

# 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 Sixth  
Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

**Volume II**

**April 23, 1973 to June 5, 1973**

KENNEBEC JOURNAL  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

WHEREAS, the week of May 6th through the 12th has been set aside and designated nationally as the 59th annual "Be Kind to Animals Week" in order to stimulate and revive humane thoughts and to encourage year-round kindness to all animal life; now, therefore, be it

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Members of the 106th Legislature join together on this occasion in calling public attention to the need for continued improvement in treatment of all animals, domestic and wild, and in commending those in the animal protective movement who have faced the world of wild and domesticated animals in a responsible manner; and be it further

ORDERED, that a suitable copy of this Order be forwarded to the Governor and the Department of Agriculture in token of our support. (H. P. 1487)

(On motion of Mr. Simpson of Standish, tabled pending passage and tomorrow assigned.)

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

Mr. NORRIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would inquire if the House is in possession of Senate Paper 79, L. D. 196, Bill "An Act Relating to the Use of Studded Tires on Motor Vehicles?"

The SPEAKER: The Chair would answer the gentleman that the House is in possession of L. D. 196.

Mr. NORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I would now move that the House reconsider its action whereby it adhered yesterday.

On motion of Mr. Simpson of Standish, tabled pending reconsideration and specially assigned for Thursday, May 10.

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

Bill "An Act Increasing Minimum Wages" (H. P. 91) (L. D. 112) (C. "A" H-318)

Tabled — May 4, by Mr. Simpson of Standish.

Pending — Motion by Mr. Brown of Augusta to accept the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Saco, Mr. Hobbins.

Mr. HOBBS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I urge you not to accept the motion made by the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Brown.

For those who served in the 105th Legislature, you may recall that a compromise bill calling for a minimum wage of \$1.80 was enacted. As you know, the cost of living has gone up greatly in the past two years despite the efforts of the Nixon Administration.

Organized labor has provided working people with cost of living raises that has helped keep the man or woman on the street above the inflationary level. But I ask you, who is going to represent the one that is not organized, the individual who is a laborer and isn't organized? This individual doesn't have union officials. He or she can't bargain and he or she is sometimes at the mercy of his employer. Who does this person look to? What can this person do? We are the ones, ladies and gentlemen of the House, who are supposed to be representing this unrepresented individual.

At this point in history, just about everyone recognizes that we have a highly sophisticated and integrated society and economy. The welfare of each of us is dependent on the welfare of others.

I think we learned from the Great Depression that we cannot have consumption without income and that we cannot have income without consumption.

The Fair Labor Standards Act was introduced as a measure to fight the depression, and it worked. The increased incomes of working people allowed them to purchase more and in purchasing more, created new jobs and with new jobs came renewed prosperity.

Now, all of this is regarded as an elementary principle in our economy. It is not a revolutionary idea, for it was present in the 30's, as many of you probably can remember. It is an idea held by

labor, business, and consumers alike.

This bill does not challenge or tamper with the principle of the interrelation of income and consumption for all. It simply updates the laws that make the principle a practical reality.

I do not have to outline for this House the causes for inflation. The war in Viet Nam and present federal deficits have created demands in excess of supply which has eroded the value of the dollar. Nor do I have to outline the consequences a lower real wage means for the Maine family living at the minimum wage. For many, going on welfare becomes financially more sensible.

In any case, a 40-hour work week means a gross pay of \$72, and that \$72 does not represent the purchasing power that this amount had when we passed our previous minimum wage. So, if we increase the minimum wage 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 doing nothing but catch up. It does nothing to let these individuals get ahead.

If we cannot provide for our people with a minimum of this type, how can we really, as legislators, expect children in our state to aspire to be normal, productive Maine citizens when they see their parents working but still not earning enough money to meet the minimum needs of their families. Certainly, a minimum wage must be set that allows a worker some dignity in his work and in the life he leads, a wage that shows his or her children that it is worthwhile to work for a wage that is a real alternative to idleness and welfare.

I sincerely hope that each and everyone of you, as members of this distinguished body, will weigh the merits of this crucial bill before you, and I hope your decision will be a just one for the people of Maine.

