

# 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 Eleventh  
Legislature***

OF THE

**STATE OF MAINE**

**SECOND REGULAR SESSION**

**January 4, 1984 to April 25, 1984**

**INDEX**

**FOURTH CONFIRMATION SESSION**

**(FIRST CONFIRMATION SESSION – SECOND REGULAR SESSION)**

**May 31, 1984**

**INDEX**

**FIFTH CONFIRMATION SESSION**

**(SECOND CONFIRMATION SESSION – SECOND REGULAR SESSION)**

**July 11, 1984**

**INDEX**

**THIRD SPECIAL SESSION**

**September 4, 1984 to September 11, 1984**

**INDEX**

woman from Portland, Mrs. Beaulieu, is right on.

We have just put in place a public advocate who has just begun doing rate filing. We have just begun doing a commission on Workers' Comp, we have three now doing a job that will investigate these problems. I think it is only fair at this point to give them a chance, to let them research this and come back in a year to let us know what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, may I pose a question to you?

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman may pose her question.

Mrs. KETOVER: Mr. Speaker, I don't see a fiscal note on this. Could you please tell me if there is?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentlewoman that there is none. However, the Chair would advise the gentlewoman that even though one is probably required, no fiscal note is required by House Rule to be put on Joint Orders.

Mrs. KETOVER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As you know, we are now going to be spending \$70,000 right now for the Public Advocate. I believe that is enough money at this point to be spending. Give them a chance, and I hope that you will go along and not put this Resolution through.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waterville, Mrs. Joseph.

Mrs. JOSEPH: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I serve on the Select Committee for Workers' Compensation and we have come a long way. Last year, legislation was passed as a recommendation from this committee to reform the Workers' Compensation system of Maine. This year, we will be dealing with the rehabilitation of the injured worker and retraining of the injured worker and also the second injury fund. You, the 111th Legislature, will be dealing with these issues before adjournment, perhaps in the Special Session.

The Speaker's Select Committee does address the concerns of all employers of the State of Maine, those in the private sector as well as the public sector.

We here in state government know first hand the concerns of the employers of the State of Maine; therefore, I urge you to indefinitely postpone this Resolution as recommended by the gentleman from Bangor.

A roll call has been requested.

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

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Diamond, that this Joint Resolution be indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL NO. 473

YEA—Ainsworth, Allen, Andrews, Baker, Beaulieu, Bost, Brannigan, Brodeur, Brown, A.K.; Callahan, Carroll, D.P.; Carroll, G.A.; Cashman, Chonko, Clark, Connolly, Cooper, Cote, Cox, Crouse, Crowley, Daggett, Diamond, Erwin, Gauvreau, Gwadodsky, Hall, Handy, Hayden, Hickey, Higgins, H.C.; Jacques, Jalbert, Joyce, Kane, Kelleher, Kelly, Ketover, Kilcoyne, LaPlante, Lehoux, Lisnik, Locke, MacEachern, Macomber, Mahany, Martin, A.C.; Martin, H.C.; Matthews, Z.E.; Mayo, McColister, McGowan, McHenry, McSweeney, Melendy, Michael, Michaud, Mills, Mitchell, E.H.; Mitchell, J.; Moholland, Murray, Nadeau, Nelson, Norton, Paradis, P.E.; Paul, Perkins, Perry, Pouliot, Racine, Reeves, P.; Richard, Ridley, Roberts, Robison, Rolde, Rotondi, Soucy, Stevens, Swazey, Tammaro, Theriault, Thompson, Tuttle, Vose, The Speaker.

NAY—Anderson, Armstrong, Bell, Bonney, Bott, Brown, D.N.; Cahill, Carter, Conary, Conners, Curtis, Davis, Day, Dexter, Dillenback, Drinkwater, Dudley, Foster, Greenlaw, Higgins, L.M.; Holloway, Ingraham, Jackson, Kiesman, Lebowitz, Livesay, MacBride, Masterman, Masterton, Matthews, K.L.; Maybury, McPherson, Murphy, E.M.; Murphy, T.W.; Paradis, E.J.; Parent, Pines, Reeves, J.W.; Roderick, Salsbury, Scar-

pino, Seavey, Sherburne, Small, Smith, C.B.; Smith, C.W.; Soule, Sproul, Stevenson, Stover, Strout, Walker, Webster, Wentworth, Weymouth, Willey, Zirkilton.

ABSENT—Benoit, Carrier, Hobbins, Joseph, Manning, Randall, Telow.

87 having voted in the affirmative and 57 in the negative, with 7 being absent, the motion did prevail.

Sent to the Senate.

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

An Act to Exclude Social Security Benefits from Taxation (H. P. 1708) (L. D. 2257) (C. "A" H-659)

Tabled—April 10, 1984 (Till Later Today) by Representative Diamond of Bangor.

Pending—Passage to be Enacted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Canton, Mr. McCollister.

Mr. MCCOLLISTER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Age does not remove the responsibility of citizenship, the proof is here in this House, we have many retired persons serving here, nor should remove the responsibility of contributing to the tax support when one is financially able to do so. I believe that a retired couple with an income of \$2500 a month or over \$30,000 a year is financially able to contribute to the tax support of this state.

The law states, I believe, that 50 percent of your Social Security income would be taxed if you fall in this income bracket and I do not believe that this will work a hardship on anyone.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Harrison, Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise to disagree with the gentleman from Canton, Representative McCollister. I think it is a philosophical thing. He is discussing the fact that people who make \$25,000 a year, including their Social Security benefits, if they are a single individual are going to be taxable and \$32,000 if they are married.

I think the issue here is, and it is an important issue, do we tax Social Security benefits? That is what we are talking about. We are not talking about that income exclusion of the Social Security benefits, that is already taxable, we are talking about the taxable Social Security benefits, those benefits which those people made contributions through their lifetime to and are in a position and have succeeded in living long enough to collect those benefits. Now that is the question I have and I think it is purely philosophical in regards to this.

I think you know we make that contribution or those people have made those contributions knowing full well that they haven't been taxed, I just don't feel that it would be appropriate at the state level to go ahead and tax those individuals. Again, it just doesn't make sense. We are striking out at a group that has already paid a partial tax on these benefits through the payroll deduction because of the income that they have earned, those benefits have still been taxed at one-half, and I just don't believe that we should be treading into this area to tax Social Security benefits at this time and probably at any time.

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

Mr. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I concur with the gentleman from Harrison's comments here and it was a unanimous committee report endorsing this concept.

