

# 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**

the way they are packaged. I don't want that misunderstood.

I think in response to the gentleman from Milo and his remarks, that if you take the percentage of excise tax on beer or malt beverages, certainly that is nowhere near the percentage that the excise tax is on cigarettes. So I think you know those are apples and bananas there.

I would just like to make one more statement. I think in response to the possibility of a decline in cigarette sales, all you have to have, because we figured that every pack of cigarettes you lose a sale on, you are not only losing that five cents, you are losing that 20 cent excise tax too. So, I guess when you look at it and I have just been doing some rough drafting here, if we have a decline in cigarette sales, take over last year and this year of 15 percent, you have wiped out any gain that you ever had. I think that is something you must seriously consider.

I see Mrs. Murphy sitting over in the other row and she had a business that was not in this state and I think she could, if she would like to, pass some stories along to us of what happens with the prices in New Hampshire versus of what they are in Maine and she probably could reflect on that quite well.

I am really concerned about this. I really think that it is a step in the wrong direction. I don't think that the policy is accurate.

**THE SPEAKER:** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Racine.

**Mr. RACINE:** Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I, too, am quite concerned about increasing the tax on cigarettes and especially coming from the southern part of the state. We will find that the majority of the smokers in the southern part of the state will travel to New Hampshire to purchase their cigarettes so you will have a loss in revenue. We have a lot of people that work at the Portsmouth Naval Station that live in the State of Maine that will be driving right to stores close to New Hampshire border and I am sure that those individuals will buy their cigarettes in New Hampshire rather than buying them in Maine.

What we did last year, we increased the excise tax by four cents; this year we are slapping them with five percent increase based on the sales tax. I think what we are doing is we are penalizing a certain segment of our society to raise taxes to fund some of the programs that have been approved.

I would like to read to you a short letter here from a cash and carry cigarette and tobacco store in the city of Biddeford. It is addressed to: "Maine Senators and Representatives: Do not kill the goose that lays the golden egg. This is what you will be doing if you remove cigarettes from the sales tax exempt items. Cigarettes are taxed too much already. You will also cause many Mom and Pop stores to close shop as many people will give up smoking. Others will buy their smokes in New Hampshire where, incidentally, they are buying their liquor. This is especially true for smokers residing in the southern part of the state. It will also mean a loss of jobs—we have four employees in our store, think of that."

"The figures that you are using to project anticipated revenues are most probably inflated and incorrect. Many of our sales are exempt because we do some wholesaling, so if you use exempt sales to list it on our sales stocks return, at least 25 percent of these are wholesale sales which will remain exempt. So, in essence, the revenue from cigarette taxes the state is presently enjoying will be reduced by one, sales driven to New Hampshire; two, no more sales to former smokers; three, sales to smokers who will start growing their own, and don't forget the loss of jobs."

"I have a new concept for you, why not reduce spending instead of finding more ways to tax higher and higher."

This is a letter from a constituent, someone who lives in Biddeford, they are quite concerned and I think it has a lot of merit. I think before you vote on this bill you should consider all aspects.

**THE SPEAKER:** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Kane.

**Mr. KANE:** Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The first thing I want to say is, how much I have enjoyed hearing mass mailings read into the record today and I would like to suggest maybe we might want to post them somewhere. I received two copies of the letter that Representative Paradis read and I only received one copy of the letter read by Representative Racine so I was glad to hear that again.

As far as the argument about New Hampshire, that this is going to cause a decrease in revenue by forcing everyone to go to New Hampshire because the tax is going up, by that same convoluted logic, the first thing I want to say is that when cigarette taxes in Maine have gone up before, experience shows that that is not the case. There is a historic immediate decline in cigarette consumption and then it goes back up. I really don't think when you are dealing with New Hampshire we ought to predicate what we do in this House on the likely actions of smugglers and thieves and criminals, I don't think that is a very wise policy for us.

As far as whether we are going to lose sales, if you follow that argument to its absurd conclusion, I think if we are going to lose revenue by increasing this tax and if we cut the tax, the excise tax as it currently exists and kept the sales tax exemption, then we would likely have a revenue windfall. I don't think anybody is going to believe and I think the rest of the argument follows that.