When the vote is taken, Mr. Speaker, I request the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill is one of several on minimum wage which we have in the committee. At the present time, I understand that we are ahead of the federal government in the minimum wage structure. We are also one of the highest in the country as far as individual states are concerned.

As a practical matter, another approach has been taken to this minimum wage problem in which we felt it better that — or at least many of us did — that this minimum wage for the State of Maine float with whatever the federal minimum wage might be. These other bills are still to come out of committee. Some of them have been acted on, some have not. But this is the reason why this one has been turned by a majority of the committee and the report was "ought not to pass." I hope you will go along with the motion.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In 1959 when I was in the other body, I sponsored the first minimum wage law bill in this state. It was for a dollar at a time when many employees throughout the state were receiving approximately 40 cents an hour. This particular piece of legislation did become a party issue. The Democrats wanted to start at \$1.25 an hour against our dollar when we had no law at all.

In the other body it was debated and debated at length. I was accused of being stingy, mean and a regular Simon Legree. At one point, and I feel I can quote this because it is in the record for eternity, one man over there stated, "Senator Ross was so tight that he wouldn't even buy his wife a Playtex girdle." By the way, that made my wife angrier than it made me, because she was sure it was only meant as a derogatory comment on her figure.

Since then we went to \$1.40, \$1.60, and we are now at \$1.80.

When this last increase was passed, we said that we would follow the national trend but not in excess of \$2.00. We all realize what has happened to the cost of living in the last two years.

I now feel that \$2.00 is fair with a maximum of \$2.25 as is in the present bill. But there is a committee amendment to set this limit at \$3.00. This, I feel may come eventually, but it is now premature. But so we can discuss the amendment, I hope you vote against the "ought not to pass" report so you can vote for the bill, and then we can discuss the amendment separately.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Saco, Mr. Hobbins.

Mr. HOBBS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Point of clarification, could the clerk read the committee reports.

Thereupon, the Clerk read the Committee Reports.

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

Mr. McNALLY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I feel that I must perhaps do a little explaining why I voted with the minority, which was 7 to 6 coming out of committee. We are already among the first eight highest states on minimum wage, and I felt that if we went faster than the federal government did, it would hurt our obtaining industries in here, which the Lord knows we need very badly.

I received a letter when I came back this Monday which pretty much goes along with my thinking. This is from the Maine Merchants Association. It says, "The members of this association respectfully request that you support the acceptance of the minority report of the Labor Committee when L.D. 112 is removed from the Table Tuesday, May 8. We strongly feel that Maine should not continue to be placed in the uncompetitive position of having a bigger minimum wage than its neighboring states." And that is true, we do. "We do support L.D. 911 which you will be considering later on in the session and which proposes

that Maine's minimum wage should be tied to the federal level"

Now, the reason that I like the 911 that they refer to is the fact that it has no umbrella over the top of it. The gentleman from Saco, Mr. Hobbins, bill, had an umbrella which said it shall stop at three dollars.

We know that the federal government has now as their Secretary of Labor the gentleman by the name of Mr. Brennan who is a union man. And there is no question but what we will have a higher minimum wage. There is no question but what it will be as high as the union people can make it. I think that as long as we go along with the federal rate, that we will not restrict the possibility of companies that desire to come here say, "We can't afford to come here because the State of Maine has such a high minimum wage."

That is the reason that I signed the minority report. I felt that it would be for the best interests to support a bill that had no umbrella over the top of it, and also that it would go along with whatever the federal government does.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Farley.

Mr. FARLEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The gentleman from Augusta mentioned being practical. I ask everybody in this House today how many of us can live on \$72 a week? I am talking about insurance for your children, rental, food, the cost of living today; \$72 a week for 40 hours is unreasonable. We need this \$2.00 minimum wage and I hope you will accept the majority "ought to pass" report.

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

Mr. FLYNN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I can concur with Mr McNally. I, too, am on the minority that signed.

Most of my mail on this L.D. has been very much adverse. They have as much as stated that they will either lay off people and get along with less amount or some of the small businesses might close their doors on account of it.

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have heard similar arguments pertaining to this bill the two previous sessions I have been here, that business will lay off, that they will not come in. These are the same arguments that we hear session after session.

Representative Ross said that this bill was premature and I am sure the members of this House that have served here before have heard these same remarks, that this type of legislation is premature.