The principle is very basic. Congress has chosen to tax these Social Security benefits for one reason and one reason only—it is to provide for more fiscal stability for our Social Security fund. It was not meant as an arbitrary income tax source for those states such as Maine which have income taxes, and therefore, I hope that you will accept this unanimous committee report as you have before.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will order a vote. The pending question before the House is on

passage to be enacted. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

102 having voted in the affirmative and 10 in the negative, the motion did prevail.

Signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

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

Bill "An Act to Increase the Minimum Wage to \$3.55" (S. P. 835) (L. D. 2236)

Tabled—April 10, 1984 (Till Later Today) by Representative Diamond of Bangor.

Pending—Motion of Representative Gwadodsky of Fairfield to Reconsider Acceptance of the Minority "Ought Not to Pass" Report of the Committee on Labor. (Roll Call Requested)

Thereupon, the House reconsidered its action whereby the Minority "Ought Not to Pass" Report was accepted.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I hope that this body would not accept the pending motion. I hope that we would vote no and then we can move to recede and concur so that we can keep this bill alive and hopefully enact it later this week.

In keeping with the Speaker's remarks to keep the debate short, I just would like to say a couple of things very briefly.

Yesterday during the debate, Representative Dillenback got up and said that he didn't want to debate the issue but then he proceeded to read a letter from a constituent, a businessman from his district, in which the gentleman said that he supported, and Mr. Dillenback said that he agreed with him, an increase in the minimum wage, that he certainly felt, paraphrasing it now, that folks who worked for the minimum wage should have an increase but that it wasn't an issue that ought to be addressed by the state, it was an issue that should be addressed by the federal government. I would just like to respond to that argument because I think it is something that probably has a lot of people who aren't quite ready to support this bill on the fence and that may be the reason, at least up to now, that some of you haven't chosen to support the bill.

Right now there are two states in the union that have a minimum wage higher than the federal, the state of Alaska and the state of Connecticut. The District of Columbia also has a minimum wage that is higher than the federal. There are no other states. Maine then would join two other states and the District of Columbia.

The percentage of the work force across the country that works for the minimum wage is 6 percent, just about 6 percent of the total work force in the United States works for the minimum wage. However, in the State of Maine, 20 percent of the work force works for the minimum wage. There is a significantly higher percentage of people in the State of Maine who work for the minimum wage when you compare it with the rest of the states across the country.

I think all of us would agree, the federal government, given the present administration in Washington, is not about to enact at the federal level, at this point, an increase in the minimum wage. Someone, one of the states, has to begin to get the ball rolling, and it seems to me that Maine should take that position, not only because it is right but because of the significantly high percentage of the people in our work force that work for a low wage, that work for the minimum wage.

One final point, in 1971, the legislature, which was controlled in both bodies by the Republican party, enacted a minimum wage of a \$1.80, 20 cents higher than the federal minimum wage. The following year they increased that to \$1.90, 30 cents higher than the federal minimum wage. For more than two and a half years, the State of Maine had a 30 cent higher minimum wage than the federal government and the growth of the work force in Maine improved, it wasn't hindered. So I think the arguments that have been

made that if Maine takes this step that we are going to have a lot of businesses closing down, a lot of people laid off. I know it is an argument that legitimately concerns many people here, I just don't think that it holds water.

This is a chance for us truly in the sense of our motto "Dirigo—I lead," it is truly time I think that we can do something significant and I would hope that those of you who perhaps are on the fence, given the significantly high percentage of our people that work for minimum wage, would vote against this motion so then we could move to recede and concur.

Representative Gwadosky of Fairfield requested a roll call vote.

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

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: Very briefly, having been here while these minimum wages were raised and having seen the effect, we automatically had to raise taxes to take care of the high cost, and I don't have the figures this morning but they could be received very quickly, how much we increased the people on welfare. So what we did, we did eliminate some jobs, a lot of them, if what the gentleman from Portland just said was true, we wouldn't have had to raise all this extra money for welfare.

I assume that if we did raise this, this is another thing that we have to take into consideration, how much more are we going to have to raise to take care of these people that don't have a job. We are going to have to take care of them and the only way we know in the State of Maine is through welfare, and most of them would rather not be on welfare, they would like to be self-supporting. I represent a lot of proud people and they resent being on welfare, they would rather work and take care of themselves.

I see the need for a raise but I don't see a need for a measly little small raise like this that doesn't really help them that much when we increase the cost of everything else along the line.

The tradition has been that when we raised, and I voted for it each time, the minimum wage, we raised a small amount of money in pennies while the people on the top got a raise in the amount of a dollar or two and so this widened the difference between the two. This is the problem in Maine. The big problem in Maine is the difference between the top and the bottom and we are making it worse every time we meet. All we have to do is raise more money and tax people to pay for the people that we throw on welfare.

Now a lot of you people don't believe these people are going to move but I happen to be one of those that saw it happen before and it is going to happen again. A lot of this industry that is barely existing, and you might have some of it right in your own town, it is in my area, they just won't be there, they are just barely surviving and they have got to compete with the states below us that have a lot of cost built in—we have a lot of costs built in like heat we have to spend for our shops where they work and the amount of extra transportation and other things built in and they are already working at a very small profit and this will just force them to do business elsewhere. Most of them have plants elsewhere also.

I hope what we did the other day will stay and we will wait a year and see if we can't help these people with some other method besides welfare.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vassalboro, Mrs. Mitchell.

Mrs. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I have listened very intently and carefully to this debate and I can sit here no longer, particularly after the remarks that were just made.

I think that this bill represents a matter of simple dignity. Ladies and gentlemen, you are going to pay one way or the other. If you allow people to work for a meaningful wage or a little

more meaningful than minimum wage, you allow them to get off welfare, not on welfare.

I think that some of the gentlemen that are speaking on this bill should take a grocery cart and go shopping at Cottles sometime and try to feed your family on the kind of money we are talking about. I suggest that you go down to some of these stores and try to clothe your children on the kind of money that we are talking about. I think that is the problem, some of you don't go shopping enough.

We are talking about raising \$416 for the entire year; that is assuming that the person on minimum wage works five days a week, eight hours a day—\$416. I suggest to you it is simple dignity, simple justice. We claim we want to help people get off welfare, let them go to work and earn it, and the nonsense about it all being teenagers, that we are simply raising the rates of teenagers, I want to emphasize again what Representative Connolly said to you the first time he spoke. More than 60 percent of the people we are talking about on this minimum wage are between 20 and 65. Two-thirds of those are women and, believe me, they know how much it costs to push that cart through Cottles.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I didn't expect to speak a second time but I do have to respond to the remarks of Representative Dudley.

