

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

1st Special Session

OF THE

*One Hundred and Sixth
Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

Volume II

MARCH 7, 1974 TO MARCH 29, 1974

Index

Legislative Ethics Committee Report

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Ault.

Mr. AULT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question to the gentleman from Lewiston and ask him his reasons for reconsideration.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Ault, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, who may answer if he wishes.

The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I stated for the purpose of an amendment. I said so in my remarks. I don't want the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Ault, to ask me what the amendment is, because I don't know.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Ault.

Mr. AULT: Mr. Speaker, I think that is the first time I ever heard the gentleman from Lewiston ever say he didn't know.

It appears to me the only amendment relating to this bill is on our desks as H-747. If this is the amendment that we are going to consider, I would ask the Speaker, since this bill pertains to municipal auditoriums, municipally owned buildings, and the proposed amendment pertains to licensed private clubs selling liquor to the public, I would ask the Speaker if this amendment is germane?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will rule on that at the time the amendment is offered.

Thereupon, Mr. Ault of Wayne requested a vote on the reconsideration motion.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that the House reconsider its action whereby L. D. 2553 was passed to be engrossed. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

28 having voted in the affirmative and 66 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

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

Bill "An Act to Increase the Minimum Wage," (H. P. 1801) (L. D. 2321) which

was tabled earlier in the day pending acceptance of any Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Garsoe.

Mr. GARSOE: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House accept Report C.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: That is the wrong report. I would ask you to vote against the pending motion and would ask for a roll call when the vote is taken and asked you to vote no.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Garsoe.

Mr. GARSOE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Report C is obviously "ought not to pass." Report B would raise the minimum wage to \$2, and Report A would raise the minimum wage to \$2.20.

Very briefly, I think we should be mindful here as we pass our laws that when we pass laws in this body that are in conflict with the laws of nature or the laws of economics, we sometimes have results that don't necessarily follow what the intent might be as we debate these subjects.

In the testimony offered in this matter before our committee, the chief concern seemed to be the humanitarian aspects of what we are doing for the low income people. I am not an economist and I am not going to suggest that anyone vote the way I do. I am going to accept the minority "ought not to pass" report, but I would ask us all to consider, as we cast our vote, the impact that the cost of wages has as it affects the profit of a company. I am sure that we are all aware that as the cost of doing business goes up, the cost of the product goes up, the profit generally being considered is a percentage of the cost of doing business, we find profits going up. I will ask you to add increased wages and increased profit and determine yourself what that does to prices? I would also like to ask you to consider who is the chief beneficiary in the region of the neck as prices tend to go up? It is the very people in whose name this action you are going to be asked to take, I know.

I submit that this does have a point of injuring the very people in whose name it is being proposed.

In this state we are currently running at \$1.90 minimum wage, which puts us in the top six states, counting the District of Columbia, in this field. So in addition to my reservations or my lack of knowledge as to what this is going to do to the low income person, I am also mindful of the fact that we can push our manufacturing people into a position of being forced to compete with still another disadvantage, as the cost of doing business is raised by this action that we are taking.

I know the argument will be made, no, it won't raise the cost of doing business because these people are so far down that they don't have that impact on the economy. Well, I submit that there is a chuckle-up theory that if this body should raise the minimum wage to \$2.20, that people in jobs now earning \$2 or \$2.20 are not going to look kindly on the new employee coming in and being paid the same amount.

I would just ask you to consider these factors as we vote on this matter today and suggest that we should have some sense of bringing Maine at least into step with the rest of the country in this matter.

One interesting statistic that has been brought out is that in the distribution system, distribution services that serve this state, that the average weekly hours worked in the last year dropped by an average of two hours. In other words, there is an average of two hours less per week being worked now than there was a year ago. I submit that this is one of the reactions that must follow if we continue to place the State of Maine increasingly out of step with the federal minimum wage. Last year we raised in this body the minimum wage from \$1.80 to \$2.00. It was finally maneuvered back to \$1.90 with the understanding in the language in the bill that when the Federal minimum wage catches up with us we will go along with it to a limit of \$3.00 an hour.

I suggest that, at least in this area, we will be meeting the problem if we can find our way clear to leave this bill, the minimum wage situation the way it is

now. We will at least be addressing ourselves to the problems that our industrial people in this State are finding themselves in, namely; of being placed at a disadvantage in competing with activities outside the State. I would recall the testimony last year when we were discussing this indicated that the increases in jobs we are having in the State are not productive jobs, they are service jobs. This is one of the fastest growing segments of our job market is in the service area. I submit that it is productive jobs that this state needs. And I would think that adopting the "C" report today might be of some small advantage to that segment.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to pose a question to the last speaker. I would like to know whether or not he would be willing to sell his labor at a rate of \$1.90 an hour or \$76 a week.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Connolly, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Garsoe, who may answer if he wishes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. GARSOE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I understand from testimony given here last year that we are doing just that right here in this body; that we don't qualify under the minimum wage.