There ought to be an excise tax on cigarettes. It is a dangerous, addictive substance. I use it, a lot of friends of mine use it and members of my family—I notice most of the people who are opposed here are looking out for people like me and I appreciate it, Representative Jackson, Representative Paradis, but there ought to be an excise tax on it and there is. It is a very expensive item for state government to support. I don't have the immediate figures before me, I did two years ago, and what the state pays out through the Department of Human Services and through Medicaid and Catastrophic illness for people who have killed themselves or nearly killed themselves through cigarette smoking is a very, very big ticket item for us.

The excise tax is not a money maker, so if we just assumed that, then what is the rationale of having a sales tax exemption? You pay sales tax—a person, a young man and woman with small children, they have to have a car to get back and forth to work in this society, they pay a sales tax on the car, they pay a sales tax on the tires as well as the excise tax on the tires and they pay sales tax on clothes for their children. Now for us to require those sorts of sales taxes and then to exempt cigarettes is just beyond reason.

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 Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Berwick, Mrs. Murphy.

**Mrs. MURPHY:** Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I certainly do have to agree with Mr. Jackson as far as coming across the border and buying because the people in my town, we don't even have a business there because of the sales tax not only on cigarettes but on any such items. All there is between us and the city of Somersworth is the Salmon Falls River. I owned a store 40 feet across that Salmon Falls River and believe me, the higher the taxes in Maine, the more money I made.

**THE SPEAKER:** The pending question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Higgins, that the House ac-

cept the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL NO. 492

**YEA**—Ainsworth, Allen, Anderson, Andrews, Baker, Beaulieu, Bell, Benoit, Bonney, Bost, Bott, Brannigan, Brodeur, Brown, A.K.; Cahill, Carroll, D.P.; Carroll, G.A.; Carter, Cashman, Chonko, Connolly, Cooper, Cote, Cox, Crouse, Crowley, Curtis, Daggett, Davis, Day, Dexter, Diamond, Dillenback, Drinkwater, Erwin, Foster, Gauvreau, Handy, Hayden, Hickey, Higgins, H.C.; Higgins, L.M.; Hobbins, Holloway, Ingraham, Joseph, Joyce, Kane, Kelleher, Kelly, Ketover, Kilcoyne, LaPlante, Lebowitz, Lisnik, Livesay, Locke, MacBride, MacEachern, Macomber, Mahany, Manning, Martin, A.C.; Masterman, Masteron, Matthews, K.L.; Matthews, Z.E.; Maybury, Mayo, McCollister, McGowan, McHenry, McSweeney, Melendy, Mills, Mitchell, E.H.; Mitchell, J.; Moholland, Murphy, E.M.; Murphy, T.W.; Murray, Nadeau, Norton, Paradis, E.J.; Parent, Perkins, Perry, Pines, Pouliot, Randall, Reeves, J.W.; Richard, Ridley, Roberts, Salsbury, Scarpino, Seavey, Sherburne, Small, Smith, C.W.; Soule, Sproul, Stevens, Stevenson, Stover, Tammaro, Telow, Theriault, Thompson, Vose, Walker, Wentworth, Weymouth, Willey, Zirkilton, The Speaker.

**NAY**—Brown, D. N.; Callahan, Carrier, Conary, Connors, Dudley, Greenlaw, Jackson, Jacques, Jalbert, Kiesman, Lehoux, Martin, H. C., McPherson, Michael, Michaud, Murphy, E. M.; Norton, Paradis, P. E.; Racine, Robinson, Roderick, Rotondi, Smith, C. B.; Strout, Tuttle, Webster.

**ABSENT** — Armstrong, Clark, Gwadosky, Hall, Nelson, Paul, Reeves, P.; Rolde, Soucy, Swazey.

114 having voted in the affirmative and 27 in the negative, with 10 being absent, the motion did prevail.

The Bill was read once.

Under suspension of the rules, the Bill was read a second time, passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

#### Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act to Increase the Minimum Wage over a 3-year period to \$3.65 (S. P. 835 (L. D. 2236)) (H. "C" H-734) on which the Bill and accompanying papers were Indefinitely Postponed in the House on April 13, 1984.

Came from the Senate Passed to be Enacted in non-concurrence.