The argument that Representative Dudley makes that if we increase the minimum wage the cost of welfare and the programs that are run by the Department of Human Services are going to increase is simply not factual. We have fiscal information that we received yesterday from the Department of Human Services that clearly demonstrates that there would be a decrease in the cost to the state for food stamps and a decrease in the cost to the state for AFDC if the minimum wage is increased, just exactly the opposite of what Mr. Dudley argues will happen. If that doesn't convince you, if you accept his and other arguments that it is an unwise thing for workers if we raised the minimum wage, then I would think that someone would put a bill in to reduce the minimum wage, because if you accept that argument, if we reduce the minimum wage, we will be creating more jobs and offering more protection and I don't think anybody in this room buys that argument.

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

Mr. GAUVREAU: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the Maine House: I will try to be brief. As some of you know, I have had some difficulties in the past endorsing the concept of raising the state's minimum wage and for a long time I think I felt afraid of some of the arguments that are being made today against raising the minimum wage, the most significant one being that if we endorse the concept, if we raise our state's minimum wage, we will force marginal businesses to leave the State of Maine.

I had some problems with this bill being introduced and being debated so late in the session. I felt that we would not have time to adequately explore all the issues and implications that this bill raised. I have done a good deal of work on this for the last week or two and my earlier objections have been satisfied. My research indicates to me that the arguments against raising the minimum wage are, to coin a phrase used yesterday by the good gentleman from Durham—"bunk."

I would point out to you what the good gentleman from Portland indicated earlier in the day, that from 1971 to 1973, the State of Maine was one of three states in the nation to have a minimum wage above the federal standard and there is no evidence whatsoever to suggest that during that time, when the Republican-dominated legislature adopted that minimum wage, that the state in any way suffered or the business climate was adversely affected.

I think a point that was not brought out in this

debate and which really should be emphasized is the fact that for many people, certainly people in the city of Lewiston and I suspect many others in your districts, are stuck at a minimum wage. They do not simply attain minimum wage wages on an entry level position. Rather, they earn the minimum wage for five, ten, fifteen, twenty years. This point was brought home to me clearly over the weekend when I went out to talk to shoeworkers, to talk to textile workers, and address the concerns that were raised against the minimum wage. The argument that "folks, what you have now may not be good but if we raise the minimum wage, you probably are going to end up losing your job," that is a real concern. They told me to a person that that was not true. You could look in their eyes and you could see their desperation. You could see how difficult it was for them to work day in and day out at a minimum wage subsistence level.

It seems to me that the gentledady from Vassalboro was right on point when she tells you that what this bill is about is basic dignity, and if we have the courage today to take our stand and support the working men and women of this state, you will go along with me in urging that we reject the Minority Report so we can go on and accept the Majority Report of the Committee on Labor to raise our minimum wage.

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

Mr. WILLEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: There is one thing that I haven't heard mentioned here so far in the arguments and that is the increase in costs of hospital costs. There was a great todo about that a year ago, to contain hospital costs.

I have a letter here from a gentleman that is involved with the Pleasant Hill Health Care Facility here in Augusta, I believe. I won't read you the whole letter because it is two pages but anybody can read it that wants to. He said in part: "The 1984 payroll for Pleasant Hill will be just under \$90,000 including taxes and benefits. The proposed minimum wage will increase the payroll costs by over \$54,000. Included are not only actual wage increases to be paid but also the related FICA taxes, workers' compensation, vacation, holiday benefits and so forth. This is an increase of about \$1.60 per day per patient at this particular facility. By inference, the total cost escalation for long-term care program in Maine will exceed \$4,600,000 a year. Add the boarding care facilities and the costs become over \$6 million per year. Add the hospitals and costs becomes over \$11 million a year."

"Increased appropriations by the state and the federal government will exceed over \$9 million a year. Not counted are the community care centers, mental health and state run facilities. All this inflation in costs for no increase in efficiency and no increase in productivity, no improvement in health care facilities and after a pathetically short length period of time, no benefits for the employees' spending power." I think that that is a very valid argument.

All of these costs have to be passed on, somebody has to pay them. If it is hospitals or whatever it is, it is an increase in costs.

I thoroughly believe that there are some businesses that will move out of state, not just because they are marginal, but because they have an opportunity to move out of state and make more money than they would if they stayed here. All of those costs are going to be paid by somebody. Apparently there are a lot of believers in this body of Keynesian theory of economics and that can only work if you are a believer in it, it can only work by a government which has the power to print money. It can't increase in a state such as Maine or any other state. We don't have the ability to print money. Somebody has to pay for it one way or the other, so it is a never ending economic cycle to create inflation so that the cost of everything goes up, so wages have to go up, so that costs have to go up, so the wages have to go up and it goes on and on.

I would submit, too, you talk about 1971-72,

that the business atmosphere in the State of Maine was a heck of a lot better than it is today. Perhaps that is one of the reasons.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mrs. Beaulieu.

Mrs. BEAULIEU: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am not in possession of the communication that was just read to you but I can tell you this, the committee and the proponents of this increase have certainly been looking at what the costs are going to be and we contend—what's new?

Since the last time the minimum wage was raised in this state, costs have gone up constantly for everybody and that will happen whether there is a raise in the minimum wage or not.

I stood before you and kind of lost my heart here yesterday when I looked at the vote and I probably expect to lose the rest of my heart when I see the vote again today. There isn't too much left of me to lose lately, but I will contend and I will restate as loudly and clearly as I can that this is an issue of fairness and equity. There isn't a state worker, a municipal worker, a state official, a State Representative sitting in this body, a member of management, a private sector worker, an AFDC worker, who has not received a raise of some sort in these past few years.

The minimum wage worker has been held in abeyance since the last time it was raised. The minimum wage has become their maximum wage. Are we really going to stand here today and say that the federal government is the only body that will ever grant over 100,000 workers in this state a raise? Are we willing to say that we don't have the guts to do something for these people at this time? Are we willing to say to them, you are going to have to wait?

We are the only body that can do something now, and if we haven't got the courage to do it, then I might as well give up, expect this bill to fail, send it down to the other body for the appropriate burial. But I will tell you something, maybe I am one of those that will be able to hold my head up proud when I go back home and report that this body failed to take action.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are not talking about 200 people in a plant somewhere, we are talking about over 100,000 people, people who have worked in firms for 17 or 20 years and the only time they have ever gotten an increase is when the federal government took action.

