

# 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

**Volume I**

**FIRST REGULAR SESSION**

**December 1, 1982 to May 13, 1983**

**HOUSE**

Monday, May 2, 1983

The House met according to adjournment and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Reverend Howell Lind of the Winthrop Street Universalist Church of Augusta.

The members stood at attention for the playing of the National Anthem by the Marshwood High School Band of Eliot.

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

**Papers from the Senate  
Reports of Committees**

**Ought to Pass in New Draft/New Title**

Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Concerning Games for Prizes" (S. P. 409) (L. D. 1257) reporting "Ought to Pass" in New Draft under New Title Bill "An Act Concerning Transient Sellers who Offer Merchandise as Free of Charge" (S. P. 508) (L. D. 1522)

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the New Draft passed to be engrossed.

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence, the New Draft read once and assigned for second reading tomorrow.

**Non-Concurrent Matter**

Bill "An Act to Create Boothbay Region Waterfowl Sanctuary" (H. P. 713) (L. D. 904) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on April 25, 1983.

Came from the Senate recommitted to the Committee on Fisheries and Wildlife in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mr. MacEachern of Lincoln, the House voted to recede and concur.

**Messages and Documents**

The following Communication: (S. P. 514)  
111th Maine Legislature

April 28, 1983

Honorable Kenneth P. Hayes  
Honorable Stephanie Locke  
Chairs  
Joint Standing Committee on Education  
State House  
Augusta, Maine 04333  
Dear Chairs Hayes and Locke:

Please be advised that Governor Joseph E. Brennan today nominated Joseph D. Murphy of Biddeford for appointment to the State Board of Education.

Pursuant to Title 20 MRSA Section 51, this nomination will require review by the Joint Standing Committee on Education and confirmation by the Senate.

Sincerely,  
S/GERARD P. CONLEY  
President of the Senate  
S/JOHN L. MARTIN  
Speaker of the House

Came from the Senate read and referred to the Committee on Education.

In the House, was read and referred to the Committee on Education in concurrence.

**Petitions, Bills and Resolves  
Requiring Reference**

The following Bill and Resolve were received and, upon recommendation of the Committee on Reference of Bills, were referred to the following Committees:

**Aging, Retirement and Veterans**

RESOLVE, Concerning Retirement Allowances for Hester G. Brown and Ruth M. Hanna (H. P. 1162) (Presented by Representative Foster of Ellsworth) (Cosponsors: Senator Perkins of Hancock and Representative Salsbury of Bar Harbor) (Approved for introduction by a majority of the Legislative Council pursuant to Joint Rule 24)

(Ordered Printed)  
Sent up for concurrence.

**Education**

Bill "An Act to Identify and to Promote Excellence in Schools" (Emergency) (H. P. 1163) (Presented by Representative Locke of Sebec) (Cosponsors: Representative Randall of East Machias and Senator Hayes of Penobscot) (Submitted by the Department of Educational and Cultural Services pursuant to Joint Rule 24)

(Ordered Printed)

Sent up for concurrence. (Later Reconsidered)

**House Reports of Committees  
Unanimous Leave to Withdraw**

Representative Brannigan from the Committee on Business Legislation on Bill "An Act to Adjust the Workers' Compensation Insurance Rates Charged Volunteer Ambulance Companies" (H. P. 888) (L. D. 1153) reporting "Leave to Withdraw"

Representative Brannigan from the Committee on Business Legislation on Bill "An Act Relating to Malpractice Insurance in the Field of Medicine" (Emergency) (H. P. 946) (L. D. 1227) reporting "Leave to Withdraw"

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

**Ought to Pass in New Draft  
Later Today Assigned**

Representative Kelleher from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act to Maximize the Availability of Certain Social Services by Providing for Income from Fees and Remove References to Federal Requirements which no Longer Exist" (H. P. 828) (L. D. 1066) reporting "Ought to Pass" in New Draft (H. P. 1161) (L. D. 1533)

Report was read.

On motion of Mrs. Mitchell of Vassalboro, tabled pending acceptance of the Committee Report and later today assigned.

**Ought to Pass in New Draft/New Title**

Representative Ridley from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on Bill "An Act to Strengthen the Shoreland Wetlands Alterations Law" (H. P. 575) (L. D. 723) reporting "Ought to Pass" in New Draft under New Title Bill "An Act to Amend Mandatory Zoning and Subdivision Control" (H. P. 1160) (L. D. 1531)

Report was read and accepted, the New Draft read once and assigned for second reading.