I am very much against the report that Mr. Brown is asking this House to accept, and I hope that you vote against it.

Mr. Hobbins of Saco, was granted unanimous consent to speak a third time.

Mr. HOBBS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: If I may answer the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. McNally. We have another bill in committee, L.D. 911, and what this bill does, it has a ceiling of \$3.00 also. So I just hope that you would not take the comments of Mr. McNally as being true. What that bill entails is keeping the minimum wage at \$1.80 at present and does have a \$3.00 ceiling. I wanted to make that point clear.

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

Mr. MORTON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It seems to me futile for the State of Maine to attempt to be different from the federal law. We are always going to have to follow the federal law. It is very difficult for employers to keep leap-frogging from one to the other. I believe it is much wiser to tie-in with the timing of the federal regulation with regard to minimum wage.

Minimum wage laws are a good thing. They have brought the standard of living up. But it is not correct for the State of Maine to jump out in front of the federal statute, place the employers of the State of Maine at a disadvantage

for six months or a year. I certainly hope you will support the motion of Mr. Brown so we can get to L. D. 911 and tie-in with the federal statute.

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

Mr. McTEAGUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Like the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Kelleher, I have served here two sessions previously. I don't have the experience of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross. I must admit that I agree with Mr. Kelleher that the arguments in opposition to a fair and decent minimum wage have a distressing similarity to the arguments that we rejected in this legislature resoundingly two years ago.

We have the predictions from the prophets of gloom that the minimum wage of \$1.80 will cause all kinds of economic problems. It hasn't. We know that by experience. We know those arguments are fallacious; and they are not only wrong economically, but they are unjust, because the very simple fact is that \$1.80 an hour now is worth less than \$1.60 an hour was two or three years ago.

Consider the ladies of the house and the gentlemen that sometimes do the grocery shopping with their wives, the cost of a loaf of bread or a quart or half gallon of milk. Forget about the cost of meat for a minute and assume the people that make \$1.80 are lucky if they eat macaroni. But we know how the costs have gone up on those ends.

There is one other item I would like to raise. I remember in the 104th Legislature, which was characterized as the environmental legislature, that the then majority floorleader, the gentleman from Cumberland, Senator Richardson, made a statement along the lines there were certain type industries and certain type people that were most welcome here in the State of Maine, and there were other people that we were perhaps a little bit reserved in regard to our welcome for. If I recall correctly, he made a famous statement about a brass band at a bridge in Kittery.

We now have a new bridge in Kittery. And I would suggest the type people we want coming over that bridge and coming into Maine are industries that are good for the State of Maine, that recognize our people, that recognize our environment and treat both with respect.

I think it is particularly incumbent upon those legislators who have a fine record in the area of environment to vote in a positive fashion on a bill like this, because, you know, the only reason, at least as I see it, that environment is really important is not abstract. It is because environment affects people. No matter how free and clear the air is or how tall or green the trees, if you are making \$1.80 an hour, the environment does not seem too good to you.

It is not a matter of what competition should be with the State of Mississippi, if they can come up with \$1.20 or \$1.30 an hour minimum wage. We have people that are worth more than that, and industry will come to Maine not because they can buy us cheaper but because our people have skills and a dedication to their work.

The sweatshop industry will not even go to the State of Mississippi anymore, they go to Mexico and Hong Kong. We cannot win that battle. There is one battle we can win here today, that is the battle to be a little bit just. We are not giving anyone anything, we are only being just, and \$2.00 an hour with the high prices we have in 1973 is just a minimum of justice.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson.

Mr. SIMPSON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to address myself to the comments made by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Kelleher, and I am talking to you strictly as an individual. I personally favor minimum wage and I favor the \$2 minimum wage, but I also favor that the minimum wage go along with the federal requirements and that we are not a step ahead of the federal requirements.

We have heard in the past the arguments that jobs would be lost and this type of thing. In answer, and also part of an answer to the gentleman from Brunswick, I do not believe that you will find any real good industry coming into this state that would even consider paying just a minimum wage. I do believe that they realize that we have something to offer. As you meet and talk with businessmen out of the State of Maine, they will tell you that they can get a dead body, if it says that he came from Maine they will hire him because they will get more work out of him than they will get out of a person that comes from out of the state.