It is one thing to go to the grocery store and to go buy clothing for your children, or your grandchildren in my case, but look at the girl or the man who is stocking the shelves and working behind the counter, we must do something for them, as minimal as it may be.

I have sat in this body and I have heard people say that 10 and 20 cents and 30 cents isn't enough but I haven't seen anybody with the guts to come in here with an amendment to make it higher. The arguments are used but nobody comes forward with an alternative proposal.

We have tried to be fiscally responsible here on this issue. There is a potential to amend this thing to make it become effective a little later but apparently we are not going to get the opportunity to do that. I would think that you would at least let this thing go to second reading or at least allow it to go down to the other end of the hall and see what we can work out to make it more palatable, to give more planning time for business people and to at least give a little courage, not a handout but a handup to over 100,000 workers in our state.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mt. Desert, Mr. Zirkilton.

Mr. ZIRNKILTON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: There have been a number of comments that have been made today and yesterday on this issue and I feel that I should respond to a number of them.

In this morning's Bangor Daily News, the gentleman from Waterville, Representative Jacques, who was quoted on a number of comments that he made yesterday, he was quoted as saying that if business wouldn't move into the State of Maine

because of a higher minimum wage, then we don't want them anyway, and of course the quote of "I spit in their eye." Well, with that attitude, anybody who assumes that attitude, does in fact spit in their eye, they spit in the eye of every decent, hard-working Maine citizen who is presently out of a job and is trying to find one.

The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Diamond, yesterday said that 20 percent of Maine's work force works for the minimum wage and the gentleman went on to say that that is terrible. Yes, it is terrible, but why do we suppose that so many of our people are forced to work for the minimum wage?

The gentleman from Yarmouth, Mr. Ainsworth, said workers are leaving Maine and people on the outside are proud to hire Maine workers because they are dedicated and hard working, that is true. Why do you suppose that is, Mr. Ainsworth? Why do you suppose so many people are forced to leave the State of Maine? Could it be that we have the highest unemployment rate in New England?

Just a moment ago, the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Gauvreau, said that he has talked to shoeworkers. Well, then you know what the business climate is, Mr. Gauvreau, and you explain to the people in Rumford who used to work for the Bass Shoe Factory, more than 200 of them who just lost their jobs, you tell them the business climate is good and you tell them that they shouldn't be forced to work for the minimum wage. They don't have jobs. You tell them that raising the minimum wage in the State of Maine isn't going to affect their chances of finding employment elsewhere.

Finally, yes Maine, we do have a heart because we believe that working for the minimum wage is much, much better than not working at all.

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

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have been listening to the debate here and trying to restrain myself. It seems to me that the opponents of this, what they are saying is that in order to keep prices down, in the case of some health care or to create a business climate where we can have more jobs, that somehow 100,000 people in the State of Maine have a responsibility to support the economy by working for a subsistence wage.

Now, this sounds very similar to arguments that were raised in the last part of this country prior to 1860, that the economy of the country south of the Mason-Dixon Line would collapse if they were required to free the slaves and pay them wages and it was better for these slaves to be slaves than to be unemployed and wandering around the country with no jobs. This sounds very similar to those arguments, and I simply can't buy that the State of Maine should be operating an economy that requires 100,000 people to work for what is actually below a subsistence wage. If they have a family and they are working for this wage, they are not subsisting, they are being supported by other taxpayers in the form of either welfare, AFDC, or food stamps.

Again, I simply state that I cannot accept that it is the responsibility of 100,000 people in this state to work for subsistence or below subsistence in effect to subsidize the rest of us so that we can live in \$150,000 houses.

In the case of the management people in my area, the businessmen are telling me "we can't afford it." I campaigned in this district and I see these people who are against minimum wage, I see the houses they live in. I climbed the rickety stairs to the apartments of the people who are working for them for minimum wage so I see what goes on around.

I, myself, have worked for better than the minimum wage and the only way that my family and I could exist with dignity was because my wife worked at a job that paid more than mine, so don't try to tell me that it is the responsibility of these people to support the rest of us in the style that we would like to live in.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the

gentleman from Mt. Desert, Mr. Zirkilton.

Mr. ZIRNKILTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Cox. Would the gentleman please tell me whether or not he believes that people are better off unemployed than they are working for the minimum wage? And if so, could the gentleman further go on by saying who is going to support these people and keep them living in a manner in which he would like to see them living?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Mt. Desert, Mr. Zirkilton, has posed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Cox, who may respond if he so desires.

The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In the first place, the gentleman from Mt. Desert, Mr. Zirkilton's, question assumes that these people are going to be unemployed, all of them, if we raise the minimum wage. I reject this. There may be a few marginal businesses that will fold but I am sure that there will be other businesses that will come in to fill the vacuum. We always have a certain amount of unemployed, and the assumption is that there is a permanent class of unemployed that is always unemployed, I reject that. The largest portion of people that are unemployed are probably between jobs. The business they have been working for has closed and they have a brief period of unemployment while they are looking for another job. People for some reason lose their jobs and are searching for another job, so I simply reject the assumption on which the gentleman's question is based.

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

Mr. BAKER: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I was reminded some months ago by my local Chamber of Commerce of a publicity campaign that they run when they wish to attract industry into the State of Maine. One of the slogans that they use is that in Maine, Maine workers give you a day's work for a day's pay. They pride our work force on being a good, hardworking, work force.

Another point I also want to mention is that we have been hearing a lot of talk about the business climate of this state. The business climate is not something that you can objectively measure like the weather. The business climate is determined solely by those businesses which wish to determine what the climate is going to be so they can either invest or withhold their investments.

This state has done a lot for the business climate. I should remind you of the efforts that were made on behalf of Pratt & Whitney, on behalf of Bath Iron Works, and the fact that we are now considering an incentive an Ethanol plant. This state constantly bends over backwards to assist industries, very often with no concrete guarantees from those industries whatsoever as to what their investment policies are going to be.

I was told by a constituent of mine who lobbied me against this particular bill that if you raise the wages this would be bad for investment, and I replied to him that it doesn't matter if we keep the minimum wage where it is because wages will still go up in many industries where workers are represented by unions and have the collective bargaining process.

A while ago the member from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, mentioned that he was opposed to the inequity, the widening gap between the lower paid workers and the higher paid workers. I submit to you that the gap between the have-nots and the haves will increase if we maintain the minimum wage where it is because those workers who are represented by the labor movement will manage to get some sort of increase.

