

# 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 Fifth*

*Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1971

KENNEBEC JOURNAL  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

would not shorten the day as it is the best hours of hunting.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Southport, Mr. Kelley.

Mr. KELLEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I stand to support the Majority Report of the committee. I would like to point out that this bill does not affect the morning hunting at all; the time would stay the same, one half hour before sunrise. We have for many years had on our books for birds, one half hour before sunrise until sunset. For game animals it has been one half hour before sunrise until one half hour after sunset.

The problem is that many people today are shooting at deer in the last few minutes of dusk, and sometimes it is deer and sometimes it is men. If it doesn't drop right there they don't bother to go down and try to track it in the woods and it is pathetic to find so many animals that have been wounded and lost because of the darkness and the inability of the hunters to pursue.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fort Kent, Mr. Bourgoin.

Mr. BOURGOIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to bring to your attention that two years from now maybe it would be cut in the morning too.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will order a vote. All in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lewin, to accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report in concurrence will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken. 65 having voted in the affirmative and 58 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

The Bill was read twice and tomorrow assigned.

#### Order Out of Order

Mr. Bernier of Westbrook presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that Donald Lampson and Allen Harris of Westbrook be appointed to serve as Honorary Pages for today.

The Order was received out of order by unanimous consent, read and passed.

#### Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Labor reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act Increasing Minimum Wages" (S. P. 16) (L. D. 44)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. TANOUS of Penobscot  
MARCOTTE of York  
LEVINE of Kennebec  
— of the Senate.  
Messrs. McTEAGUE of Brunswick  
GENEST of Waterville  
BEDARD of Saco  
SIMPSON of Millinocket  
KELLEY of Machias  
GOOD of Westfield  
BUSTIN of Augusta  
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought not to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mrs. LINCOLN of Bethel  
Messrs. ROLLINS of Dixfield  
LEE of Albion  
— of the House.

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "B".

In the House: Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westfield, Mr. Good.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Westfield, Mr. Good moves that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report in concurrence.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi.

Mr. SUSI: Mr. Speaker, I move that this item be tabled two days, please.

Whereupon, Mr. Ross of Bath moved that the matter be tabled until later in the day's session.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would inform the gentleman that the longer time has priority.

Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston then asked for a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi moves that this matter be tabled until Tuesday, April 27, pending the motion of the gentleman from Westfield, Mr. Good, that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report. A division has been requested on the tabling motion. All in favor of tabling will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

60 having voted in the affirmative and 67 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Albion, Mr. Lee.

Mr. LEE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a member of the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report I feel that I should say something about this. At a time when the economy of our state when almost every business is having trouble making ends meet, we are trying to practically drive the small businessman out of business at a time when the federal government, the President of the United States, and several distinguished Democratic senators have said that the increase of wages without increase in productivity has got to be curbed or inflation will keep on. I am against this bill and I hope that it doesn't pass.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I sponsored the first Minimum Wage bill in the State of Maine. This was in 1959 when I was a member of the other body. Prior to this workers in certain small businesses were receiving anywhere from 35 to 50 cents per hour. I felt that this was not only bad, but unfair and not humane. My bill at that time was a dollar.

Members of the other party wanted to start at \$1.25 and in all of my debates over there my opposition was formidable, headed by

Judge Alton Lessard, the former Judge Peter MacDonald, the very beloved and esteemed Senator from Lewiston, Jean Charles Boucher. During this debate one of these gentlemen remarked that the Republicans were so tight that the Senator from Sagadahoc, Senator Ross, wouldn't even buy his wife a new Playtex girdle. I only repeat that because that is already on the record of the Senate.

But to prove that we were not that tight, the last increase in the Minimum Wage law was also sponsored by a Republican who happened to be from Bath, the former Senator Ralph Brewer. I still am in favor of the conception of Minimum Wages if they are fair and equitable. The original bill would increase it from \$1.50 to \$2.00. The amended bill now says \$1.80. I feel this is justified and I wholeheartedly support the motion as presented.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I presented a \$2.00 Minimum Wage bill at this session. When I found out, too late, that the bill had been printed and found out that the chairman of the Labor Committee had already presented a measure that was a like measure but was different than mine. And I went to the committee and I told them that I would withdraw my measure in favor of and out of courtesy to the gentleman from East Millinocket, Senator Tanous. I felt that I wanted to do this because he had gone. I found out, before me to ask for the bill, and out of courtesy to him I did it, and I think that courtesy should extend itself incidentally into other areas probably go into the co-sponsorship and we would avoid duplication and save money thereby.