Seriously, I suggest to my good friend from Portland that this isn't what I find to be the problem with approaching this situation. It is a humanitarian concern. And I don't want to take a back seat to anyone here in my concern for my fellow man. But I say this is an economic situation. And the minute that we start talking humanitarian good impulses we are doing a disservice to the very people in whose name we make these demands.

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hope that the House takes the position this afternoon of not supporting my seatmate's motion. If I can remember

correctly just a few weeks ago we passed a bill in here that would help industry to the point of, on tax exemptions, on new and used machinery, which was a very handsome amount of money. And I am not trying to use this as an argument supporting the minimum wage. That the lower the minimum the better it suits them. I am not one. And I think we should at least express a desire as far as the Labor Committee is concerned to consider the other two committee reports that are presently before us.

I would ask the House to vote against the motion. And I ask for the yeas and nays when we take that action.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dixfield, Mr. Rollins.

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hope you will vote against the motion this afternoon on report "C" so that we can go ahead and vote on the good part of this bill which is report "B".

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Town, Mr. Binnette.

Mr. BINNETTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I don't know, but my colleague here, Representative Garsoe, and I have been at odds on a good many occasions. Some of it, I think, was on a marginal line. But this one here, I don't believe that we are doing enough for our fellow man. I don't believe that this motion should be accepted. And I am very, very much in opposition to it because we have another amendment laying there before us that will increase the minimum wage. And, therefore, I certainly hope that you will not accept this motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore.

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I can't picture anyone standing in here asking labor to work for any less than \$2.00 or \$2.20 an hour.

The gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Garsoe, I don't believe he thinks so. I don't know why he is saying it. People try to live and exist with families on \$80 a week gross pay at \$2.20 an hour. I hope we never see the day that we are under what the Federal government allows. I

hope if they go to \$2.20 we go to \$2.20. I hope that if they go to \$2.50 that we go to \$2.50. I believe it is ridiculous to ask a person out here with families, and we have got plenty of them. I don't know about Cumberland County, but I know in Aroostook county that we have plenty of them that are working now for \$1.90 an hour, and they aren't living, they are existing. Their children are underprivileged. And the people who are staying off AFDC and these other programs. I hope today we can vote against this motion and get along with the motion for \$2.20 an hour minimum.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is not my intention to speak at length on this bill no more than I speak at length on any other measure.

Believe it or not my sister city of Lewiston, which is the second largest city in the state, which is 35 miles from Portland, the largest city in the state, has a differential of \$30 a week. The differential between Augusta, on average wage, and Lewiston is between \$20 and \$22 a week. Now for any of you who are about to press the button to indefinitely postpone this measure, I would like to have you join me as I go down very often in the morning to the Lewiston Public Works and watch people walking to work because they can't afford to drive to work, have people telling me thank God for food stamps because we couldn't live. Somewhere along the line these people that have a take home pay of \$68 or \$70 a week, if we look at some of the measures that we are putting here, I would remind the gentleman, Mr. Garsoe, that if it did pass it would raise us beyond the \$1.90 an hour. And I say that in all sincerity and all honesty. I certainly hope it could be possible that this bill here would not stay alive at \$2.20 an hour. Certainly, to think that the bill would be downed and it could remain at \$1.80, or on report "B" at \$1.90, would be accepted, would really and truly be a crying shame. I certainly hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone would not prevail so that we accept and keep this bill alive and accept report "A".

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Garsoe.

Mr. GARSOE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: To a point of information only. The last speaker indicated that the "Ought not to pass" report would reduce minimum wage to \$1.80. This isn't correct. It would leave the minimum wage where it is. Report "B" would raise it to \$2.00, and report "A" would raise it to \$2.20. I just wanted to correct that.

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

Mr. MORTON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: A question, is there any provision in this bill for the summer employment of students at less than the minimum?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Morton, poses a question through the Chair to anyone who may answer if he or she wishes.

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

Mr. McTEAGUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I introduced the bill originally and I would attempt to answer the question of the gentleman.

Although the various reports, in the case of the report we are speaking to now, report "C", retains the \$1.90 minimum. Another report, I believe it is report "A", takes \$2.20. And the middle report, report "B" takes \$2.00. But none of the reports change the student exemptions, so-called. The students work at three quarters. And I believe they do not change the overtime exemption in agriculture. The exemption in a special situation regarding students stays the same. Of course, if the minimum wage is increased generally, let's say from \$1.90 to \$2.20 the three-quarters wage paid to students would go up in proportion.

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 Chair recognizes the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Morton.

Mr. MORTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Another question if I may.

What is the comparison of what this bill will do with the Federal Minimum wage at the present time? In other words, report "C", of course, will leave it where it is. But if we happen to defeat report "C" and go to "A" or "B" how will they compare to the Federal Minimum Wage?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Morton, poses a question through the Chair to anyone who may answer if he or she wishes.

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

Mr. McTEAGUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As I understand from the newspaper reports, the Federal Congress has at this time again a minimum wage legislation pending before it. One body, I believe it is the Senate, the Federal Senate, has voted for a \$2.30 bill. I believe the Federal House has voted for a \$2.20 bill. I think the matter is either in or about to go to congress between the two bodies in the Federal Congress.