**THE SPEAKER:** The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Beaulieu.

**Mrs. BEAULIEU:** Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

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

**Mr. CONNOLLY:** Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: It is not my intention to initiate any sort of extended debate. We have been through the arguments and the counter-arguments in a rather extensive fashion on this bill in the past three weeks and probably anything that is said today is not going to be new and it is not probably going to change anybody's mind.

However, the issue is of such significance to many of us here in the legislature and a lot of people outside these walls that I think it does deserve one last appeal.

Almost all of the arguments that have been made on this bill in the last three weeks had been economic arguments that really center onto one question—if we increased the minimum wage, is it ultimately going to help or hurt the minimum wage worker for whom minimum wage legislation was designed to protect? We have trotted out our facts, we have trotted out the appropriate studies and we have laid out our theories. On the one hand, we say that this is a woman's issue because two-thirds of the people who work for minimum wage are women and that it is an issue, con-

trary to popular belief, that does not affect teenagers because more than 60 percent of the people who work for minimum wage are not teenagers, and even if we do increase the minimum wage in the meager level that this bill now calls for, most of the families who rely on minimum wage for their sole source of income will still be at or below poverty level and there hasn't been an increase in the minimum wage since 1981 and the cost of living has gone up 16 percent.

Conversely on the other side, the opponents of this legislation have trotted out their arguments. They have said that if we pass this bill that it is going to hurt the tourism industry, that it is going to hurt business, that jobs will be lost, that people will be laid off and that new positions that would have been created will not be created because of the effect of this legislation. But in my opinion, to debate this issue solely on economic grounds misses the point and begs the question because for me the issue with this bill is really the moral argument that tests our ability as lawmakers to, number one, reason logically and, two, to govern compassionately.

As Representative Beaulieu has said on several occasions in the past three weeks in debating this legislation that what is represented in this bill is really a matter of fairness and a matter of equity. As the sponsor of this legislation saw fit to write into the Statement of Fact on this bill, the purpose of the legislation is to increase the economic standards of living for Maine's working poor.

For many workers in this state, the estimated 100,000 workers give or take a few thousand, who work for minimum wage, that wage determines how they clothe their family, how they feed their family, how they house their family and what type of medical care they receive. A 30 cent increase in the minimum wage that is called for in this bill over three years, not even beginning initially until January 1, 1984 is certainly not going to hurt any individual or any business and I think everybody in this room, if they had the courage, would admit that that is true.

During the evening of high drama that occurred here a week or a week and a half ago when we had our last debate on this bill, the opposition floor leader recited in opposing this legislation the Republican Bible and what he said was, the only thing that really matters to us and to our party is business, that is the thing that matters primarily. That argument, that is okay for me because I understand where the Republican Party is coming from and understand the Republican individuals, their positions and their philosophies. I think since 1938 when the minimum wage legislation was first enacted, you could accurately portray the Republican Party's position as being in support of the minimum wage—the lower the minimum, the better it would be as far as they were concerned. But that night when members of my own party got up and espoused the same philosophy that the Republican floor leader gave in arguing against the bill, I just couldn't understand it and I can't accept it. I don't think regardless of how the vote turns out today, that I will ever fully comprehend Democratic opposition for this legislation.

Today I happened to come across this postcard. It seems from discussions that I have had with individual members of the legislature that this card was sent to most if not all the Republican members of this legislature and to some selected Democrats and the message that is on the back of the card reads as follows: "Thank you for your strong support, for your strong voice of support, for Maine business and tourism community." It is signed by one of the chief lobbyists for the tourism industry in the state, a woman who has been up here lobbying on behalf of small businesses and tourism for the last couple of years.

The temptation for me and I think for many

people here in this legislature has been strong to demagogue this issue and I think for the most part most of us have stayed away from that temptation but I would like to say now, here at the last hour of the final vote of this legislation, to say publicly what I think of the tourism and business community as I see them represented in the halls of the legislature, and in my opinion, I think they are an extremely selfish and greedy bunch of people.

In the last several years in this legislature, we have given tax breaks to Bath Iron Works, we have given subsidies to Bath Iron Works and taxbreaks to companies like Pratt-Whitney and Spencer Press. In this session of this legislature, we are going to give full conformity to a majority of businesses and individuals across this state. We are giving tax breaks to the ethanol people, Bar Harbor Airlines and a variety of other airlines. Last session of the legislature in the budget we gave \$500,000 to the tourism industry and this year in the budget that we passed two weeks ago, we gave them another \$175,000. In the words of the gentleman from Lewiston, "that ain't potato chips, folks." That is a substantial contribution that this legislature has given in one form or another to the tourism and business community. Now, with them having received all of that, they are not even willing to share some of the crumbs from the table with their workers and that is really what this legislation represents.