However, when I withdrew I also agreed to the \$1.80 Minimum Wage bill and certainly I did not disagree with the cost of the bill. I stand wholeheartedly behind the program. I certainly hope that the Majority Report "Ought to pass" does prevail. When the vote

is taken I hope it will be taken by the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Haskell.

Mr. HASKELL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Earlier in the session we had a bill before the Education Committee sponsored by the gentleman from Old Orchard, Mr. Farrington, that would have mandated the study of economics at the high school level. I was opposed to the bill because I am opposed to mandating courses at the high school level.

However, I think there might be some merit if we mandated a short course in economics for people who are trying to serve in the legislature. Because at a time when the principal and the overwhelming problem that faces our nation, is an inflationary phenomenon that is known as the cost push effect that this nation has not yet learned the technique of controlling, and when this same problem is present in all the advanced capitalistic countries of the world, and that this body would seriously entertain the measure that could only be compared to pouring gasoline on a fire that was out of control. It seems to me that a little better appreciation of the basic economics would be a very helpful thing. However, the total effect of an increase in the Minimum Wage in the State of Maine, certainly on a national scale, would be minimal. There is, however, an extremely important effect of Minimum Wage legislation that unfortunately is not well known and is not sufficiently appreciated.

A short while ago President Nixon appointed a task force to investigate the problems of our cities in relation to unemployment, the rapidly increasing welfare load, and appointed as the chairman of that task force Edward Banfield, who is the Urban Affairs professor at Harvard. Professor Banfield has written an extremely interesting book, the title of which is "The Unheavenly City," and he makes some very interesting points on the effects of Minimum Wage legislation in the field of welfare.

Now it must have occurred to all of you as you view the almost uncontrolled welfare problem that we have at both a state and a national level, that in the period of unprecedented job opportunities when our economic level was extremely high — and I am referring to the period of the 1960's, that in this period the number of people on welfare in this nation almost doubled, that there must be some causes that we didn't fully understand.

It is interesting to note that the chairman of this task force makes this statement: "The principal effect of Minimum Wage is to injure some of the lowest paid workers by forcing them into even lower paid occupations exempt from the act, one of which is unemployment." You don't have to look too far to recognize that the effect that we are producing by constantly and rapidly increasing our Minimum Wage, is to screen out of the labor market thousands of workers who are described as marginally productive workers.

These people have no alternative since they are effectively screened out of the market they have to become permanent welfare cases. And this is exactly what is happening in this state, it is exactly what is happening in all of the states across the nation. In an attempt to provide a reform by increasing the Minimum Wage we are in fact forcing into permanent welfare status thousands of our citizens.

We have an additional fact, which certainly isn't as important but is nevertheless significant—we are making it increasingly difficult for our youngsters of school age and those just beyond high school age to secure entry into the job market. I had some statistical material prepared for distribution in the House, but I had anticipated that this was not going to be debated this morning. But the statistical material which comes from the United States Department of Labor very clearly shows that the root cause of much of our juvenile delinquency, of many of the riots

that we have, characterized in our urban centers in the last few years, have as a very significant contributing cause, the passage of Minimum Wage legislation.

We have made it so difficult for teenagers, particularly those who have not finished their high school education, to secure employment, that we are in fact creating many of our juvenile delinquency problems by the passage of Minimum Wage legislation.

For these three reasons, I would think it extremely ill advised for this body at this juncture to attempt to lead the nation in establishing higher Minimum Wage levels. I think that by doing this we are simply adding immeasurably to our welfare problems, we are creating very severe difficulty for our youngsters, and we are creating extreme difficulty for many of our small employers in the state.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think that all of us are fully aware what this bill does. The time to debate it is now and the vote ought to be taken this morning. I don't think that the vote is going to change by more than two or three at any point during this session.