Let's take a look at the people that we are really affecting when we are talking about a minimum wage, because we are talking about the marginal worker, we are talking about the student and this is just exactly where the people in this state have taken work away and have cut it back and you are looking at one Mr. Kelleher. You're looking at a man who pays more than a minimum wage but when the cost of living and everything else based on a seasonal employment came to the point that we had to cut down on our services, we took six people right off our payroll. They are all students, because we just could not come up and meet the standards and meet the payroll cost and all the other requirements for taxes and everything else and make a profit on seasonal business. This is happening all over the State of Maine.

If you go and ask the students today about the amount of work that is available to them in the summertime, they will tell you that jobs now are hard to find in the State of Maine and for that one reason, that they have cut back, they have cut back on the hours. I have some people that I used to find work for so to make sure that they got 40 hours. I no longer do that. When their job is done at 9, 10, 11 o'clock in the morning, I let them go. Many other people do too.

These are the people you are talking about when we are talking about a minimum wage, it is the

marginal worker. I would hope that you would except the majority report "ought not to pass" and that we do take a look at the other bill when it comes along and we support that and put ourselves in the area of the federal standards.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is my fifth session and we are constantly saying let's not do this because the federal government is not going to do it, or let's do this because the federal government is requiring us to do it, or let's wait awhile and the federal government is going to do it for us. I think that argument has been so overused that now I just look at it and say if the federal government has got anything to do with it, let's just do what we want to do and let them worry about the consequences of what we are doing.

There is nothing that says that in the Constitution of this State and the Constitution of the United States that we ought to wait for the federal government to do anything or that we ought to have them shove anything down our throat which we disagree with, whether it is a minimum wage or whether it is an OSHA bill or anything else with which we are going to be dealing.

I think that the issue raised by the gentleman from Standish with reference to the marginal worker and the students are two issues which we ought to give consideration to. First of all, as far as the student is concerned, keep in mind that this law is the same as the past laws which has indicated that students will get the salary based on three-fourths of the minimum wage, provided that they are 18 years old and still in high school. If the cost of living and the cost of expenses have gone up for someone who's earning \$2 or ought to be earning \$2, the same is true of those people who are shortly going to be receiving their adulthood.

It seems to me that what we are in effect doing is simply saying

look, we would love to have you, provided that you would work for 75 cents, but if you do not work for 75 cents then do not bother me. I used to pay a \$1 an hour to mow my lawn and I am now paying \$2 and this happens to be a high school student. Maybe I am overpaying them in some people's opinions, but I believe that this is entirely proper. If I am going to be getting and expecting to receive \$2 an hour minimum wage, then I ought to be willing to pay it at the same time.

Now in reference to the marginal worker, the marginal worker's problem is not as much the fact that he cannot earn what he is worth but the fact that he is not as well trained as he ought to be and that problem still lies upon our backs for failure to do the job of training these individuals to make them a productive member of society. I hope that we are going to help to resolve this this session. That is really the way to get to that problem, not by keeping the minimum wage that it is better for him to get on AFDC or aid to the disabled rather than making a minimum wage so that he can at least make a living.

Whatever we do to help them, to give them a desire to get off the issue of trying to get AFDC or AD then we are moving in the right direction. I know of people who if we had given them \$20 a week state money then it might have given them the pride and desire to earn the \$8 a week that they had and that they were making at the time and that they would not have bothered to try to force themselves upon the FDC roles of the state. If we want to solve that problem, then again I think a minimum wage is the proper way to do it.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Perhaps when I spoke before my aside remarks confused you and I did not make it clear exactly how I do stand. I am for the bill. I hope you vote against the "ought not to pass," and later we can discuss



the committee amendment which raises it to \$3.

It has been mentioned that there is another bill in line with the federal government. This original bill ties in with the federal government but up to a point of \$2.25.

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

Mr. HASKELL: Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I really had not planned to speak on this bill but the remarks of my friend, the assistant minority floor leader I cannot really let go unchallenged. He indicated that some of the economic consequences that were introduced in debate before have not materialized. This definitely is not true. Points that were made in debate the last time around on this are still valid.