As far as this legislature is concerned, in the eyes of the tourism and business community, it is like a line from the song "Alice's Restaurant"—they can get anything they want.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if you view this issue as I do, as ultimately a moral issue and you put aside all the economic arguments on both sides that have been made, I don't think that you can, in your heart of hearts, escape the conclusion that the increase of 30 cents over three years, 10 cents at a time, not beginning until January 1, 1985, an increase of that nature to be done now in this state is the right thing to do.

I would hope that today we would vote our conscience.

Mrs. Beaulieu of Portland requested a roll call.

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 Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wells, Mrs. Wentworth.

Mrs. WENTWORTH: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: May I respectfully remind you that this minimum wage is not a fixed wage but merely the lowest salary that may be paid to an entry level position.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Athens, Ms. Rontondi.

Ms. RONTONDI: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have been listening to this debate and all the other debates for the last few days. I had not intended to speak on this issue but now I feel I must.

As you have heard before, this issue is one of simple justice and fairness, a raise to the lowest paid workers in the state, workers who have not had a raise since 1981. As you already know, those who have the most to lose are adult women, many of whom are single heads of households and very poor.

If you read the Portland Press Herald last week you also know that there are no simple answers. No one can be absolutely sure what the economic impact will be for the workers or the industries but we have also taken a lot of risks towards the end of the session, most notably a risk on an ethanol plant to the tune of \$5 million. That vote is completed but I say that we owe it to the workers of this state to make an investment on their behalf. If we are willing to go along with a \$5 million risk on ethanol, we should be even more willing to take the responsibility to give 100,000 of the hardest workers

in this state a 30 cent raise.

I hope you will join me in making an investment on our Maine workers and their future.

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is on the motion of the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Beaulieu, that the House recede and concur.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brooksville, Mr. Perkins.

Mr. PERKINS: Mr. Speaker, I request permission to pair my vote with the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Clark. If Mr. Clark were present and voting, he would be voting yes; I would be voting no.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Telow, and the Chair would welcome him back.

Mr. TELOW: Mr. Speaker, I wish to pair my vote with the gentleman from Sangerville, Mr. Hall. If Mr. Hall were present and voting, he would be voting yes; I would be voting no.

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

Mr. MACOMBER: Mr. Speaker, I request permission to pair my vote with the gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Swazey. If Mr. Swazey were present and voting, he would be voting yes; I would be voting no.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Gorham, Mrs. Brown.

Mrs. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I request permission to pair my vote with the gentlewoman from Pittston, Mrs. Reeves. If Mrs. Reeves were present and voting, she would be voting yes; I would be voting no.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Baileyville, Mr. Tammaro.

Mr. TAMMARO: Mr. Speaker, I wish to pair my vote with the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Soucy. If Mr. Soucy were present and voting, he would be voting no; I would be voting yes.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Orono, Mr. Bost.

Mr. BOST: Mr. Speaker, I request permission to pair my vote with the gentleman from Wilton, Mr. Armstrong. If Mr. Armstrong were present and voting he would be voting no; I would be voting yes.

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

Mr. RACINE: I request permission to pair my vote with the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Nelson. If Mrs. Nelson were present and voting, she would be voting no; I would be voting yes.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westport, Mr. Soule.

Mr. SOULE: Mr. Speaker, I request permission to pair my vote with the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Gwadosky. If Mr. Gwadosky were present and voting, he would be voting yes; I would be voting no.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Buxton, Mrs. Roberts.

Mrs. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I request permission to pair my vote with the gentleman from York, Mr. Rolde. If Mr. Rolde were present and voting, he would be voting yes; I would be voting no.