We are experiencing over the past few years already a great inequity in terms of incomes, they are getting wider and wider, and I submit to you that when you have a situation like that, you start to tear apart the moral fiber of this country. I do not think that we can afford to have a situ-

ation where the gap in incomes gets deeper and deeper and wider and wider. We have seen the effect of that in many of our large cities.

Finally, I want to talk a little bit about the employment issue. It has been mentioned here whether or not is best to have no job or low paying jobs. You cannot take the minimum wage totally out of context from an overall strategy to deal with unemployment. I have been an advocate of the Hawkins-Humphrey Full Employment Law for the last six years. It is a law that is on the books that directs the President to put forward a full employment budget with targets designed to achieve full employment under strategy. Nothing is being done about implementing the Hawkins-Humphrey Full Employment Law but that is something that has to be done.

Finally, the question of divestment, that is of business wishing to leave the state, I can only say this—when they leave, they don't take the natural resources, they don't take the buildings, they don't take the workers, they take the capital. We have means to put the capital back and we have a law on the books that can allow employees to buy out these businesses, we passed it last year so we have the means, if we choose, to put people back to work. We have those means, we can do that.

We should pass this bill and we should pass it today.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Shapleigh, Mr. Ridley.

Mr. RIDLEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am not going to take too much time but I feel that I should get up and talk. I have been here four years and listened to this thing kicked around all the time that I have been here.

As most of you know, I have been a businessman, small businessman, for better than 25 years and there has been times when it has been a struggle. You can use all the fancy charts that you want, you can dig out all the information about this and what they should do and what they shouldn't do. I am not a real economist but I learned the hard way and it boils down to this—if you have got to pay more for your help, the employer has got one or two things that he has to do, he can either absorb it and get less wages for himself or he can increase the price of his product.

I have made parts for aircraft most of my life and I will admit that there isn't many people working for minimum wage that are buying airplanes; nevertheless, it reflects all the way down through. When you go to the store now and you say prices are high and the guy working for the minimum wage can't afford it, if they have to pay out more money because of this minimum wage, I am sure that there isn't many of them that are going to absorb this themselves, they have got to pass it on. So the next time you go to the store, the prices will reflect this. I mean, this is just simple plain arithmetic and it doesn't take very long when you look your books over to find out whether you are making any money or you can meet the payroll the next month. It is as simple as that, it is like a dog chasing his tail.

Mrs. Beaulieu of Portland was granted permission to speak a third time.

Mrs. BEAULIEU: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: A question, kind of unfair, but a question was posed a few minutes ago as to which is better, to have a low paying job or to be unemployed? Ladies and gentlemen, an unemployed worker can collect unemployment compensation, is eligible for food stamps, sometimes rental assistance, medicaid, taxpayers' dollars in effect subsidizing maybe the business climate of the state?

The minimum wage earners and the overwhelming majority cannot get this help. He pays the same \$25 per visit for the doctors; the same \$1.09 for the same loaf of bread that the \$30,000 or \$40,000 wage earner is paying. They are subject to the same rental increases and their light bills and their heating bills and their telephone bills don't go down.

The potential \$8 that we might be able to put into their pockets is not money that is going to go into the bank, it is going right back into the economy.

Granted, the prices may go up because the businessman will feel that he needs to make ends meet and in order to maintain his capital gain and his profit margins he will go up on the cost, but I am sure that he is also going to welcome that minimum wage worker who is going to be going into his store with a little bit more buying power.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Jacques.

Mr. JACQUES: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I don't intend to spit in anybody's eye today; I think they have all had their fun with that, but I would just like to make a few comments. I am sorry that I missed the good gentleman from Mt. Desert, the Casey Kasem of the 111th Legislature's comments, because I was working on the wood measurement but I do get an idea of what he was trying to do.

The only thing that bothers me is if we follow the mentality of the good gentleman from Mt. Desert that we cannot raise the minimum wage because businesses are doing real good, the business climate is right and we don't want to ruin it and then you turn around and say, well we can't raise the minimum wage because the business climate is bad and it is going to hurt them so we can't do it now, we could go on until time ad infinitum and we would still not raise the guy on the bottoms pay. I have yet to find or hear anybody tell us how we could solve that problem.

There has been a lot mentioned on being able to compete in today's market and that raising the minimum wage would cause severe complications on these companies being able to compete. Well, I would submit to you that all they will have to do is like most of these companies do, they get together, the board of directors say, we have got to do something to increase our profits and somebody comes up with the idea of, let's go to some poor country somewhere where the people are so far down that the bottom looks up and we can do just like we used to do to the people in this country before the unions started forming and making these people work for a decent wage, and what we will do is offer them peanuts and because these people don't know any better, we will take advantage of the situation and then we can turn around and give our people who own shares in our company bigger profits. Well, that is a wonderful idea, let's move out, and so they go to these second world countries and take advantage of the situation.

Some people think that these second world countries are ignorant and illiterate but I can tell you one thing, they are a lot smarter than we are in some ways. In the shoe industry, when you export some shoes to their country, first thing they do is mark it up about 10 times the price of what it should be to make sure that their people don't buy our shoes, they buy their shoes. Then in this country, we turn around and take these cheap shoes in here and we take them in and we take them and we take them in with no quotas and we ultimately force the people of this country to buy them because a lot of them make the minimum wage and can't afford anything else but the junk that we bring in from other countries.

We can laugh at these other countries all we want but, they may be uneducated in some ways but when it comes to simple, pure economics, they are a lot brighter than we are.

I wonder if we follow the reasoning of the good gentleman from Mt. Desert, when the time will be right for minimum wage to be increased for the people who are working for the minimum wage in this state. When will the time be right? I doubt that it ever will.

#### House at Ease

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gen-

tleman from Yarmouth, Mr. Ainsworth.

Mr. AINSWORTH: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Before we left, I did want to get up on the floor for just a second. I hope that Mr. Zirkkilton will rise very quickly because he referred to me a little while ago and I just wanted to answer him as best I could.

He mentioned something about people going out of state and so forth but he took my words out of context. I mentioned our workers going out of state and being welcomed to another state because they are terrific workers. One of the biggest reasons they leave the state is because of the minimum wage and I can prove it every day. We want to keep our workers, especially the young workers, in our state, there is no question about that. No one today has mentioned the spinoff that takes place when more money is poured back into the economy.

Before I sit down today, I am going to make this very brief, I would like to mention the words of the gentleman who is on TV all the time and you see him all the time and in answer to him and to you, how does a Maine worker get his wages? I am going to say to you, he "earns" it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. McHenry.