I would like to say a few comments about the remarks of the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Haskell. When we talk about legislators having to have a short course in economics, frankly I don't disagree with him. But I am sure that the gentleman is fully aware of the cost push effect in the other direction as well; and that is a very simple one. That most employers, and the very small employers are usually the ones involved, are the last ones to do anything about raising the Minimum Wage unless they are told to do so or unless they have to do so. And if you don't believe me, just go back to your home town and take a look at what some of the small employers are paying and you will

find that they are still paying the \$1.60 minimum.

I know that some people have made a great strive in trying to change this. Many small employers have done a good job. I am not criticizing all of them of course. I am telling you that the biggest abuse of low wages are caused by many of the people that we are trying to do something about this morning.

If any of you have tried to live on \$1.60 an hour for forty hours, then I think you know fully well what the Minimum Wage would do. And you may argue that anyone who was worth their salt is not going to get only \$1.60. Well, I remind you that some people are not going to pay a dime over what they are forced to do, and a dime over what they are forced to do means \$1.60.

I simply cannot believe that we are going to equate juvenile delinquency with the Minimum Wage. That we are going to equate that Maine ought not perhaps for one occasion lead the nation. Teenagers are not going to become juvenile delinquents just because they can't find a job. I am sure that the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Haskell, knows that juvenile delinquency starts a lot younger than eighteen. I am sure that the gentleman from Houlton is also aware that there are exemptions to the law on the books now and those are not being removed by this bill.

And perhaps for one occasion let Maine take the lead, and that is what the gentleman from Houlton says we might do this morning, and do the job to help the people that work in Maine. So I would hope that you would vote for acceptance of the Majority Report.

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

Mr. WHITSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think the statement was made earlier that all legislators should have a basic course in economics. I would submit to you that I have had this basic course; I majored in economics in colleges. And I would submit and concur with Mr. Martin's statement. I believe that this

Minimum Wage bill should pass and it has my wholehearted support.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. McNally.

Mr. McNALLY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am not speaking as a contractor this morning, because the contractors are not affected by this Minimum Wage. I don't think that anybody in this House that has ever paid as little as \$1.60 for several years now for labor. But I have been requested by two blueberry growers that support me in my county, who have warned me that this will be one more nail to their coffin as blueberry growers. They say that the only way that they will be able to come out of it will be to go into mechanical means for picking, which means that much less of employment. Never having owned an acre of blueberry land or ever worked in it or anything about it, I can only submit to you what the blueberry growers of Ellsworth have told me would happen to them.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. McTeague.

Mr. McTEAGUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Haskell, has told us about economics and about his philosophy of it. It seems to be that we are really dealing perhaps with a matter of philosophy rather than economics regarding our vote today. Or at least a matter of the philosophy of economics. There is the one view that I think Mr. Haskell has espoused which I would call the dribbled down view of prosperity. That is, if the rich get richer, some of us and many down at the lower end of the scale will get the droppings from their table. I think that is a view that has been well rejected by this state and by our nation.

The other view and the view which I think squares with modern economics is that in our mass consumption society we are all interdependent upon the welfare of each other. The butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker, all do better when the working

men and women in their town make a better wage. They have more to spend and the prosperity goes out to all of us.

The reason for the adjustment proposed—and the bill is \$2.00 and I understand it has been amended in the other body to go to \$1.80 and then \$2.00, is really not even a step ahead; it is just catching up, and catching up too late. We have had inflation for many reasons, primarily the war over the last five years or so. And this inflation has meant that the Minimum Wage, which was enacted at \$1.60 at the federal level some six or seven years ago, is now worth only about \$1.24. So if we increase our Minimum Wage to \$1.80, and then to \$2.00, we are really not increasing the number of loaves of bread or bottles of milk that people can buy with the Minimum Wage; we are just helping them catch up to what they lost due to inflation.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Norway, Mr. Henley.