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is the motion of the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Beaulieu, that the House recede and concur. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL NO. 493

YEA—Ainsworth, Allen, Andrews, Baker, Beaulieu, Benoit, Brannigan, Brodeur, Carroll, D.P.; Carroll, G.A.; Carter, Cashman, Chonko, Connolly, Cote, Cox, Crowley, Diamond, Erwin, Gauvreau, Handy, Hayden, Hickey, Higgins, H.C.; Hobbins, Jacques, Jalbert, Joyce, Kane, Kelleher, Kelly, Ketover, Kilcoyne, Lehoux, Lisnik, Locke, Mahany, Martin, A.C.; Martin, H.C.; Matthews, Z.E.; Mayo, McCollister, McGowan, McHenry, McSweeney, Melendy, Michael, Michaud, Mills, Mitchell, E.H.; Mitchell, J.; Moholland, Murray, Nadeau, Norton, Paradis, P.E.; Perry, Pouliot, Richard, Rotondi, Stevens, Theriault, Thompson, Tuttle, Vose, The Speaker.

NAY—Anderson, Bell, Bonney, Bott, Brown, D.N.; Cahill, Callahan, Carrier, Conary, Connors, Cooper, Crouse, Curtis, Daggett, Davis, Day, Dexter, Dillenback, Drinkwater, Dudley, Foster, Greenlaw, Higgins, L.M.; Holloway, Ingraham, Jackson, Joseph, Kiesman, LaPlante, Lebowitz, Livesay, MacBride, Manning, Masterman, Masterton, Matthews, K.L.; Maybury, McPherson, Murphy, E.M.; Murphy, T.W.; Paradis, E.J.; Parent, Pines, Randall, Reeves, J.W.; Ridley, Robinson, Roderick, Salsbury, Scarpino, Seavey, Sherburne, Small, Smith, C.B.; Smith, C.W.; Sproul, Stevenson, Stover, Strout, Walker, Webster, Wentworth, Weymouth, Willey, Zirkilton.

PAIRED—Armstrong, Bost, Brown, A. K.; Clark, Gwadosky, Hall, Macomber, Nelson, Perkins, Racine, Reeves, P., Roberts, Rolde, Soucy, Soule, Swazey, Tammara, Telow.

ABSENT—MacEachern, Paul.

66 having voted in the affirmative and 65 in the negative, with 2 absent and 18 paired, the motion did prevail.

### ORDERS

On motion of Representative McSweeney of Old Orchard Beach, the following Order:

ORDERED, that Representative Richard W. Armstrong of Wilton be excused April 24th and 25th for personal reasons.

Was read and passed.

### Passed to Be Enacted

An Act Providing for Administrative Changes in Maine Tax Laws (H. P. 1871) (L. D. 2473)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed, passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

### Enactor Reconsidered

An Act to Amend the State Income Tax Credit for the Installation of Renewable Energy Systems (H. P. 1831) (L. D. 2432) (C. "A" H-732)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed.

On motion of Representative Higgins of Portland, under suspension of the rules the House reconsidered its action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed.

On further motion of the same gentleman, under suspension of the rules the House reconsidered its action whereby Committee Amendment "A" was adopted.

The same gentleman offered House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" (H-736) was read by the Clerk.

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

Mr. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: The purpose of this amendment is to restore the limit on the income tax credit to what it originally was, which is \$100.

Thereupon, House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" was adopted.

Committee Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto was adopted.

The Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

### Orders of the Day

The following matters, in the consideration of which the House was engaged at the time of adjournment Friday, April 13, 1984, have preference in the Orders of the Day and continue with such preference until disposed of as provided by Rule 24.

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

Bill "An Act to Amend the Forest Fire Control Laws and Change the Method of Funding Forest Fire Control Services" (Emergency) (H. P. 1581) (L. D. 2093)

—In Senate, Majority "Ought to Pass" in New Draft Report of the Committee on Taxation read and accepted and the New Draft (H. P. 1782) (L. D. 2347) Passed to be Engrossed in non-concurrence.

—In House, House Reconsidered Insisting on recommitting Bill and Accompanying Papers to the Committee on Taxation on April 10, 1984.

Tabled—April 12, 1984 (Till Later Today) by Representative Mitchell of Vassalboro.

Pending—Motion of Representative Jackson of Harrison to Recede and Concur.

Thereupon the House voted to adhere.

The following papers were taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

### Unanimous Leave to Withdraw

Representative Higgins from the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act to Repeal the Sales Tax on Meals and Lodging and to Establish a Meals and Lodging Tax for the Purposes of Stabilizing the Property Tax and Promoting Tourism" (H. P. 1737) (L. D. 2303) reporting "Leave to Withdraw"

Was placed in the Legislative Files without further action pursuant to Joint Rule 15 and sent up for concurrence.