I would like to mention for the gentleman's information, too, that the Federal Minimum Wage and, therefore, in most cases the minimum wage of the people in Maine, went to \$1.60 in about January or February in 1967. I obtained figures from our State Legislative library regarding the degree of inflation, the Consumer Price Index in 1967, beginning of the year, until the end of 1973. The rate of inflation has been such that if the \$1.60 that people had in 1967 were to remain the same in terms of purchasing power it would be necessary to go to \$2.21.8. I mention this because I thought it might be of interest to some members of the House.

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

Mr. SIMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think there are a couple of points here I believe, first of all, that the Senate has approved a \$2.20 minimum wage in Congress and it is now before the House.

I remember very vividly during the regular session when the minimum wage bill came out that there was a lot of behind the scenes activity relative to the minimum wage in the state. And I felt at that time that we had bargained in good faith that we would put a ceiling limit on minimum wage to \$3.00, tied with the Federal bill. And then the second bill did just that. We came up with our minimum wage of \$1.90 and we tied it right directly into the Federal bill. And the arguments given to us in a good faith bargaining session was that we would not then be faced with minimum wage bills for a while, that we would ride right along with the Federal minimum wage which would put us way over and above most of the other states in the country. I guess that is the thing that troubles me right now; is the fact that when you bargain like this and you come through and compromise on a regular session, any bill, and then suddenly you are faced right here where we are right now with that compromise gone right down the drain and the bargain gone right down the drain in another issue right here before us.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: First of all, I propose a question to the gentleman, and he can answer when I'm through making my remarks. I would ask him to tell us who the compromise was with since it certainly was not with the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. McTeague, or myself; or, to my knowledge, most of the other people that I happen to know. I wasn't involved in that.

I do think that the point that is raised about whether or not there was a compromise arrived at a year ago or be it two years ago, that what has happened to our national economy has created a situation where people just can't survive. I think it's up to us to help them. The gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson, and I have gone to a number of vast Legislative Leaders Conferences together, and as he fully knows, what has happened is that there has been a tremendous increase of everyone's cost of living. I think it is time we make some

small attempt to try and help these people. And I think we can do it if we move the way we ought to be moving and increasing that rate. There is no question that everything else has gone up. And when some people are still taking home \$70.00 a week, then they are going to start looking for other ways to survive. I think it is up to us to try and help them and I ask you to vote "no".

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

Mr. SIMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would be delighted to answer the gentleman and also comment a little further, I guess, as I go along.

I don't think I have to go to Washington to realize that there has been a tremendous rise to the cost of living. I also would have to ask, what are the other forty-nine states doing that are suffering the same costs of living, if not maybe more than we are, when their minimum wage is also below ours. As far as a compromise goes, I think a lot of us were opposed to the minimum wage last time for many reasons. And, mainly, the compromise was worked out to the fact that we would support the particular bill that was before us, with the idea that this would not be coming back in a Regular Session. And maybe that is why the gentleman didn't have to be there because he supported the bill as it was.

I think we ought to consider a few other things in this State, and that's the fact we now have a State that depends very much upon, lets say, the marginal worker. We have an awful lot of summer employment we offer the young people in the State. And without that employment they, too, would also suffer. I very seriously doubt that there are too many people making a living in this State of \$2.00 an hour or get paid \$2.00 an hour out of industry. I realize that there is probably a few that are gouging the worker, etc., and I don't condone that a bit. But I think, when you look at the basic premise, the basic industry in this State, that they are paying well over a minimum wage. When you start talking about a minimum wage, you are talking about the marginal worker. You are talking about the student who was

brought up here a few minutes ago, and whether he is going to work in the summer or not. And in about a month, you are going to receive a copy of the report that will show that that marginal worker represents, especially a student worker, the seasonal type of employee, represents almost 8 percent of the total employment force in this State. These are the people you are going to see that are going to be hurt through this type of a situation. You are going to see guys that aren't going to hire these people, you will see the reduction. I say that we are doing more in this State right now to kill business and to hurt business than we are doing to help them. It is a two-way street. — If the employees in this State want better wages and better working conditions, then we as a Legislature ought to start to look at industry a little bit and start to help them and start to realize some of their problems. Some of these industries where some of these marginal workers are working, are just the ones who are going to go under and when they go under, they go on unemployment. Then what happens? Then you pick it up out of the other industry, the employer again, because his rates are going to increase. Employment compensation funds still has to be maintained. Somewhere along the line we better start and strike a balance and look at both ends and not just the lower end.

