, Mailhot, Martin, Mayo, McDonough, McGlocklin, McKee, McKenney, Mitchell, Murphy T, Muse, Norbert, O'Neil, Perry, Pieh, Povich, Powers, Quint, Richard, Richardson E, Richardson J, Rines, Samson, Sanborn, Savage C, Savage W, Saxl JW, Saxl MV, Schneider, Sherman, Shiah, Stanley, Stanwood, Stevens, Sullivan, Tessier, Townsend, Tripp, True, Tuttle, Twomey, Usher, Volenik, Watson, Wheeler GJ, Williams, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Ahearne, Berry DP, Buck, Bumps, Campbell, Carr, Cianchette, Clark, Clough, Collins, Cross, Daigle, Davis, Desmond, Etnier, Foster, Gerry, Glynn, Jones, Joy, Kasprzak, Kneeland, Lemont, Lovett, MacDougall, Mack, Madore, Marvin, Matthews, McNeil, Mendros, Murphy E, Nass, Nutting, O'Brien, O'Neal, Peavey, Perkins, Pinkham, Plowman, Rosen, Shields, Sirois, Skoglund, Snowe-Mello, Stedman, Thompson, Tobin J, Tracy, Trahan, Treadwell, Waterhouse, Wheeler EM, Winsor.

ABSENT - Bouffard, Bragdon, Jabar, Lindahl, McAlevy, Shorey, Tobin D, Weston.

Yes, 88; No, 54; Absent, 8; Excused, 0.

88 having voted in the affirmative and 54 voted in the negative, with 8 being absent, the **COMMITTEE REPORT** was **ACCEPTED**.

The **RESOLUTION** was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (S-24)** was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED**.

Under suspension of the rules the RESOLUTION was given its **SECOND READING** without **REFERENCE** to the Committee on **Bills in the Second Reading**.

Under further suspension of the rules the RESOLUTION was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-24)** in concurrence.

The following item was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

ENACTORS
Emergency Measure

An Act to Clarify the Authority of the Maine Milk Commission

(S.P. 451) (L.D. 1326)
(C. "A" S-32)

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. 137 voted in favor of the same and 1 against, and accordingly the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate. **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH.**

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH.**

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Lebanon, Representative Chick who wishes to address the House on the record.

Representative **CHICK**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I will only say briefly that my part in political matters started in 1949 when I was elected to a school committee position. Beginning at that time and continued to date, I have always found that I could work with committee members or

whomever without hatred. During this time, Muriel and I would talk about situations that I would be facing on whatever my activity was at the time. This was something that we shared jointly. When I came here to the House, which I want to direct my remarks about this afternoon, she met many people and had many enjoyable discussions with you people and others that are not here now.

One of the things that I am proud to say is she had high principles. In coming here with me, she didn't know or consider that there were lines of division down the center aisle or in the offices here in the State House building. She and I would discuss bills that were coming up and she did right up until a few days ago when she was able to talk about things that she is interested in. This winter as many of you are aware and present on a cold winter night out at the Civic Center she listened and when we had a chance to talk, I realized her concern for the promise of the future. The last time that she attended a function with me was in Brunswick and she, at that time, didn't feel very well, but she wanted to know and she said to one of the other daughters the other day that probably these two functions would be the last that she would be able to attend. I would want everyone here in this body and within the sound of my voice in the offices in the State House to know that my family and I wish to have you know how much we appreciate everything you have done and said. That is another item that Muriel and I always talked about. I criticize no one for writing letters or sending cards. We used to do it and she'd send lots of cards, but we both believe it was important to tell someone how we felt. That is what I have attempted to do here this afternoon and I would thank you for listening.

On motion of Representative CHICK of Lebanon, the House adjourned at 1:04 p.m., until 9:00 a.m., Wednesday, March 31, 1999 in honor and lasting tribute to Muriel Chick, of Lebanon, Representative Albert P. Gamache, of Lewiston, and Maynard F. Marsh.