Mr. MCHENRY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I heard that by increasing the minimum wage we are going to do away with some jobs, we are going to fold up some business. You know, for the past three years the United States of America has had more businesses going out of business, we have had more unemployment than we have ever had and we have had no increase in the minimum wage. How come? Can you explain that to me?

A minimum wage increase of 20 cents, 40 hours a week, means \$8 a week, means \$416 a year. At 100,000 employees, this means \$41,600,000 into the economy, directly into the economy of the State of Maine. What better industry can we have?

As far as the inflation rate, it has gone up 15 percent in the past three years. Those employees on minimum wage, zero. All we are saying is give them 2 percent; it is 6 percent right now which comes out to 2 percent per year—big deal—that is no big deal to me.

I for one believe we keep ignoring the minimum wage as we have kept ignoring indexing, as you people know, and I, as a Democrat, did fight for indexing in this House but we refused to handle it—what happened? The people took it into their hands. Well, I might suggest that the people may take it into their hands, the minimum wage, and tie it to inflation and give themselves a good raise, a real good raise which they deserve, the good working people of the State of Maine, but we, the great intelligent people of this House, probably think they are too stupid to do it or too lazy to do it.

We might have some good news in the future. I, myself, think it would be good news if it would move.

Why is it that a House which is dominated by Democrats is voting against the minimum wage? It boggles the mind of people that have not been involved in politics too long.

I remember when I first came here, this House was Republican, the Senate was Republican, we had a Democrat for a Governor, and guess what? The best legislation for working people was passed in this House and other body—why, why is that? Today we have a Democratic controlled House, a Democratic controlled Senate and we have a Democrat for a Governor and we can't seem to do a darn thing to help our working people. Why? Well, I have come to the point where I think I know—maybe I am wrong, I can stand to be corrected, but when you have working people, Democrats, who supposedly represent the working people here and before we had Republicans who supposedly represent the business people, not all, just like Democrats, not all, but in those days the reason was that a Republican that was running for office said, hey, I had better do something for those little working

people; otherwise, they might find some opposition and they might work their butts to get me out of here. Well, today the situation is reverse. We have Democrats here that are afraid that the business people are going to put up some money to defeat them. They will put up candidates to defeat them if they vote for the working people, that is my opinion. I may be wrong but I think I am right, that is the fear of those people. I say, stand up and be counted for what you are.

I have never in my whole life, in all my 10 years in politics, I have never ever promised a thing to my constituents except to do the best I can for them and when I sit here, I think, how would they vote if they had the opportunity to vote? I believe in my opinion that I am doing what is right for my people and I am going to vote for minimum wage until I hear from my people that they don't want it.

How many people here have sent out the questionnaire if they wanted an increase in the minimum wage? I will tell you, my people want it. I wouldn't fear putting it out to referendum, not one bit, because that is the way we can go. I can vote for it here but I can also send it out.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Corinth, Mr. Strout.

Mr. STROUT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hadn't intended to speak on this minimum wage bill yesterday nor today. I have served in this legislature going onto 12 years and it is the first time that I have spoken before you on an issue that concerns me primarily, I guess, on the timing of the bill that we have before us.

Yesterday there was mention that some of us may not have a heart. When I leave this body, hopefully in the next week or two to go back to what I normally do full-time, I am going to have to make a decision on employees that I hire for the summer program. We are just a small town in central Maine and we use five to six employees in a summer program for recreation or maintenance. Some people probably agree with me today but I did an analysis last night and I am going to be faced with either not hiring one of those individuals or I will have to cut back the hours. You might say that is not going to be a substantial loss; however, if I do cut back on those individuals that I normally hire for 25 hours, I am going to have to go with 20 to meet my budget that was approved in March. I am sure that there are a lot of communities out there that are in the same situation that I am.

Just to give you a simple figure on what it means to those five or six individuals, if I hire them as I normally do in the summer at \$3.35, they would receive \$670 for an eight-week program. If this bill passes, I would only be able to use them 20 hours and they would receive \$568, so there is a loss to those students out there of \$102.

The students that come in and talk to me in a small community are not interested so much in the hours or the hourly pay, what they are concerned about is the amount of money that they are going to earn during the summer that will help buy those clothes and necessities to start school the next Fall.

I also wanted to mention that it will mean an increased cost in our Workers' Compensation, it means an increase in our Social Security, it is not substantial but it is an increase. Our budget is put together and our budget is close. Where do I take those funds from? There is only two accounts that I am allowed to overdraft and that is winter maintenance and general assistance.

I wanted to mention one other program that is close to a lot of our communities, it is the JPTA act that was formerly CETA. We received an application two weeks ago that these students will be able to work 25 hours. Now my concern is that if this bill passes, there is going to have to be adjustments in those hours. There is only so much money there and I would imagine that they would either allot those students less hours or there would be some layoffs. I haven't talked to those people because I sent my application

in last week for three additional students.

I also further mentioned that a lot of your small communities have ambulance and fire personnel that are on an on-call basis. We are one of those communities. We normally run about 2,000 hours a year and if this bill passes, it is going to be a one-half year cost to us. It is only \$400 if this should pass, but I guess it concerns me that, if this should go into effect this summer, I have to make a decision of hiring only four or I cut the hours back, that is why I am going to vote against this bill today.

Mrs. Beaulieu of Portland was granted permission to speak a fourth time.

Mrs. BEAULIEU: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The issues raised by Representative Strout have certainly been discussed by the majority of the people on our committee. There is no doubt that we wish to take some action concerning these particular areas. If you had a federal program, it is possible to amend the bill to say that the federal wage would prevail if it is a federally funded program. We are not going to have the opportunity to address those issues unless we get a favorable vote here today to give us an opportunity to get the issue to second reading. That question before you is a critical question.

We ask you to reconsider so that we can recede and concur and then do the job to address the concerns that have been raised by so many of you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Windham, Mr. Cooper.

Mr. COOPER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I had not intended to address the body today but because of the item that Mr. Strout brought up, I feel that I should. I didn't want to speak because I am still trying to collect data. This has happened quite quickly and I think the gentleman from Fairfield was correct when he said that there really wasn't time to do a good study of this issue. I am still trying to get any facts together that I can.

One of the things that I have done is check with my local job training apprenticeship program in Cumberland County which has a county commissioner. I was in part responsible for running and it is called the Training Resource Center. I also checked with the state program and one operated by the Penobscot Consortium to find out what the effect would be on the summer youth program.