First of all, minimum wage legislation, most competent economists recognize that unless they are applied with very sensible precision, you do have unfortunate effect in the economic climate and you also have unfortunate effects as far as the welfare situation in the state is concerned.

Now I will say very categorically that we have had unfortunate effects in the economic climate of the state. We have been engaged for the last ten years in the export of our labor intensive industries. You do not have to look any further than the shoe manufacturing industry to know that this is the case. We have had almost a wholesale exodus of manufacturing facilities out of the state and the percentage of the shoe manufacturing in the United States, more than a third of the capacity has now been exported.

We have a similar situation with respect to the labor intensive assembly of the electronic components. The labor intensive section of the electronics industry has been exported largely to the Orient and to Mexico.

Now with respect to its effect on welfare. Unless there is left a very substantial segment of your economy to accommodate marginal workers, you have the effect of creating a permanent class of

people on welfare. You do not have to look any further than the dollar figures on the welfare costs of the state to realize that some effect is taking place in a period of rising economy that we have a constantly increasing welfare load. Just within the last week we have had communication from the Governor that the cuts that he had made in his budget for aid to dependent children would have to be restored because there has not been a reduction as had been anticipated.

The cuts are going to have to be restored. This is a substantial item running, as I recall it, somewhere in eight or nine hundred thousand dollars.

So when minimum wage legislation is passed, you have to pass it with full knowledge that unless you leave widespread exemptions you are going to compound your welfare problem and the sensible course, in my view, is exactly the course that has been recommended this morning to defeat this piece of legislation and tie minimum wage legislation in with federal standards so that the manufacturers in the state are not at a disadvantage costwise and so that your total business community is not at a disadvantage costwise. You should recognize that this type of legislation has to be handled with precision otherwise you do as much harm as you do good.

There is another argument which has been advanced this morning, that an individual can not live and support a family. The thing that is very widely overlooked is that substantially more than half the family units in this or in all of the states, there are two wage earners. The percentage is well in the excess of half, so in reality what you are considering on low income is the fact that in most cases you have two wage earners and not a single wage earner.

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

Mr. McNALLY: I rise to ask a question through the Chair from anyone that cares to answer. Has L. D. 911 been redrafted or amended? If it has an umbrella

of \$3 over it, I apologize to the entire legislature.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. McNally poses a question through the Chair to anyone who may answer if he wishes.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Saco, Mr. Hobbins.

Mr. HOBBS: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: In reference to that question, yes, in committee it was amended for a \$3 ceiling on the bill.

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

Mr. FARNUM: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House I rise in opposition to this bill and I would be the last one to ever say that \$1.80, \$2.00 or \$2.25 an hour is a high wage.

I would like to point out to the gentleman from Saco, Mr. Hobbins, who quoted from the great results obtained in the 1938 passage of the First Fair Labor Standards Act, which at the time called for 25 cents an hour, time and a half under 44 hours, and sir I was one of the beetles that went around enforcing that law. It did not change the economic picture of the country one iota. What changed the economic picture of the country was a war in Europe that started in 1939 and we had to supply them until that time when we were embaggled into the war.

I would like to call your attention to this one fact, that as far as industrial workers go, and these other people who produce wealth and all the rest of us live on top of them. There has been a decline in the number of industrial workers in Maine, if you want to look at the 1965 statistics and look at the 1971 statistics. Now, no industry wants to come into Maine with a low rate. But what does happen, many of these industries are piecework rates, and a pieceworker often has to be trained for weeks and weeks and months at a time. Even paying them 1.80 an hour, they are not earning their production. They may be working alongside another worker on the same type of work who is qualified, has experience and that same worker

may have no trouble at all earning \$3 an hour.

We are rather ridiculous to lead with our chin ahead of the rest of the country. There are 48 states all looking for industry. We have a Department of Economic Development or Commerce and Industry that spends a million dollars a year of state money trying to get industry into the state, and they also have had barrels of federal money. Now, you can't get people into the state when you put a roadblock in front of them to start with. If you are really thinking of encouraging industry in the state, stick along and wait until the federal law goes into effect and then we are all the same.