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

Mr. McTEAGUE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson, has talked about marginal workers in Maine. I guess there are some everywhere, but I don't think there are more in Maine than there are other places. I think there are fewer. If the argument is, that we have to be a low-wage type State, we have to sell our people and ourselves cheap, in order to get economic development, I suggest that the game can never be won. When Japan was at \$.90 an hour, Hong Kong went to \$.40, and when that came up, Thailand came in at \$.25. The way in which we can make our State more prosperous, on a permanent basis, is not

to down-grade ourselves into unskilled, sweat-shop-type occupations, but rather to attempt to attract into this State, industries that have a heavy capital investment and require skilled workers that pay a high rate. This is the reason that in this Legislature I have voted for bills that would remove the sales tax on capital equipment. Some people might think that vote was a gift to industry and maybe, in a sense, it was, but it was a gift to industry or a reduction in industries taxes on the basis that they would provide good, high-quality, high-wage, employment. We have, in some of our industries, in this State, for example, — in the paper industry and the shipbuilding industry, the best craftsmen and working men, not only in the United States, but in the world. We cannot win the game of paying the lowest wages in the world, and we shouldn't try. It morally smells, even thinking in that direction. We have an obligation here, not in behalf of people who are union people and who are organized and can bargain for their wages and who, on the average, probably make \$3.50 or \$5.00 or more an hour, but we have an obligation to represent those in our own towns who have no lobbyist behind them because they don't make the money, because they aren't organized to retain lobbyists. I fully respect the right of any industry to retain its lobbyist and to come here and try to persuade us by their logic. I think, in a sense, that we have a very special duty, as Representatives to the Legislature, as Representatives of the people in our towns, particularly to those who in a sense don't have the push, don't have the 'pizazz,' who don't have the political power, to speak for themselves, not to forge them ahead, not to create an increased standard of living for them, but, at least, to keep them at the same level.

I ask each of you to think back as to the cost of a loaf of bread, for example, in 1966 or 1967. And think of the cost of a loaf of bread today. Think of the cost of any of the essentials of life; fuel oil, gasoline for your cars so you can get to work. I would say to this House, and I would invite anyone who doubts it, to check with the State Legislative

Research Library, that in order to be the same, as a \$1.60 minimum wage in 1967, we need in excess of \$2.20 today. This is not going ahead; this is catch up. It might be a good idea if we could do it, if we could make the legislation retroactive and pay those people for what they haven't had in the past. Our minimum wage laws should probably have an inflation protection feature in it, so that each year, on an annual basis, adjust it just to keep up with inflation. Those of us who are fortunate, who are businessmen, who are professional men, and who are skilled working men, represented by unions, we are able to, even though it's difficult in these inflationary times, to protect ourselves. The people who are near the bottom of the heap can't do that. They have to rely on you and me.

The gentleman from Standish suggests that minimum wages or, wages down around \$2.00 or so an hour, are only paid, perhaps, in seasonal type industries. I ask each of you that has a particular type of industry in your town, and I have some in mine, and, like you, I know the people that work there, and they are kind enough and interested enough to tell me what they make. And I can tell you there are a lot of them that make a \$1.90 an hour. I am not talking about a sixteen year old student. I'm talking, in some cases, about fifty-five year old women or twenty-five year old men. When we set the minimum wage here, it's not a minimum wage, it's an actual wage for most of those people. Anyone who has the courage to continue to fight and struggle, and put in a 40 or more hour week, for the minimum wage, I truly respect. I think they deserve a little bit of help from us and this is our chance to give it to them today.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I thank the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Garsoe, for correcting me. The motion as I understand it now, is to accept Report C.

The SPEAKER: Correct.

Mr. JALBERT: I hope that it's soundly defeated. And I would like to

take this opportunity — all the time when I'm in my seat, I listen to the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. McTeague, speak because I like his delivery and I like the way he puts his point over. But he is talking about the Dark Ages today when he is talking about 1967.

I was conned into a shopping trip to the market about two weeks ago. Within the last year or year and a half, bread, potatoes, meat, why it doesn't go up by a cent or two cents a pound; it goes up by sixteen or eighteen or twenty cents a pound. I have one hang-up that most of you know that I have. I don't go out very much, but I kind of like to dress up a little bit. And would you believe that the type of suits I wear, have gone up \$75.00 in over the last year? Shirts have gone up \$2.00 to \$3.00 to \$5.00. Stockings about .50 cents, shoes, \$8.00 and \$10.00 jumps. We've spent so much time around here messing around with what we call an energy crisis that we've forgotten anything else. What is this energy crisis? I bet my oilman in front of my house, when the oil tank is down to a certain level, the same this year as I had last year, and I'm sure the vast majority, if not all of you, have had the same privilege. As far as gasoline is concerned, on one occasion I was told by an attendant, \$3.00 limit. I got \$3.00, turned right around and went back to the same pump and got \$3.00 more bananas and by then on my way, my tank was filled. That was the only occasion that that ever happened. The whole problem is this; that we spend so much time, in my opinion, on something that really doesn't make sense, and we have yet to really do something about it at this session that we have forgotten everything else. Just go into a clothing store, ask them how much was this three years ago? How much was this three years ago; how much was this three years ago. Go in and ask somebody how much a loaf of bread was three years ago? I am not objecting to the potato people. This is not the first time in years that they are starving; believe me, they are not starving. You see that row in front of me and they look nice and healthy. God love them.