The summer youth program, for some of you who are not familiar with it, is a program targeted to AFDC recipient youth whose parents are AFDC recipients or who are handicapped or the income guideline—I don't know exactly what it is, I do know that if you are earning minimum wage, you earn too much, so it is targeted at a very poor group of people and the United Way Social Planning Committee on which I serve in Cumberland County has determined that idle youth is one of the top five problems that exists in that county so this program will affect it.

The figures, again, were off the top of the head of the people that I talked to because of the shortness of time, but it was their guess that they would probably go with the new minimum wage. It is what they have done. In fact, they thought that unions might be upset if they didn't and in fact it is somewhat of a tradition that they do this and their intent at this point was to continue with the new minimum wage if it increased.

There was a possibility of cutting back on hours. There is concern that once you go below a certain number of hours, it is not a useful program to help train youth in the work ethic because they are going a couple of days a week or for a few hours each day a week, so if you cut back to 15 or 20 hours, it gives them a little money, probably not enough to do too much, but it also does not help them develop the work habits that we hope they will develop. So, the alternative to that is to hire less students for the summer, but it appears that the result would be probably a loss of between 150 to 200 jobs for students this summer if this went into effect this summer.

I would ask you to carefully consider this. As I said, I am still trying to get more information on other things but at least so far it appears that in fact there would be a loss of jobs, which has been debated here at great length, as far as the general populace goes. As far as youth goes, it seems to me almost certain that there would be a loss of jobs and I would ask that you keep that in mind as you vote on this bill today.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Winslow, Mr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question through the Chair to the gentleman from East Corinth. My question to Mr. Strout is that if he has served in this legislature, and from what I have seen in my term, served very admirably, served for the last 12 years in this body, was he a part of the Republican legislature at that time that voted for a higher minimum wage and how did he vote?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Winslow, Mr. Matthews, has posed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Corinth, Mr. Strout, who may respond if he so desires.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Diamond.

Mr. DIAMOND: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I hate to prolong the debate on this issue anymore and if I didn't believe in the matter before us so strongly, I wouldn't do so.

We have talked about so many different things today, this afternoon, this morning and yesterday that I afraid that possibly the overall bigger picture might have been lost in the debate over whether or not our business climate is 43rd in the country or 44th or whether or not we are going to lose two jobs or 20 jobs, whether or not we are going to gain jobs from the passage of this proposal.

There are several questions that have been raised by the opposition on this and basically they are two: One is, what is the impact going to be on the business climate of this state? It is a legitimate question and I respect the fact that members of this body are so sensitive to that concern. It is something that we have all been concerned about for the last few years and all of us, both Democrats and Republicans, have been working to better that business climate.

The concern is, what will increasing our minimum wage do, what kind of an impact will that have and how attractive will Maine become if we do that and how attractive will it remain if we don't enact this law? I think if you will look at the statistics, there are a number of things that businesses look at in deciding whether or not a state has an attractiveness to them as far as the business climate goes. It goes way beyond whether or not we have a minimum wage that is equal to that in most other states, there are several factors. You have to look at the cost of labor in general, and if you look at Maine's labor costs and the average wage of Maine workers, it is substantially lower than that nationally. Maine is attractive if you will look at labor costs. I believe we are 16 percent below the national average and if you deduct the paper industry, we are 25 percent below the national average. So again, if you take a look at whether or not the cost of labor in Maine is something that is going to discourage business, it is not now and it won't be if we increase the minimum wage.

You have to look at transportation costs; that is something that has no relation on this argument here but that is something that business look at in determining whether or not a state is attractive from a business standpoint. You have to look at the available natural resources and we have an abundance of that and we have been able to capitalize on many of those.

We also have to look at the work ethic of the people of our state, something that has been vital to our success as a state in the past. In fact, a few years ago, the work ethic was in some sense our greatest state export. A lot of our people were being drawn into other states where the jobs paid much higher than they pay in Maine because of the strong work ethic; that is some-

thing that people around this nation respect and recognize.

Maine people work hard and they work for every penny that they get. If you simply imply that if we raise our minimum wage, something involves 20 percent of the work force of this state, then it simply does not take into consideration the other factors that businesses look at in determining whether or not they are going to locate or relocate or stay in Maine.

The other argument that the gentleman from East Corinth, Mr. Strout, brought up was the potential for lost jobs, that if we are actually going to lose jobs and in the long run we will be worse off than we are now. I don't buy that argument, it doesn't take into account an economic reality.

I don't think, except for probably Mr. Dillenback, that there are any economic experts in this body, I certainly am far from one, but I think it is generally accepted that those people who make less wages than those at the top tend to put their money more directly back into the economy.

We have talked and President Reagan has talked about the fact that if you give tax benefits to those at the top of the ladder, if you give the big corporations tax cuts, that they will take that money and they will reinvest it in retooling factories and creating jobs. That remains to be seen. I don't believe it is going to happen. But one thing that all sides agree on is the fact that if you give money to those people at the bottom of the ladder, either directly through a government subsidy or indirectly through encouraging a higher based wage, that that money does go back into the economy at a far greater rate. They spend that money on food, clothing, shelter, the essentials of life, and those are the things that have the so-called trickle down effect on society and our economy, much more so than investing in Taiwan expansion of Bass or some other shoe company.

We have two important factors that we have to look at and the arguments have been made very well by those people who have been trying to defend those positions but they are wrong in my opinion. I don't think we are going to find a loss of jobs if the economic theorists are correct. Stimulating the economy by allowing those people at the very bottom of that ladder to go out and buy a little more than they have in the past is going to create jobs.

Then we have to look at the arguments for this proposal, they are very significant, they are substantial arguments. What will happen if we give the people at the bottom of the ladder an increase in minimum wage? Certainly it is going to help them as individuals. We talked about the working poor, we are trying to help them. Right now the working poor, those people who work at minimum wage, are \$3,000 below the poverty level if you look at them as a member of a household of four. We subsidize them. Their businesses don't subsidize them, their employers don't subsidize them, the government subsidizes them through food stamps, through other forms of assistance, and it is not government at the federal level necessarily, it is government at this level, government at the local level. We take care of those businesses by underwriting their costs so they can pay their employees less.

If we give those people that minimum wage increase it is going to cut down state government costs. Representative Beaulieu pointed that out in talking about what an impact it would have on health costs and dealt with the argument from the gentleman from Hampden. It will reduce costs to municipalities because it will reduce the burden of general assistance on them. It will get people working; it will encourage them to work.