It has been pointed out that this would help get a lot of people off relief and whatnot. I heard that argument in 1938, and I am still hearing the same argument when the rate has gone from 25 cents to 1.80 an hour. So it accomplishes nothing. I urge you to vote against this bill.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The gentleman from Hampden has just about covered what I was going to say except that I want to elaborate a little about the gloom that has been spoken of here in the last raise. Obviously, it costs different to live in the city than it does in the small towns where I come from. This is very obvious.

When we raise the wages, we drive out these marginal industries and probably should, but they are working in wood products, making wooden bowls and making fence stakes, cedar fence stakes and cedar fencing. It did put a lot of them on relief in my area. I was trying to figure out as near as I could, but in the immediate area that I represent, I know of approximately forty families give or take one or two. Now they had a job before. They had a choice to work making bowls, so much a bowl or working for the minimum wage. Some of them

were old or lame or lived alone or had a small family or just a man and his wife and farmed a little. They chose to work for the minimum wage rather than work on piecework. When we increase the minimum wage, we just drive out more of these little marginal industries in the area. Therefore, we increase the welfare load.

I agree that people should have \$2 an hour probably. But what I have noticed is that when they were making the minimum wage before and they were living quite comfortably and now after we closed the industry that I mentioned, namely the wood outfit that makes maybe toothpicks or what have you out of wood, then they were on relief and they are living on less money and they seem to be happier and now they do not want to get off relief. In other words, you would have to give them an \$8 job now to get them off relief.

The big industry in our area, the paper mills, do all pay more than the minimum wage and my thought in this matter is before we drive out any more from the area and put any more on relief, that we try to go along with federal standards. I think it is reasonable to these people who are making these marginal items like fence rails and fence stakes, wooden bowls out of wood, they have to put them on the market and be competitive and they cannot do it from this area if they are to compete with Georgia and some of the states where the wood even grows faster and their wood procurement, I understand, is even cheaper.

We have a choice, to put more on relief; and you have got to bear in mind that even rents in this city cost two or three times more than they do where I live. Food is much more expensive because they raise a lot of their own food. I think those areas like where I come from. There must be others in the state.

I hope that we will eventually go along with the federal regulations, and I probably do not think that \$2 an hour is too much.

It won't drive out any that haven't already been driven out. I would say that the federal is going to take care of it, in my opinion, anyway; and if you run much beyond that now, you will certainly drive out a few more and put a few more on relief.

The point that I want to make, you say they can't live on the now existing wages, they seem to be getting along; and if you take that away from them and they go on relief, they are going to live on even less and still seem to be happy.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson.

Mr. SIMPSON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to just bring out one quick point to you that hasn't been brought out yet, I don't believe. If we think that this bill is going to do a lot for us or the other one did, I would remind you that right now the unemployment rate in this state is 50 percent higher than what it is nationally. It is well over 7½ percent right now.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Berwick, Mr. Goodwin.

Mr. GOODWIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to address myself briefly to a point that was brought out several times in the debate. For a year, I worked as a job developer, a job counsellor with the Maine Concentrated Employment Program, and my basic job was to try and find jobs for people who were marginal workers. This was in the York County area.

This talk about if we raise the minimum rate, we are going to force people on welfare or force them out of their jobs, I would like to talk a little bit about economics, and this is what I faced when I was trying to convince a person to go to work for \$1.80 an hour just to get started. It is not \$72 a week. You have to figure your taxes that are being taken out, your social security and everything else. For a person with a

wife and a kid, it comes to around \$65. And if he is going to pay transportation to and from work, it can bring it down to \$60. If it is a woman on A.F.D.C., and you are trying to get her off the welfare rolls, say she has a kid. She starts at 65. She has to pay for a babysitter. That knocks about 20 more off a week, transportation. You are really talking \$1.80 an hour, you are talking around \$50 or so a week clear. This is the purchasing power. I feel that we should go along and raise this minimum wage. At least it will help some. I do not think it is enough personally.

I would also like to bring up a point that as far as I am concerned and from my experiences — and I will probably get murdered on this statement — but I would rather see us keep out industry that is going to pay \$1.80 and \$2 an hour. Literally, when I tried to get people to go to work for \$1.80 or even \$2 an hour at a few places, they laughed at me because they can make more on unemployment and they can make more on AFDC, and I think the minimum of \$1.80 an hour is ridiculous.