I think, frankly, that we haven't done

anything in this Session, we have done a great deal but I think we go down one mark, a little bit, in my opinion, if we accept Report C. What are we arguing about, \$2.20 an hour to work in this day and age? \$2.20 an hour won't even buy you a hot turkey sandwich in a restaurant anymore. It used to go for 40 cents, and not too long ago. I'm not talking about 1967. I'm talking about last year and the year before. In many instances, commodities have doubled. I think we should soundly defeat the acceptance of Report C, and then Report A should be accepted.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Garsoe, that the House accept Report C on L. D. 2321. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Ault, Bither, Brown, Garsoe, Hamblen, Knight.

NAY — Albert, Baker, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Berube, Binnette, Birt, Boudreau, Brawn, Briggs, Bunker, Cameron, Carey, Carrier, Carter, Chick, Chonko, Churchill, Clark, Conley, Connolly, Cooney, Cote, Cottrell, Cresse, Crommett, Curran, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Dam, Deshaies, Donaghy, Dow, Drigotas, Dudley, Dunleavy, Dyar, Emery, D. F.; Evans, Farley, Farnham, Farrington, Faucher, Fecteau, Ferris, Finmore, Flynn, Fraser, Gahagan, Gauthier, Good, Goodwin, K.; Greenlaw, Hancock, Hobbins, Huber, Hunter, Jackson, Jacques, Jalbert, Kauffman, Kelleher, Kelley, Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Kilroy, LaPointe, Lawry, LeBlanc, Lewis, E.; Lewis, J.; Littlefield, Lynch, MacLeod, Maddox, Mahany, Martin, Maxwell, McCormick, McHenry, McKernan, McMahan, McTeague, Merrill, Mills, Morin, L.; Morin, V.; Morton, Mulkern, Murray, Najarian, Norris, O'Brien, Palmer, Parks, Perkins, Peterson, Ricker, Rolde, Rollins, Ross, Shaw, Shute, Silverman, Simpson, L. E.; Smith, D. M.; Smith, S.; Snowe, Soulas, Stillings, Strout, Susi, Talbot, Tanguay, Theriault, Tierney, Trumbull, Twitchell, Tyndale, Walker, Webber, Wheeler, Whitzell, Willard, Wood, M. E.; The Speaker.

ABSENT — Bragdon, Bustin, Davis, Dunn, Genest, Goodwin, H.; Herrick, Hoffses, Immonen, LaCharite, McNally, Murchison, Pontbriand, Pratt, Santoro, Sheltra, Sproul, Trask, White.

Yes, 6; No, 125; Absent, 9.

The SPEAKER: Six having voted in the affirmative and one hundred twenty-five in the negative, with nine being absent, the motion does not prevail.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dixfield, Mr. Rollins.

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I now move the acceptance of Report B.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Dixfield, Mr. Rollins, moves the acceptance of Report B.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker I would ask you to vote no, and when the vote is taken I ask for a roll call.

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

Mr. McTEAGUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The report now before you recommends the \$2 basic minimum wage in Maine, subject to the exemption in the student provision we talked about before. I must confess my error and perhaps even my sin in introducing a bill to the rate of \$2 an hour. I felt before this session started, as many of you did, that we needed an increase in the minimum wage, and I did want that increase to be a reasonable one.

I recalled that we had voted on a \$1.90 bill during the regular session and \$1.80 the year before, and I thought that perhaps the 10 cent increase would be reasonable. But between the time I introduced the bill, or at least between the time that was included in the gubernatorial call and the time of the public hearing on the bill, I had this opportunity to study the Bureau of Labor statistics and consumer price index, and as you can see by a little mathematics, a 10 cent increase on \$1.90 minimum wage is roughly a 5 cent increase. Of course we all know that we had about an 8 percent inflation, 8 percent plus inflation rate during calendar 1973, and I understand so far this year it is running at an annual

rate of 10 to 12 percent. When I saw these figures, and when I considered the year in which the federal minimum wage may change to a dollar sixty back in the mid or late sixties, I became convinced that \$2 was inadequate.

You might say that something is better than nothing. But if people get a 10 cent increase over a 40 hour week, that is a gross of \$4 and a net of \$3. I guess perhaps they can fill up their tanks just once at those stations that have the three-dollar limit, that the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, is talking about. But I would ask you, on this roll call, to reject the \$2 as being inadequate, and even though well intentioned, and I in no way challenge the intentions of the gentleman from Dixfield, Mr. Rollins, but as to be grossly inadequate. And perhaps even though well intended to be considered when you consider all the other costs involved, it is slap matter and insult to these people. I think we should keep them even, and \$2.20 doesn't quite do that, but it comes within a penny or two of it.

By the way, with the inflation that we are having now at the end of this year, in order to have a minimum wage given in January 1975 that is the equivalent of that dollar sixty we went to back in 1967, we probably would have to have about \$2.40 or \$2.45. I hope we have at least \$2.20 and therefore I ask you to vote against the pending motion.

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

Mr. TALBOT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I also would hope that you would vote against the pending motion. This morning on my way up, I stopped to fill my tank up. I have a Volkswagen bus camper. Last year I was filling that bus up with \$4.50. This morning I filled that tank up and it cost me \$7. That would concur with the comments of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that prices are going right out of sight.