Mr. HENLEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I certainly did not major in economics, but I think there is something in economics that anyone who has ever done business, large or small, should realize; and that is the matter of production. We all know that a small businessman cannot be pushed forever to pay a person more than he produces.

I talked to a labor leader — now this might surprise you, recently, and the labor leader came to me and he says, "I hope you do not vote the Minimum Wage." Now that may sound funny to some of you people, but it is true. Of course I will not name him. He says, "Well I have people working that are not possibly earning the Minimum Wage in factories," and he says "What happens? They have to pay it to them." If the factory — some of the factories have their own minimum wage, what happens is it has to be taken away from the others. Somebody has to pay this difference.

Now normally a good many cases, how many of us can go out and hire anybody at the Minimum Wage? I know I can't; I have had

to pay \$2.00 to \$2.50 an hour for labor, or anything of that sort. But there are a few instances and there are a few people who still will be glad to get along on \$1.60 an hour or \$1.50 an hour. They do not demand much of life. I can name probably 25 or 30 right in my town that they get all they want out of life, and the only difference would be if they got \$1.80 an hour they would buy a little bit more beer.

Now I agree with what Mr. Haskell said; he said it in a lot more technical way than I am able to do. But I still insist that we are just taking more and more steps towards complete socialism. If the government, our government, our state government and everyone else keep insisting that industry pay more and more Minimum Wage, they are taking away from a good many other areas where people would really earn it. Because there is only so much money you can squeeze out of a business. If you are going to pay an engineer \$15,000 a year, he has got to produce \$15,000 a year. If you are going to pay a workman in a factory \$5,000 a year, he is supposed to produce \$5,000 a year; or else soon money is going to be taken away from the engineer.

It seems to me that is sort of a rule of thumb economics. There is only so much money that comes out of a business. And this is all there is to it. So if you keep jacking up the Minimum Wage, what is going to happen? It is just going to hasten this socialism, which I call galloping socialism, and we are getting closer to it all the time.

I don't expect that my harangue is going to make any difference, but I have been asked by several small business people to oppose any further increase in the Minimum Wage at this time.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Bath, Mrs. Goodwin.

Mrs. GOODWIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think that perhaps we are still a long way from socialism and I would like to cite some statistics that might prove it. 1.6% of the population of this country owns 52% of the private wealth; they own 80% of all stock; they own

70% of all productive property; and they pay only 14% of the taxes. And we are standing here quibbling about 20 cents an hour for a man who makes only \$64.00 a week.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Haskell.

Mr. HASKELL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The usual argument that always appears in a discussion of Minimum Wage has appeared. The gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin, has confused it by saying that we would have to imagine trying to live on \$1.60 a week. Mr. Martin completely overlooks the fact that our society presently is characterized by the fact that the average family unit has more than one wage earner; and the fact that we are screening out the marginal workers from the labor market is the key point in this discussion.

There are and have always been in all societies people who are handicapped, either physically, mentally, by youth or by age. These people on the production lines or in a work situation in many cases cannot earn the minimum, and as we increase the minimums we deny them work opportunities. This can be documented. I just had distributed to you statistical material that has been assembled by the Department of Labor that very clearly shows the effects of an increase in the Minimum Wage on marginally productive workers.

When Mr. Martin attempts to argue that when the rate among the groups described in this graph goes from somewhere in the neighborhood of 4% to around one out of every four unemployed, and when he says that there is no relationship between this and a marked increase in riot activity and juvenile delinquency, he simply is not familiar with the facts of life. Because this is a factor and a very significant factor, and it is also a factor, and it cannot be successfully argued, that we are screening out of the labor market thousands of people.

These people are becoming permanent welfare charges and we cannot on the one hand vote for



a constantly increasing minimum hourly wage and then be perplexed as to why we have a tremendously, constantly increasing load of welfare cases. Because this is a factor. It has been documented by substantial authorities. It is going on. You can observe it from your own experience. It is a factor that I appreciate is not well understood. But just to make the point.

Historically it is extremely interesting that the very first Minimum Wage legislation that was proposed in the nation was proposed to effect a social reform. The first Minimum Wage legislation was proposed as a method of decreasing prostitution. And the success of that endeavor I think is about as successful as some of the social goals that are attached to Minimum Wage legislation currently.