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

Mr. McMAHON: Mr Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I will make this very brief. It seems to me that many of the businesses that come to this state take a lot more from it than they give. They pollute our water, they take our trees away in many cases and don't put them back. I would suggest that this is one way of encouraging them to contribute something to the people that do the work for them.

On a related issue, it seems to me that there is an imbalance in this state. I look around at government officials, not including the legislature, but mostly appointed government officials who make very high salaries. I look around at members of my profession, the school teachers, who make high salaries compared to the salaries that other working people make.

I suggest that this bill is a good way to begin to correct that imbalance.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Dunleavy.

Mr. DUNLEAVY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I will take about 15 seconds. If there is anything I want to remember when I look back at my legislative service, it is that I dedicated myself to the proposition that every Maine man and woman who works is entitled to a living wage. This legislation does that. I am for it and so are the great majority of working people in this state.

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

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I do not have the answers to all the problems, the wage problems. But I do have some facts. I have always been interested in history, and I think we have to study our facts a little more carefully.

In 1871, a hundred and twenty-two years ago, Governor Hubbard, then the governor of Maine who was being inaugurated, said, among other things, in his inaugural address, "We must do something to keep our young people in Maine. We must do something to develop industry." The census showed in 1850 that we had 600,000 people in the State of Maine. Here we are now, having gone through the greatest industrial revolution in history, and we are just breaking a million in population.

On a special Taxation Committee this last summer, we were trying to get facts. And I was very interested in trying to find out how many new industries we have got compared to how many industries we have lost. We didn't have any facts on that. I think another fact that should be researched is that fact. How many industries are we losing compared to the industries we are gaining?

I haven't got the answers. But I think we have got to be very careful, and try to get more industry here to stay in line at

least with the rest of the country as far as the minimum wage is concerned. Then, of course, you have got the problem of it is easier to go on welfare than it is to work. We have a problem here.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bethel, Mr. Willard.

Mr. WILLARD: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It has been my observation, having worked in industry, that the minimum wage is relative. When the minimum wage is raised, let us say 10 percent, everybody else gets a 10 percent raise in the factory, and that will happen all over the State of Maine. Then the doctors go up in their price, the lawyers go up in their price and everybody else, the teachers, they demand more wages and what have we got? We have more inflation. I guess that is all.

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 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 Augusta, Mr. Brown, that the House accept the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report on L. D. 112, Bill "An Act Increasing Minimum Wages." All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Baker, Birt, Bither, Bragdon, Briggs, Brown, Cameron, Cressey, Donaghy, Dunn, Dyar, Emery, D. F.; Farnham, Flynn, Gahagan, Garsoe, Hambleton, Haskell, Henley, Hoffses, Huber, Hunter, Immonen, Jackson, Kelley, Kelley, R. P.; Knight, Lewis, E.; Lewis, J.; Littlefield, Maddox, Maxwell, McCormick, McKernan, McNally, Merrill, Morton, Norris, Palmer, Parks, Perkins, Pratt, Rollins, Shaw, Simpson, L. E.; Sproul, Susi, Trask, Trumbull, Tyn-

dale, Walker, White, Willard, The Speaker.

NAY — Albert, Berry, G. W.; Berube, Binnette, Boudreau, Bragdon, Bustin, Carey, Carrier, Chick, Chonko, Churchill, Clark, Conley, Connolly, Cooney, Cottrell, Crommett, Curran, Dam, Davis, Deshaies, Donaghy, Drigotas, Dudley, Dunleavy, Farley, Farrington, Faucher, Fecteau, Ferris, Finemore, Fraser, Gauthier, Genest, Good, Goodwin, H.; Goodwin, K.; Hancock, Herrick, Hobbins, Jacques, Kauffman, Kelleher, Keyte, Kilroy, LaCharite, LaPointe, Lawry, LeBlanc, Lynch, Mahany, Martin, McHenry, McMahon, McTeague, Mills, Morin, L.; Morin, V.; Mulkern, Murchison, Murray, Najarian, Peterson, Pontbriand, Ricker, Rolde, Ross, Sheltra, Shute, Silverman, Smith, D. M.; Smith, S.; Soulas, Stillings, Talbot, Tanguay, Theriault, Tierney, Webber, Wheeler, Whitzell, Wood, M. E.