**Divided Report**

Majority Report of the Committee on Transportation reporting "Ought to Pass" on Bill "An Act to Require the Wearing of Protective Headgear by All Motorcycle, Motor Driven Cycle and Moped Riders" (H. P. 836) (L. D. 1072)

Report was signed by the following members:

Senators:  
DANTON of York  
DIAMOND of Cumberland  
— of the Senate.

Representatives:  
MACOMBER of South Portland  
McPHERSON of Eliot  
REEVES of Pittston  
NADEAU of Lewiston  
CARROLL of Limerick  
— of the House.

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting "Ought Not to Pass" on same Bill.

Reporting was signed by the following members:

Senator:  
EMERSON of Penobscot  
— of the Senate.

Representatives:  
STROUT of Corinth  
MOHOLLAND of Princeton  
THERIAULT of Fort Kent  
CALLAHAN of Mechanic Falls

**CAHILL of Woolwich**

— of the House.

Reports were read.

Mr. Carroll of Limerick moved that the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report be accepted.

Whereupon, Mr. Strout of Corinth requested a roll call vote.

The SPEAKER: For the Chair to order a roll call, it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All those desiring a roll call vote will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken, and more than one fifth of the members present having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Limerick, Mr. Carroll, that the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report be accepted. All those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL**

YEA—Ainsworth, Anderson, Andrews, Baker, Beaulieu, Bonney, Bost, Brannigan, Brodeur, Brown, K.L.; Carrier, Carroll, D.P.; Carroll, G.A.; Chonko, Cox, Daggett, Diamond, Drinkwater, Foster, Gowadosky, Handy, Hickey, Ingraham, Joseph, Joyce, Kelleher, Kelly, Ketter, Kilcoyne, LaPlante, Lebowitz, Lehoux, Lisnik, Livesay, MacBride, Macomber, Manning, Martin, A.C.; Martin, H.C.; Masterton, Matthews, K.L.; Matthews, Z.E.; Maybury, McPherson, McSweeney, Melendy, Mitchell, E. H.; Mitchell, J.; Murray, Nadeau, Perkins, Perry, Pines, Pouliot, Reeves, P.; Rolde, Stevenson, Thompson, Walker, Wentworth, Zirkilton.

NAY—Allen, Armstrong, Bell, Bott, Brown, A.K.; Brown, D.N.; Cahill, Callahan, Carter, Cashman, Clark, Conary, Connors, Cooper, Cote, Crouse, Crowley, Davis, Day, Dexter, Dillenback, Dudley, Erwin, Gauvreau, Greenlaw, Hall, Hayden, Higgins, L.M.; Hobbins, Holloway, Jackson, Kiesman, Lewis, Locke, MacEachern, Masterman, McCollister, McGowan, McHenry, McSweeney, Michael, Michaud, Moholland, Murphy, Nelson, Norton, Paradis, E.J.; Parent, Paul, Racine, Richard, Roberts, Roderick, Rondoni, Salsbury, Scarpino, Seavey, Sherburne, Small, Smith, C.B.; Smith, C.W.; Soucy, Soule, Sproul, Stevens, Stover, Strout, Studley, Swazey, Tammara, Telow, Theriault, Vose, Webster, Weymouth, Willey.

ABSENT—Benoit, Connolly, Curtis, Higgins, H.C.; Jacques, Jalbert, Kane, Mahany, Paradis, P.E.; Randall, Reeves, J.W.; Ridley, Tuttle, The Speaker.

Yes, 60; No, 75; Absent, 14; Vacant, 2.

The SPEAKER: Sixty having voted in the affirmative and seventy five in the negative, with fourteen being absent and two vacant, the motion does not prevail.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Nelson.

Mrs. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I now move that we reconsider our action and further move that this be tabled for one legislative day.

Whereupon, Mr. Brown of Livermore Falls requested a vote.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Nelson, that this matter be tabled for one legislative day. All those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

62 having voted in the affirmative and 71 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Nelson.

Mrs. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I am glad that we have the opportunity to debate this very important issue, and since we have not with the previous vote, I felt it was important that you remember just a few things.