But I think if we do a little arithmetic this morning, we will find out that \$2 an hour, that is a gross of \$80 a week. That is not take-home, because after taxes and whatnot, you are taking home little over \$70 a week. If you will just break that

down into four, which is four weeks in a month, you will find out that by the time you take out your rent, and I am just saying off hand that you have got an \$80 a month rent, and that is what I call very very reasonable, because it is very hard to find a rent for \$80, but that is \$20 a week out of your pay check right there.

I know I have four children, and my wife spends at least a minimum of \$50 a week for groceries. That is not counting the bread and the powdered milk she has to go to the store for throughout the week. So that runs up another fifty or sixty dollars. That is not taking into consideration groceries, gas, telephone bill, light bill, fuel bill. I think if you will add all of these up and do a little arithmetic, you will find out that a man making \$2 an hour now, by the time he pays for this during the week, he ends up in the minus at the end of that month paying back money.

It is very, very unreasonable and very very unrealistic for us to sit here and want to pass a bill for \$2 minimum wage. The comments of the gentleman from Standish, insofar as there are very few people in this state making the \$2 minimum wage, except students, I would disagree with him wholeheartedly, because there are a lot of people working in hospitals, a lot of people working as janitors, filling station operators, 55 years old, 35 years old, people with families, who are only making that minimum wage of \$1.90 an hour.

So I would sincerely hope that you would vote no on this pending motion so that we can accept Committee Report A.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dixfield, Mr. Rollins.

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I agree wholeheartedly with my friend from Portland, Mr. Talbot, but I have learned some of the facts here in the last day or two. We passed a bill Thursday or Friday in this House. It went to the unmentionable body and was soundly defeated. I think we have to consider this in this bill here, and I think we have to have something that does have a chance to go through both bodies, and I would hope that we would vote for Report A.

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

Mr. FARNHAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: One of my colleagues said, what are you getting up for. This isn't a liquor bill.

I would like to speak to one or two of the arguments that have been presented for the increase, and I do go along with the increase as stated in Committee Amendment "B" which would raise the minimum from \$1.90 to \$2 an hour.

The gentleman from Brunswick, in good faith, mentioned that the cost of living had gone up since the last minimum wage. The federal minimum wage was raised in 1967 to \$1.60, and he said to bring that same person up to what he should be in purchasing power, the minimum wage should go to \$2.21. Well I would agree that is true. If that same person that was on \$1.60 in 1967 is on \$1.60 today. If he is on \$1.60 today, after five or six years, there is something radically wrong with him. Because for the most part, in industry — and this was not true in the industry in which I worked for 30 years — their minimum rate was at least a dollar above this most of the time, so we were not affected. Most industries that are using a low rate are those in which there was a heavy turnover such as the shoe industry and the textile industry, and you bring people off the street that don't know a thing about the job and you do put them on a low rate, but it can't be below \$1.60, and I doubt now if any of the shoe factories or textile mills even try to bring them in at \$1.60. It seems to me, the last textile contract I saw for the Bates Mill, the minimum was \$1.80. But I won't stand as that being a fact.

These people for a few months are being trained by the employer. They are not earning 50 cents an hour the first few weeks. They are not earning a dollar an hour the second month, but generally, by the end of six months, they are well above that and they are usually on piece work basis and they are earning far more than \$1.60 an hour.

The gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. McTeague, also mentioned how big hearted he was when he voted to exempt new machinery from the sales tax. This,

of course, was an inducement to bring industry into the State of Maine. He is to be congratulated for once in his life for standing up and trying to bring industry to Maine. But at the same time now, he wants to increase the cost to an extent that they will not come to Maine.

I would point out to you that in the last four or five years there have been over 4,000 jobs lost in the Maine shoe industry. Where does the shoe industry go? Maybe I don't like it, but it goes where it can get the cheapest labor, and we have had a severe set-back in Maine in that effect. Again I would ask you, is a job at \$2 an hour not better than no job at all? Do we want to put everybody on relief? I think, and I know this is true of the Maine worker, he would rather work for \$2 an hour than be on relief, but when there are no jobs, he has no choice but to go on relief.

I urge you to seriously think this out. There is an economic factor involved.

I negotiated for years in a high paid industry. Some of those men today get \$6 an hour. You apply the same increase to them — and they will be after it, they are crazy if they aren't after it. My colleague down here, the assistant minority leader, sat across the table from me for years. He was one of the highest paid men in the mill in his classification. He is a highly skilled man. I am telling you, he expected this same increase as the lowest paid man when it came to percentages. So the \$6 an hour man goes up 96 cents an hour. What does that do to the cost of the goods he is producing? So you have just like a dog chasing his tail. The higher paid men will get an equivalent percentage increase. The cost of everything else goes up, and the fellow that is at the bottom will be worse off two years from now than he is today.

I urge you to accept Report B.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Dam.