We are trying to achieve social goals by Minimum Wage legislation and we continue along blithely ignorant of the unfortunate economic effects that we are having with Minimum Wage legislation. Now this state, of all the states, has been characterized industrially by industry that is described as labor intensive industry. I will cite an example—the shoe industry is labor intensive. A large part of the cost of the production of the shoe industry is the labor cost.

Nationally, as we have increased Minimum Wage legislation, more and more of the shoe production has been transferred from this country to foreign sources, to the point that this state and New England at large has lost literally thousands of production jobs in the shoe industry. One of the contributing factors is constantly increasing Minimum Wage legislation.

Now, granted, it would be desirable if we could replace these labor intensive industries with more sophisticated industry. To date we have not been able to do so. We are in a situation now that our men returning from Vietnam cannot find employment. There are hundreds and thousands of jobs in labor intensive industries in the state that have been eliminated by increasing Minimum Wage through legislation.

So when you look at this you have to look at it not only from the point of view of the desirable social effects that you are trying to achieve, you would have to look at it from the hard-headed economic effects that you are in fact having; and the economic effects that you are having is that you are constantly screening out of the labor market the very people that you are trying to help. You are making them permanent welfare cases.

We would be well advised in this body to reject this Minimum Wage legislation and all its amendments.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Morrell.

Mr. MORRELL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to rise in opposition to Mr. Haskell. I think it is important for you to get the viewpoint of a businessman, and not a big one. My feeling, and I have chatted with several other businessmen in my area, and they did not describe to me any real opposition to this bill at all.

Now I think when you talk about productivity, where you are talking on a production line, where you are talking in the higher pay scales, one has to be particularly concerned about that. But from our own experience I think it has been rather interesting that as you—and we are talking about people on the lower end of the wage scale, as you gradually get them up, I think experience from many businessmen has been that you in effect do increase their productivity.

It seems to me that I would have frankly been in favor of the bill before amendment — I am perhaps even more in favor of it now, but I think that you can cite all kinds of statistical evidence from elsewhere to point up the fact that the Minimum Wage does create some problems. I think every piece of legislation does. But if you balance everything, if you talk with small businessmen who are concerned about paying people properly and trying to get particularly those on the lower end of the wage scale up gradually and trying at the same time

through management skills to make them more productive, that a combination of these two is effective.

I would hope that you would vote in favor of this legislation. I think it is good. I think it is humane. I think it does improve productivity, and I submit to you that many thoughtful small and large businesses in this state are for this kind of legislation.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would certainly hope this morning that we don't get carried away from the issue of Minimum Wage from one to socialism, juvenile delinquency, and very lastly to prostitution. I hope that we manage to stick to the issue of Minimum Wage.

I certainly don't want to get into a verbal argument with my friend from Aroostook, but I would point out to you that this graph is seven years old. The last year on here is 1964. I would point out that dealing with white teenagers that the rate has gone from 8% in 1948 to 12% in 1964; but the problem is with the non-white teenagers having gone from 8% to 24%. And I am sure that the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Haskell, knows full well that the problem with the non-white is caused by a heck of a lot more than the problem dealing with Minimum Wage.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Drigotas.

Mr. DRIGOTAS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am always bothered by charts that come to us, and particularly one that comes from a good source — and namely, the statistics come from the Bureau of Labor. But I wonder if through the Chair Mr. Haskell can tell us who the Free Society is and who comprises its membership?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Drigotas, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Haskell and he may answer if he

chooses; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. HASKELL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: That chart that I distributed was included in Professor Banfield's book, "The Unheavenly City". I can't answer your question, I don't know who the Free Society is. This is an exhibit that Professor Banfield included in his material.

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

Mr. VINCENT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: For anyone that has made a minimum wage after they have taken out of his salary he can make more collecting Unemployment Compensation than he can make in a wage, and your Unemployment Compensation is not taxed. This is one reason that many people will stay on Unemployment and draw Unemployment Compensation instead of going to work.