Seven years ago, perhaps you don't remember that, but seven years ago as a fresh-

man I was asked by the chair of the committee, Health and Institutional Services, if I would give him a vote on a bill that he cared a lot about. It was about the second week of the session and I said yes. And I remembered that rule number one was that once you say yes you don't change your vote, you don't change your mind. That vote was to take off the helmets from the motorcyclists. For seven years I have lived with that had vote. I knew it was wrong, I knew it was wrong at the time, and I listened to the debate and yet I had promised my vote and gave my vote, and for seven years I have worked to change that vote around, and now I have again the opportunity to speak to my peers to tell you of the enormous health cost to the State of Maine.

The Health and Institutional Services Committee, for 12 hours on Thursday, heard testimony regarding health costs in the State of Maine, and I want you to know that for no other reason, and let's not talk about freedom, let's not talk about these people having the right to choose whether they have a helmet or not, because it is costing you and every taxpayer in the State of Maine enormous amounts of money for that so-called freedom.

Now, we put hats on hunters, we put hats on people that work in construction. . . .

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

Mr. WILLEY: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his point of order.

Mr. WILLEY: Mr. Speaker, am I missing something on this? I thought we had a roll call on this bill and also a division on tabling?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would answer in the affirmative, and that is why the gentleman has the right to debate the bill. The pending question is on the motion to reconsider.

Mrs. NELSON: I am pleading with the people to reconsider their vote and vote with the majority "Ought to Pass" report. It costs the State of Maine over \$50,000 a year to support these young people who did not know the value of their own head, and that is what it is all about. How much to you value your head?

Last night, I had the privilege of speaking to a young man who was a motorcyclist who told me lots of things. Just because I don't ride a motorcycle doesn't mean I don't have the right to talk about it. I have given birth to three children; that doesn't mean that I am the only one that should vote on what it is like to have a baby. We all here have a responsibility to the people that we are supposed to be representing.

This young man told me that he was wearing a helmet, but even though he had an accident, he is paralyzed from the neck down, he thanks God that he was wearing that helmet because if he wasn't he would be dead, and although he has only the use of his very keen mind, he pleaded with me on the phone last night to do everything I could to have this body insist that people wear helmets.

For a motorcycle driver who suffers brain damage in an accident because he didn't wear a crash helmet, it costs about \$2,500 a day to keep him alive, those first days in intensive care. His total hospital bill could easily run thirty to fifty thousand dollars if, as is often the case, he must then be placed in a nursing home. The price just to maintain him starts at \$12,000 to \$15,000, and sometimes rehabilitation services can push that cost to forty to fifty thousands dollars a year.

The non-helmeted motorcyclist is just one in a growing group of self-negligent Americans who are driving up health care costs with preventable injuries and illnesses. They demand freedom to behave as they please, they overindulge and to speed down highways without seatbelts or safety helmets, but if they are profoundly injured, many become permanent financial wards of the state, and so I plead with you, if for no other reason than the fact that we

can't afford to take care of these people anymore, the Governor said enough is enough, you stood on your feet and you cheered him—now you have the opportunity to vote with him on this area of, indeed, hospital cost containment, medical cost containment. I plead with you to reconsider your vote and vote with the majority of the Transportation Committee, "Ought to Pass."

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gray, Mr. Carroll.

Mr. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The helmet bill is not a new law. It was in place from 1967 on. The purpose of the law was to reduce severe head injury and death for those who ride motorcycles. Independent studies conducted since the repeal of that law has shown that prior to repeal, nationwide 99.7 percent of riders chose to wear helmets. Since that repeal, we have seen severe head injuries take the toll of individuals and put them into institutions for extended periods of time at a high cost not only to them, their families, but to society as a whole.

Research on helmets, to wear or not to wear, dates back to the early forties, and the research has become remarkably consistent. Unhelmeted riders are from two to four times more likely to incur head injuries than those who are wearing helmets. Even more drastically, unhelmeted riders are nine times more likely to receive fatal head injuries than those who are wearing helmets. In this country, thirty to fifty thousand people each year suffer serious head trauma. Most of them are under the age of 30 and most of those as a result of motor vehicle accidents, accidents that physically disable and intellectually impair you, the unhelmeted rider, for all lifetime. With such an epidemic affecting the youth of this country, should we not take steps to correct it? Have we not taken steps to cure other health epidemics which have swept through this country, measles, mumps, polio, have we not had a history of attempting to eradicate disease that threaten our youth? I submit to you that this state is a leader among the nation in preventative health care; this is a preventative health care issue and the time is now for the state to continue its leadership.