Mr. DAM: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I can't sit here and let the remarks of my good friend, Mr. Farnham, go by without mentioning something about the shoe industry. He said, why do the shoe industries move around? Number one, let's put it this

way. Why did the industry come to Maine in the first place? What do we have when we have shoe industries in Maine? And I am speaking now for the majority of the shoe plants in the State of Maine.

We have what is known as runaway factories. They come into the State of Maine from other states, and we gained the most of ours from the neighboring state of Massachusetts because the wages there were higher than what was being paid in the State of Maine. And the reason they were higher there is because the people in Massachusetts have learned the art of collective bargaining. They, in other words, unionized. The plants that did not want to pay the wages moved into Maine and Maine welcomed them with open arms. This is not the industry we need in the State of Maine, a minimum wage industry. We do need a better industry than the shoe industry.

Mr. Farnham mentioned training, and I was very happy to hear him use the word training, because what the shoe industry does, they hire the people in at a training wage and they train them for six months. Let's say they train them as a single needle stitcher. After six months of producing on the training wage, they say, "Well, we think you will make a better two-needle stitcher." So they train him for six months on the two-needle stitcher. Well, maybe by that time they would be up to the unheard of — maybe they would be earning, if they were on piece rate and by that time they would be experienced and they would be going on piece rate, maybe they would be making \$2.30 or \$2.40 an hour, maybe even \$2.50. But boys that run the shoe shops are smart cookies. They are a lot smarter than a lot of us here. So they get together and they say, "Well, we are not going to move this lady up. Let's move her on the other side of the room and we will have her cementing linings. We will train her for six months more." Still they keep them down to the trainee wage.

The people in Maine associated with the shoe industry have not really learned the art of collective bargaining, because they are too easily intimidated; they are too easily scared. So the union moves in, they get their authorization cards signed, and if my memory serves me

correctly, to have an election it only takes 30 percent of the employees to sign the cards, so they petition for an election. Immediately these same shoe companies, they have been telling the workers right along they are just hanging on by the skin of their teeth, yet by their stockholder's report, it shows sometimes they are making a \$5 million net profit, and that is not hanging on by the skin of their teeth in my thinking. Of course, I am not as intelligent as the executives of the shoe industry, and I admit that. But they say, "All right, we are going to have the election."

First, they will fight it and then they realize they can't, and they come up with all kinds of gimmicks. In the meantime they rush back to Massachusetts or New York and they have hired a real expensive law firm to represent them, and it is nothing for them to spend two hundred fifty or three hundred thousand dollars to hire this law firm. These lawyers are smart cookies also. So they send up some of their boys into the area, and they sit down with management and they come up with all their little gimmicks. They put their bulletins on the bulletin board of how nice the company has been to the workers, and you want to remember that last Christmas we gave every worker a turkey. Of course, they don't say that for 20 years we have stolen your money so we can afford to give you the turkey. They don't say that.

The next thing they tell them, we have got a pension fund for you. We have got medical insurance for you. You don't need anybody to help you get more money because we're taking care of you. They sure are. The worker is contributing to the pension fund, he can put his money in a savings bank and get 5 percent, but the companies pay 3 percent so they use the employee money to expand their own company, and they buy this money at a ridiculously low rate of interest of 3 percent. Speaking factfully and not off the top of my head, the medical insurance policy that provides \$12 a day hospital expense, you can't even put a dog in a veterinary hospital for \$12 a day. I don't know where you can put any human being in this State for \$12 a day, whether you go way

up in the northern end of Somerset County, up in Carratunk or the Forks, or whatever, or you can go down the southern end of the state where I am not familiar, I don't know of any hospital that has this rate of \$12 a day.

This is the way we need to raise the minimum wage here, because of what is being done in the low paid industries. And going back to the intimidations, the day of the election times and all the shoe workers are gung-ho and they are ready to vote for the union because they are going to have someone speak for them, just like some of us are trying to speak for the workers now, and get them somewhat of a decent living wage and I don't say decent living wage, I say somewhat.

As these people go down to the polling places, the bosses walk along, they become the peoples' friend. They pat them on the back, "How are you this morning, Joe? How are you Mary? Remember, if you vote for the union, don't come in tomorrow, we'll close" They don't dare to vote for the union, because the word is passed down the line that if it's victory for the union, don't come in tomorrow morning. They don't put this in writing, they pass it word of mouth, and I don't care what industry it is. I've worked in a few, not too many. I worked prior to World War II for five weeks in a shoeshop and I realized that I could never own it so I quit. I worked for a woolen mill in Skowhegan and I came to the same conclusion and I quit. I know a little something about it. People in my family spent their whole life in the shoe shop practically. I've seen them work, seen the act of intimidation go on, and this is why we have to fight in the legislature to raise the minimum wage. Another strange thing, when attacks appear in the parking lots and employees have a flat tire, it is always the union or the workers management. Well, I can assure you people that management plays a big part in those little tactics.

If we could educate the people in this State to what collective bargaining was, we might not have to stand here every session and fight to hand out 10 or 15 cents to the workers in this State. They might be able to take care of themselves.