Recently I had a friend returned from Vietnam who was collecting the Unemployment Compensation and this was where it was borne out the fact that he could collect more than making a minimum wage. So I would hope that you would support the increase in the Minimum Wage.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Mills.

Mr. MILLS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We have listened to all these statistics that have been given to us here. But the way I am seeing this is the low wages has made the unemployment we have across the state, which is so large.

Recently we just passed a bill extending 13 weeks of Unemployment Compensation, 50% federal money. This was an emergency thing for the state. We also have a bill before us that is going to change the quarters of earning power, which will affect my county very seriously in the fishing industry. Mechanization in my opinion has been the biggest cause of our unemployment.

This bill we have before us this morning has a lot of merit to it. It is a balanced bill and it is spaced out on time when these increases

will take effect. I think that it deserves passage.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Westfield, Mr. Good that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report on Bill "An Act Increasing Minimum Wages," Senate Paper 16, L. D. 44.

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 members desiring a roll call 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 Westfield, Mr. Good that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report in concurrence. If you are in favor of the Majority Report you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Albert, Bailey, Baker, Barnes, Bartlett, Bedard, Bernier, Berry, P. P.; Berube, Binnette, Birt, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Brawn, Brown, Bunker, Bustin, Call, Carey, Carrier, Carter, Churchill, Clark, Clemente, Collins, Conley, Cote, Cottrell, Curran, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Cyr, Dam, Doyle, Drigotas, Dudley, Dyar, Emery, D. F.; Emery, E. M.; Evans, Farrington, Faucher, Fecteau, Finemore, Fraser, Gagnon, Genest, Gill, Good, Goodwin, Hancock, Hawkens, Hayes, Herrick, Hewes, Hodgdon, Jalbert, Kelleher, Kelley, K. F.; Kelley, P. S.; Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Lawry, Lebel, Lewin, Lewis, Littlefield, Lizotte, Lucas, Lund, Lynch, MacLeod, Maddox, Mahany, Manchester, Marsh, Martin, McCloskey, McCormick, McKinnon, McTeague, Millett, Mills, Morrell, Murray, Norris, O'Brien, Parks, Pontbriand, R and, Rocheleau, Ross, Shute, Simpson, T. R.; Smith, E. H.; Starbird, Stillings, Susi, Tanguay, Theriault, Tyndale, Vincent, Webber, Wheeler, White, Whitson, Wood, M. E.

NAY — Ault, Berry, G. W.; Bith-  
er, Bragdon, Crosby, Cummings,

Curtis, A. P.; Hall, Hardy, Haskell, Henley, Immonen, Lee, Lincoln, Marsteller, McNally, Mosher, Page, Payson, Porter, Pratt, Rollins, Shaw, Simpson, L. E.; Trask, Wight, Williams, Wood, M. W.; Woodbury.

ABSENT — Cooney, Donaghy, Dow, Gauthier, Hanson, Jutras, Kilroy, Lessard, Orestis, Santoro, Scott, Sheltra, Silverman, Slane, Smith, D. M.

Yes, 106; No, 29; Absent, 15.

The SPEAKER: One hundred six having voted in the affirmative, twenty-nine in the negative, with fifteen being absent, the motion does prevail.

The Bill was given its two several readings.

Senate Amendment "B" (S-96) was read by the Clerk and adopted in concurrence, and the Bill assigned for third reading tomorrow.

#### Order Out of Order

Mrs. Berube of Lewiston presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, Laura Murray and Susan Marichal of Lewiston be appointed to serve as Honorary Pages for today.

The Order was received out of order by unanimous consent, read and passed.

#### Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Natural Resources reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Prohibiting the Landing of Supersonic Transport Planes in Maine" (S. P. 486) (L. D. 1456)

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. SCHULTEN of Sagadahoc  
— of the Senate.  
Messrs. AULT of Wayne  
MacLEOD of Bar Harbor  
HARDY of Hope  
Mrs. BROWN of York  
Messrs. HERRICK of Harmony  
CURRAN of Bangor  
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. GRAHAM of Cumberland  
VIOLETTE of Aroostook  
— of the Senate.