There are currently 19 states which require motorcyclists to wear helmets, and the use of helmets is being encouraged and urged not only by health officials, by their foundations, public agencies, but by a major group of organizations and the motorcycle industry itself.

The Motorcycle Industry Council, the Motorcycle Safety Foundation and the American Motorcycle Association encourage and endorse the use of helmets. The American Motorcyclists Association requires the use of helmets in all sanctioned events.

I would submit for your consideration that the American Motorcycle Association's sanction is far safer for cyclists than those traveling the highways with some of the four-wheel motorists, and I would draw your attention to the motor vehicle accident yesterday when a four-wheel motorist ran head on into a motorcyclist.

Clearly, the best solution to the head injury epidemic in this country is prevention and, clearly, if the industry, the majority of riders, the general public endorsement of protective mandatory head gear, this legislation, you should look upon that favorably.

I received a lot of mail both pro and con since I sponsored this piece of legislation not only from people in my district but from people around the state. Friday I receive one from Monroe, Washington. In 1981, it reads, I had a motorcycle accident that left me unconscious for three days, but now I have fully recovered; my helmet saved my life.

I have gathered 52 motorcycle accident victims who want a motorcycle law. The State of Washington is considering it, some of the

states that surround us have mandatory helmet laws. I would urge this body to look at this preventative health measure in a positive way and reconsider our action.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. McGowan.

Mr. MCGOWAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to have you just think about Representative Nelson's argument for a minute and think about the headlines you have read in the newspapers of airplane crashes and bicycle accidents and accidents of all types that impose severe head injuries on individuals of this state, and I would urge you to oppose the reconsideration motion.

I am a licensed parachutist with 546 jumps and I wouldn't get in an airplane without wearing a helmet, I think that is very important, but let me tell you, if my chute didn't open, the helmet wouldn't help me very much.

I would also add that motorcyclists who wear helmets wear helmets of different types, and if we are going to mandate helmets, let's mandate good quality, top quality, \$150 helmets that provide adequate protection, because there are a lot of motorcycle helmets on the market that if a severe impact is imposed, they will crack and cause severe damage to the head that might not have been there had they not had that helmet on.

I think the word we are talking about in this bill is mandate; let's not mandate. I believe in helmets, I believe in people riding motorcycles wearing them, but let's not mandate them. Let's let people choose whether or not they would wear them.

The SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is hospital cost containment. There are letters that I have gotten from people who have said, "do something about hospital cost containment." Whether you are pro or con, whether you are for the Governor's bill or Senator Twitchell's bill, they want to do something about hospital cost containment.

We sit here and we talk about mandating. Well, ladies and gentlemen, one of these days we are going to have to do something about the catastrophic illness program because, as previous speakers have indicated, \$50,000 a year—\$50,000 a year—just think what that could do for some of the programs that are sitting on the appropriations table. If you take 10 motorcycle accident victims, that is a lot of money; that is a half a million dollars a year that this state, you, me and the rest of the taxpayers of the state are paying for.

Representative McGowan talked about the helmet law and what should we do about the price of it. If he wants to amend it and put on a strict amendment that says it should be of a certain quality, I don't think anybody in this House would have any problem. If you can afford the prices of some of these motorcycles, some of them are going as high as \$5,000 and \$6,000, that is as much as some of the cars nowadays, then I think you can afford a \$150 helmet.

Also, most of these people out there aren't even insured. If we want to put an insurance on it, fine and dandy, but let's at least get the helmet law back on so that these people who are writing to me, and probably are going to be writing to the rest of you people about hospital cost containment, will at least have the opportunity to say that this legislature did something about hospital cost containment.

I have gone into three X-ray rooms in the last three years. They looked at me and they said, "You can do one thing for me—put the helmet law back in—one thing, put the helmet law back in."

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from St. George, Mr. Scarpino.

Mr. SCARPINO: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There are just a few points I would like to clear up on the helmet controversy.