But as long as you have these high-paid boys from out-of-state, as long as you have these runaway gypsy industries coming in, and as long as you have agencies that welcome them with open arms, this is what we are going to have. I don't welcome that type of industry, and I am sure if we should pass the minimum wage today, and it was \$2.50 an hour, that neither one of the shoe shops, in my town are going to move out, because they have one good thing going and they are going to keep it going as long as they are there.

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

Mr. HOBBS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I won't take any more of your time but just want to mention one point. I know we have debated this matter in the regular session and here in the special session, but if you look at the amendment before you, which is House Report B, and it is amended by House Paper 745, Committee Amendment B, to this report. You will find that the effective date of the report we have before us, the debate right now is on October 15. I think many of you are under the impression that if we pass the \$2 minimum wage, you vote for this at the present time, that a person will be receiving the \$2 in three months. I think it was a very smart part, in fact, on the people who signed this report to put the date off until October 15. It is pretty sneaky and smart, I suppose.

If I may for one second tell you a story that happened to me last week, and it has probably happened to a lot of people who are supporting gubernatorial candidates, and who have the opportunity to go through mills, shoe shops and whatever with them. Last week I had the opportunity to go through one mill with a gubernatorial candidate, who I won't mention, you probably know who it is, but I won't mention it, and we went through and many ladies who work there came over to us. The candidate I am working for asked one of the women, "What are you making an hour?" The woman said, "\$2.00." He said, "Do you think you are worth more than that?" She said, "Your darn right I am worth more than that. How can I live on \$2.00 an hour?" We went on debating and she

said, "Isn't it about time for the legislature, you've been in session now for two months, to do something about the unorganized person, like myself, who doesn't have the benefit of going through a union?" And my candidate, of course, since the party he belongs to, said, "I think we should increase the minimum wage, like a good politician should, I suppose, but that is beside the point." If you saw what the woman looked like and you saw the clothes she had on, and she told you she had three kids who couldn't afford the price of milk because the way the milk prices are today, or she couldn't afford the price of gasoline or the price of the three room rent she had, with three kids, and the wife, you get to wondering — what are we doing up here? Isn't it our elected responsibility to represent this unorganized person? When you do vote today, I hope you will think about this woman who I met, and I urge you to defeat the pending motion.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I went out after I got through my last remarks, and I was told by a learned gentleman from the unmentionable body, who might be standing in back of the hall of the House, he said, "Where do you get off talking about shoes and stockings, you've only been wearing them for a year?"

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 Dixfield, Mr. Rollins, that the House accept Report B "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "B". All in favor of Report B will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Ault, Baker, Birt, Bither, Briggs, Cameron, Cressey, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Farnham, Farrington, Gahagan,

Hamblen, Huber, Hunter, Immonen, Jackson, Kelley, Knight, Lewis, E.; Lewis, J.; Littlefield, Lynch, McKernan, Morton, Palmer, Parks, Perkins, Rollins, Shaw, Simpson, L. E.; Snowe, Soulas, Stillings, Trask, Trumbull, Walker, Willard, The Speaker.

NAY — Albert, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Berube, Binnette, Boudreau, Brawn, Bunker, Bustin, Carey, Carrier, Carter, Chick, Chonko, Churchill, Clark, Conley, Connolly, Cooney, Cote, Cottrell, Crommett, Curran, Dam, Deshaies, Donaghy, Dow, Drigotas, Dudley, Dunleavy, Dunn, Dyar, Emery, D. F.; Evans, Farley, Faucher, Fecteau, Ferris, Finemore, Flynn, Fraser, Garsoe, Good, Goodwin, K.; Greenlaw, Hancock, Hobbins, Jalbert, Kauffman, Kelleher, Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Kilroy, LaPointe, Lawry, LeBlanc, MacLeod, Maddox, Mahany, Martin, Maxwell, McCormick, McHenry, McMahan, McTeague, Merrill, Mills, Morin, L.; Morin, V.; Mulkern, Murray, Najarian, Norris, O'Brien, Peterson, Ricker, Rolde, Ross, Shute, Smith, D. M.; Smith, S.; Strout, Susi, Talbot, Tanguay, Theriault, Tierney, Twitchell, Tyndale, Webber, Wheeler, Whitzell, Wood, M. E.

ABSENT — Bragdon, Brown, Davis, Gauthier, Genest, Goodwin, H.; Herrick, Hoffses, Jacques, LaCharite, McNally, Murchison, Pontbriand, Pratt, Santoro, Sheltra, Silverman, Sproul, White.

Yes, 38; No, 93; Absent, 19.

The SPEAKER: Thirty-eight having voted in the affirmative and ninety-three in the negative, with nineteen being absent, the motion does not prevail.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Martin of Eagle Lake, Report A "Ought to pass" was accepted.

The Bill was read once. Committee Amendment "A" (H-744) was read by the Clerk and adopted and the Bill assigned for second reading tomorrow.

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

Bill "An Act Authorizing a Study of Maine's Forest Products Industry" (H. P. 1952) (L. D. 2498) reporting "Ought to pass" in New Draft (H. P. 2026) (L. D. 2567) under new title "An Act Authorizing a Study of Maine's Forest