ABSENT — Ault, Berry, P. P.; Carter, Curtis, T. S., Jr. Evans, Greenlaw, Jalbert, MacLeod, O'Brien, Santoro, Strout.

Yes, 55; No, 84; Absent, 11.

The SPEAKER: Fifty-five having voted in the affirmative and eighty-four having voted in the negative, with eleven being absent, the motion does not prevail.

Thereupon, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted, the Bill read once and Committee Amendment "A" (H-318) was read by the Clerk.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: You heard me say that I was in favor of increasing minimum wages, but I think that at this time, although we probably eventually will go to \$3, I believe that it is premature to write this as our intention now. Already we are ahead of federal standards and I believe that we just should use caution. There is no telling what the federal government might do. They might go to \$2.50 right away and then go to \$3 and more but I think that we should stick with the original bill and stay with \$2.25,

and I move indefinite postponement of this amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, moves the indefinite postponement of Committee Amendment A. Is this the pleasure of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Saco, Mr. Hobbins.

Mr. HOBBSINS: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: If I may just bring up a point that the bill we have in committee L. D. 911 presented by the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Brown, does have a \$3 ceiling. So, in fact, if we do limit ourself by defeating this amendment, what we would be doing in his bill is defeating his amendment also. I would like to have a roll call on this.

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 Bath, Mr. Ross, that Committee Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Baker, Berry, G. W.; Birt, Boudreau, Bragdon, Brawn, Bunker, Cameron, Carey, Chick, Cottrell, Cressey, Curran, Dam, Davis, Deshaies, Donaghy, Dudley, Dunn, Dyar, Emerv, D. F.; Farnham, Farrington, Ferris, Fine-more, Fraser, Garsoe, Hamblen, Hancock, Haskell, Henley, Herrick, Huber, Hunter, Immonen, Jackson, Kelley, Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Knight, Lawry, Lewis, E.; Littlefield, Maddox, M c c o r m i c k, McNally, Merrill, Morton, Murchison, Palmer, Parks, Perkins, Pontbriand, Pratt, Rollins, Ross, Shaw, Shute, Simpson, L. E.; Smith, S.; Sproul, Stillings, Susi, T r a s k, Trumbull, Tyndale, Walker, White,

Willard, Wood, M. E.; The Speaker.

NAY — Albert, Berube, Binnette, Bither, Briggs, Brown, Bustin, Carrier, Carter, Chonko, Clark, Conley, Connolly, Cooney, Cote, Dow, Drigotas, Dunleavy, Farley, Faucher, Fecteau, Flynn, Gahagan, Gauthier, Genest, Good, Goodwin, H.; Goodwin, K.; Hobbins, Jacques, Kauffman, Kelleher, Kilroy, LaCharite, LaPointe, LeBlanc, Lewis, J.; Mahany, Martin, Maxwell, McHenry, M c K e r n a n, McMahon, McTeague, Mills, Morin, L.; Morin, V.; Mulkern, Murray, Najarian, Norris, Peterson, Ricker, Rolde, Sheltra, Silverman, Smith, D. M.; Soulas, Talbot, Tanguay, Theriault, Tierney, W e b b e r, Wheeler, Whitzell.

NAY — Ault, Berry, P. P.; Churchill, Crommett, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Evans, Greenlaw, Hoffses, Jalbert, MacLeod, O'Brien, Santoro, Strout.

Yes, 71; No, 66; Absent, 13.

The SPEAKER: Seventy-one having voted in the affirmative and sixty-six having voted in the negative, with thirteen being absent, the motion does prevail.

The Bill was assigned for second reading tomorrow.

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

Bill "An Act Preventing a Lien on Real Estate When Owner has Paid Contractor" (H. P. 828) (L. D. 1087)

Tabled - May 4, by Mr. Simpson of Standish.

Pending - Motion by Mr. Shute of Stockton Springs to accept Report C "ought to pass"

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bristol, Mr. Lewis.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would hope that the body here would not vote to accept report C. Report C is merely the original bill. We had it before us at one time. It was sent back to committee and now we get three reports back. In my estimation, if we accept report C we are leaving no recourse whatsoever to the lumber dealer or supplier of the products that are used in the building of a house. It would seem to