First, Representative Nelson mentioned the amount of head injuries that would be prevented by wearing helmets. She did not mention, and I don't really know if there is any documentation of it, the number of accidents that may be caused by wearing helmets. A motorcycle rider has got three prime things to protect himself—he has got his senses, the full awareness of his senses, and he has got the speed and maneuverability of whatever machine he is on.

As a former motorcycle rider, as a member of the AMA and one who is licensed to race over an expert track in the New England Sports Committee, my experience is that wearing a full helmet, which is the only kind of helmet that will protect you from breaking your neck when you strike some hard object, it cuts out about 40 percent of your vision and about 80 percent of your hearing. The simple fact of it is, while wearing a helmet there are many situations that you cannot avoid simply because you are unaware of those situations existing. By the time you become aware of them, it is too late to do anything.

Mention was also made about the AMA, that at all AMA sanctioned events helmets must be worn. Well, there is one thing that wasn't mentioned, and that is the simple fact that most of these AMA sanctioned events are competition, they are races, they are scrambles, they are flat tracks, they are TT's. It is just common sense in a situation of competition where you are traveling at high rates of speed and taking undue risks that you would not normally be taking on the road that you wear a helmet.

There is also the other consideration that in the sanctioned events you are dealing with all experienced drivers and you can predict what the individual is going to do, and you can concentrate your senses upon your driving and the machine. You do not have to put a large portion of your senses into watching and being aware of other things and unpredictable events.

The simple fact of it is that while in certain situations helmets are helpful, in other situations they create as many problems as they resolve. As was mentioned earlier, an improperly constructed helmet or a certain style of helmet may break individuals' necks when they strike objects. If they don't break your neck, they are guaranteed to break your collar bone.

Basically, this is a matter that should be left up to the individual. The individual should judge, based on the type of riding he does, where he rides and how he rides, whether he feels it requires a helmet or not. Accordingly, I would urge you not to support the motion to reconsider.

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

Mr. RACINE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise this morning to speak in opposition to mandating to the people that drive, especially a moped, and I happen to be a moped owner and I like to go out, drive around the neighborhood, cruising about 10 to 15 miles an hour to cool myself off in the summer, and I'll be darned if I am going to wear a helmet to just drive 10 to 15 miles an hour.

Let me tell you what happened yesterday as an example. I tried to start my lawnmower and I ran into some difficulties—it wouldn't start. After trying to start the mower for about 15 to 20 minutes, if you will remember, yesterday was quite damp, humid and warm, so what I did to cool off was, I jumped on my little moped and pattered down the road. I was traveling at about 15 miles an hour when suddenly I heard a voice; there was a bicycle that passed me—a bicycle passed me. Now, if we are that concerned about safety and health cost containment, I think we should include bicycles in this bill.

The proponents of this bill are trying to impress upon us that if you wear a helmet, you

will not end up in the hospital and will walk away free—I don't believe that. I certainly object to having to wear a helmet on my little moped. As a matter of fact, if this thing becomes a law, if anyone wants to buy a moped, I will have one for sale.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Woolwich, Mrs. Cahill.

Mrs. CAHILL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As a motorcycle enthusiast, I feel personally that the helmet is an extremely important item of motorcycle attire, but also of equal importance, I believe that goggles and leather jackets should have some consideration, and I wonder if we as legislators are prepared to mandate leather jackets and goggles as well.

I would urge you not to reconsider this motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Princeton, Mr. Moholland.

Mr. MOHOLLAND: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I could stand up here and talk all day about this helmet. You probably ought to put them in trucks when we go down the road, and everything else. But I had a boy that had a real bad accident, I might as well tell it while I am on my feet, I don't have anything written down here, so I will try to speak from the heart.

I had a boy that was thrown 150 feet from a motorcycle out into a pasture. It cost me \$42,000 because he had a helmet on. The helmet hit him in the back of the neck and he had a blood clot that was draining the blood from his brain, so what does he do, he suffered for five years and he threatened to shoot his wife and family, he threatened to shoot me, all on account of wearing a helmet. Who knows if he didn't have that helmet on whether he would have been killed or he would have been all right today.

But I am saying this—down in Transportation, we just voted not to wear seatbelts in cars and trucks. The federal government took the seatbelts out of the trucks because it was causing too much hardship for the drivers, they were strapped in there and they couldn't move around, they were having accidents, and if I am not mistaken, Mr. Cole was down there, he is head of transportation for school buses, he said, in no way did he want seatbelts in school buses because they didn't need them.