### The following Communication: COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

April 24, 1984

The Honorable John L. Martin

Speaker of the House

111th Legislature

Dear Speaker Martin:

We are pleased to report that all business which was placed before the Committee on Taxation during the second regular session of the 111th Legislature has been completed. The breakdown of bills referred to our committee follows:

Total number of bills received	45
Unanimous reports	38
Leave to Withdraw	15
Ought to Pass	5
Ought Not to Pass	0
Ought to Pass as Amended	12
Ought to Pass in New Draft	6
Divided reports	7

Respectfully submitted,

S/FRANK P. WOOD

Senate Chair

S/H. CRAIG HIGGINS

House Chair

Was read and ordered placed on file.

By unanimous consent, all matters acted upon were ordered sent forthwith.

Bill "An Act Relating to the Use of Implements and Devices in Washington County Waters" (H. P. 1873) (L. D. 2475) (Presented by Representative Vose of Eastport) (Cosponsors: Representatives Connors of Franklin, Crowley of Stockton Springs and Senator Brown of Washington) (Approved for introduction by a majority of the Legislative Council pursuant to Joint Rule 27)

Committee on Marine Resources suggested and ordered printed.

Under suspension of the rules, the bill was read twice, passed to be engrossed without reference to any committee and sent up for concurrence.

### The following Communication: STATE OF MAINE House of Representatives Speaker's Office Augusta, Maine 04333

April 24, 1984

Honorable Edwin H. Pert

Clerk of the House

State House

Augusta, Maine 04333

Dear Clerk Pert:

I am pleased to authorize and direct you to

serve on a full-time basis when the 111th Legislature is not in regular or special session, as provided in Section 42 of Title 3 of the Maine Revised Statutes Annotated.

Sincerely,

S/JOHN L. MARTIN

Speaker of the House

Was read and ordered placed on file.

The following Communication:

STATE OF MAINE

House of Representatives

Speaker's Office

Augusta, Maine 04333

April 24, 1984

Honorable Edwin H. Pert

Clerk of the House

State House

Augusta, Maine 04333

Dear Clerk Pert:

I am pleased to authorize and direct Deborah Bedard Wood to serve on a full-time basis when the 111th Legislature is not in regular or special session, as provided in Section 42 of Title 3 of the Maine Revised Statutes Annotated.

Sincerely,

John L. Martin

Speaker of the House

Was read and ordered placed on file

### Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act to Require that the Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program Promote Family Unity (S. P. 652) (L. D. 1842) which was Passed to be Enacted in the House on April 10, 1984. (Having previously been Passed to be Engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-383)

Came from the Senate, Passed to be Engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-383) as amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-422) thereto in non-concurrence.

House voted to Recede and Concur.

### Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act to Permit Possession of Soft-shell Clam Stocks 2 Inches or Greater in the Largest Diameter (H. P. 1501) (L. D. 1975) which was Passed to be Enacted in the House on March 27, 1984. (Having previously been Passed to be Engrossed as amended by House Amendment "E" (H-537)

Came from the Senate, Passed to be Engrossed as amended by House Amendment "E" (H-537) as amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-423) thereto in non-concurrence.

House voted to Recede and Concur.

### Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act to Amend the Statutes Relating to Handicapping Conditions Under the Human Services Law (H. P. 1589) (L. D. 2099) which was Passed to be Enacted in the House on April 6, 1984. (Having previously been Passed to be Engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-565) and House Amendments "A" (H-576) and "B" (H-629)

Came from the Senate, Passed to be Engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-565) and House Amendments "A" (H-576) and "B" (H-629) and Senate Amendment "A" (S-424) in non-concurrence.

House voted to Recede and Concur.

### Non-Concurrent Matter

RESOLVE, Reimbursing Certain Municipalities on Account of Taxes Lost Due to Lands being Classified under the Tree Growth Tax Law (Emergency) (H. P. 1720) (L. D. 2260) which was Finally Passed in the House on March 27, 1984.

Came from the Senate, Passed to be Engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-425) in non-concurrence.

House voted to Recede and Concur.