So many people in this body, time and time again, get up and criticize those people who say they are the welfare cheats, the people who take advantage of the system. Well, in some ways government encourages that and we know it and we try to fight it, but if you can make working more attractive to them by providing them with

a little greater reward financially, then it is going to become something that will be more appealing to them and they are going to be less likely to take advantage of the system.

It will stimulate the economy, as I pointed out, and we have the economic background to prove it. It will provide dignity for those people who work at that base wage. Most importantly, I think, it is going to show a recognition on the part of this legislature and of this state that our people do not receive sufficient compensation for their efforts—\$3.35 an hour was determined to be the minimum standard as of 1981 and even then we realized that it was less than adequate. In fact, if you look at the real standard, an employee would have to make \$4.75 an hour to meet the poverty level that I just talked about. The \$3.35 was adequate in 1981; there is no reason to believe that it is adequate now. The cost of living has gone up 16 percent, their buying power has decreased by 16 percent.

We have an opportunity to do something for the people at the bottom of the ladder, something that should have been done a long time ago and something that won't be done at the federal level, unfortunately.

Once again, I must point out that we have done a lot at this level and at the federal level over the last three and a half years to help those people at the top of the ladder. We have given them all kinds of breaks, we have given businesses, those people who are employing the people we are talking about, tremendous advantages—accelerated cost recovery, safe harbor leasing, you name it, you can go right down the list. I have a list here a mile long, not quite a mile long, that deals with the benefits that this legislature has passed such as tax conformity in the past and full conformity coming up shortly. We have done a lot and here we are asking to do something to give people who work 40 hours a week, and not a lot of these people do that, \$8 a week more to help them increase their buying power and help get them back on their feet and keep their motivation to work there. I just can't believe that we would fail to enact this piece of legislation when it is of such a vital interest to the working people of this state, 20 percent of our work force.

I appreciate your listening to me, I plead with you to support this proposal. Mr. Speaker, I believe the motion is to accept the "Ought Not to Pass" recommendation?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would answer in the affirmative.

Mr. DIAMOND: Then I would ask you people to vote to oppose that motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Thomaston, Mr. Mayo.

Mr. MAYO: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Very briefly, I just want to say that there is a way to address the concerns that the gentleman from Corinth, Mr. Strout, and Representative Cooper have raised, but those must be done in the form of amendment at second reading. I plead with you to let this bill go to second reading so we can address those concerns.

I would also like to concur with the good gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. McHenry. This is a question of personal courage. I intend to go home to my town of Thomaston tonight with my head held high saying to myself that I have done the right thing, not the politically expedient thing.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Tuttle.

Mr. TUTTLE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I will try to be brief. I haven't said anything on this issue so far but I think I have an input that probably a lot of you don't. I come from a working class family. Many of my relatives, including myself, have worked for the minimum wage in the shoe shop, in the textile mill and as common laborers in the State of Maine.

I am sure that we all realize, as was mentioned before, that often working for the minimum wage is the same as working for the maximum wage. I would like to read a quote that I read last night

from Thomas Jefferson, something I think that applies to this issue and to us today. He said: "History shows us that if those who can most afford it forget about those who can least survive based on the premise of expediency or profit alone, then those who support this wrongdoing will not long prevail."

I think as Mr. Connolly has said, the State of Maine has always been known for its motto, "Dirigo" which is "I Lead." I hope that the Maine Legislature would go on record today in leading the fight for the working poor of the State of Maine and support this legislation and go on record again as leading once more.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. McHenry.

Mr. McHENRY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Just a little bit of information here. We all know that it is 20 percent of the people of the State of Maine that are working for minimum wage but do we also know that we are the state with the highest percentage of millionaires? Not because we are a vacationland, Florida is more of a vacationland than we are and I would hope that the Democrats that are voting against this, because the Republicans are 100 percent, they are totally supportive of killing this bill, but there are two Democrats that did get up out of the 20 and explained why they did what they did and I wish the other 18 would get up and tell us why.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question is on acceptance of the Minority "Ought Not to Pass" Report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Macomber.

Mr. MACOMBER: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to pair my vote with the gentlelady from South Portland, Ms. Benoit. If Ms. Benoit were present and voting, she would be voting no; I would be voting yes.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Richard.

Mr. RICHARD: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to pair my vote with the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Telow. If Mr. Telow were present and voting, he would be voting yes; I would be voting no.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on acceptance of the Minority "Ought Not to Pass" Report. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL NO. 474

YEA—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Bell, Bonney, Bott, Brown, A.K.; Brown, D.N.; Cahill, Callahan, Conary, Conners, Cooper, Cote, Crouse, Curtis, Daggett, Davis, Day, Dexter, Dillenback, Drinkwater, Dudley, Foster, Greenlaw, Gwadosky, Higgins, L.M.; Holloway, Ingraham, Jackson, Joseph, Kiesman, LaPlante, Lebowitz, Livesay, MacBride, MacEachern, Manning, Masterman, Masterton, Matthews, K.L.; Maybury, McGowan, McPherson, Moholland, Murphy, E.M.; Murphy, T.W.; Paradis, E.J.; Parent, Perkins, Pines, Pouliot, Randall, Reeves, J.W.; Ridley, Roberts, Robinson, Roderick, Salsbury, Scarpino, Seavey, Seherburne, Small, Smith, C.B.; Smith, C.W.; Soucy, Soule, Sproul, Stevenson, Stover, Strout, Walker, Webster, Wentworth, Weymouth, Willey, Zirkilton.

NAY—Ainsworth, Andrews, Baker, Beaulieu, Bost, Brannigan, Brodeur, Carroll, D.P.; Carter, Cashman, Chonko, Clark, Connolly, Cox, Crowley, Diamond, Erwin, Gauvreau, Hall, Handy, Hayden, Hickey, Higgins, H.C.; Hobbins, Jacques, Jalbert, Joyce, Kane, Kelleher, Kelly, Ketter, Kilcoyne, Lehoux, Lisnik, Locke, Mahany, Martin, A.C.; Martin, H.C.; Matthews, Z.E.; Mayo, McColister, McHenry, McSweeney, Melendy, Michael, Michaud, Mills, Mitchell, E.H.; Mitchell, J.; Murray, Nadeau, Nelson, Norton, Paradis, P.E.; Paul, Perry, Racine, Reeves, P.; Rolde, Rotondi, Stevens, Swazey, Tammara, Theriault, Thompson, Tuttle, Vose, The Speaker.

ABSENT—Carrier, Carroll, G.A.

PAIRED—Benoit, Macomber, Richard, Telow.

77 having voted in the affirmative and 68 in the negative, with 2 being absent and 4 paired,