When you have got a helmet on—I rode a motorcycle part of my life—and you could be a vegetable if you fall off a motorcycle and broke your back. This idea about falling off and hitting your head, I don't think it is right. You can upset a truck and you can cost the state \$50,000 a year, you can upset a car and cost the state \$50,000 a year. I don't think you should mandate helmets for motorcyclists and I hope you defeat the motion today.

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

Mr. MATTHEWS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise today as a cosponsor of L.D. 1072. Since many of the arguments in support of this legislation have already been mentioned, I will be brief.

I would like to address, however, the statement which many of the opponents of this legislation like to use, and that is that this bill and this kind of law represents governmental intrusion and intervention in the private affairs of each individual citizen. Fellow members of the House, I believe that the legislature and our government, state government, has a unique responsibility to play in the roles of individual citizens of this state. That role is a unique one and that role is to protect and enhance the quality of life of each individual citizen of this state. This bill would do that. My only urge to each member of this House is that you look down deep in your conscience and decide whether or not we as members of the legislature should not be involved in protecting our citizens and our residents of this state or

rather, as I believe and I am sure many of you believe, that there is a very, very important job for us to do down here, and that is to protect and enhance the quality of life of each member of this state.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Nelson, that the House reconsider its action whereby it failed to accept the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report. All those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

54 having voted in the affirmative and 72 having voted in the negative, the motion to reconsider did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

#### Consent Calendar

In accordance with House Rule 49, the following items appeared on the Consent Calendar for the First Day:

(S. P. 360) (L. D. 1081) Bill "An Act to Change References to the Public Utilities Commission in the Transportation Statutes"—Committee on Transportation reporting "Ought to Pass"

(S. P. 466) (L. D. 1420) Bill "An Act to Amend the Laws Governing the Administration of Medications in Group Home Intermediate Care Facilities for the Mentally Retarded"—Committee on Health and Institutional Services reporting "Ought to Pass"

There being no objections, the above items were ordered to appear on the Consent Calendar of May 3, under the listing of second day.

#### Consent Calendar Second Day

In accordance with House Rule 49, the following items appeared on the Consent Calendar for the Second Day:

(S. P. 326) (L. D. 971) Bill "An Act Concerning Public Easements for Access to Harvested Lands and Cemeteries"

(S. P. 304) (L. D. 918) Bill "An Act to Reestablish the Time of Announcing a Shorter Deer Season" (C. "A" S-74)

(H. P. 400) (L. D. 483) Bill "An Act to Increase the Damages Jurisdiction of the Maine District Court to \$30,000"

(H. P. 376) (L. D. 459) RESOLVE, Appropriating \$15,000 for Maine Poison Control Center

(H. P. 515) (L. D. 640) Bill "An Act to Allocate Moneys for the Administrative Expenses of the State Lottery Commission for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1984, and June 30, 1985" (Emergency)

(H. P. 778) (L. D. 1027) Bill "An Act to Create a Revolving Fund for Publications of the Department of Marine Resources"

(H. P. 577) (L. D. 725) Bill "An Act to Clarify the Maine Motor Vehicle Habitual Offender Statute" (C. "A" H-172)

(H. P. 715) (L. D. 906) Bill "An Act to Amend the Reporting Requirements in Cases of Death Due to Abuse or Neglect" (C. "A" H-173)

(H. P. 306) (L. D. 365) Bill "An Act Regulating the Activities of Political Action Committees" (C. "A" H-174)

(H. P. 768) (L. D. 998) Bill "An Act to Regulate Interstate Bank Ownership" (C. "A" H-175)

(H. P. 120) (L. D. 128) Bill "An Act to Authorize Group Self-insurers to Add Participating Employers" (C. "A" H-176)

(H. P. 478) (L. D. 575) Bill "An Act to Make Allocations from the Maine Nuclear Emergency Planning Fund for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1984, and June 30, 1985" (Emergency)

(H. P. 858) (L. D. 1108) Bill "An Act to Strengthen the Penalties for Misuse of Narcotics by Health Professionals"

No objections having been noted at the end of the Second Legislative Day, the Senate Papers were passed to be engrossed or passed to