

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

Ought to Pass in New Draft Under New Title

Senator HAYES for the Committee on Education on BILL, "An Act Concerning State Assistance to Areas Affected by Indochinese Immigrants" (S. P. 424) (L. D. 1286) Reported that the same Ought to Pass in New Draft under New Title, BILL, "An Act Concerning State Assistance to Areas Affected by Non-English Speaking Immigrants and Refugees" (S. P. 532) (L. D. 1555)

Which Report was Read and Accepted. The Bill in New Draft Under New Title Read Once and Tomorrow Assigned for Second Reading.

Second Readers House

The Committee on Bills in the Second Reading reported the following:

BILL, "An Act to Require the Wearing of Protective Headgear by all Motorcycle, Motor Drive Cycle and Moped Riders" (H. P. 836) (L. D. 1072)

Which was Read a Second Time.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Minkowsky.

Senator MINKOWSKY: Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I guess for those of us who have been here a few years, the helmet law is nothing new to us. Back in 1977 when we first were faced with making a decision to repeal the mandatory wearing of helmets, one of the key phrases we used during that segment of time was "freedom of choice." Maybe that phrase has been overused today, but I still believe somewhat in the general philosophy projected at that particular segment of time.

Prior to then not many valid statistics were kept relevant to motorcycle activities in the State of Maine, but since that particular segment of time the activities of motorcycles, mopeds, and other two-wheel vehicles have increased dramatically. During that segment of time many statistics have been developed which basically indicate, according to the Statement of Fact, that the deaths of operators are increasing tremendously in Maine.

There has been one organization in the State of Maine that has kept track of those statistics, and I would like to put their name on Record, United Bikers of Maine Incorporated. They've done one commendable job in really bringing forth exactly what are the true, valid statistics relevant to accidents regarding motorcycles in Maine.

There was a handout, apparently in the other Body, that brought out certain statistics, which were not really relevant, but broad, as it pertains to motorcycle activities in the State of Maine. It is very hard to draw an analogy between Maine's activities with a very very short driving season versus those in the State of California, which has a very long motorcycle driving season.

The final concluding remark at the base of the report, I think is interesting, it says no figures on the number of motorcyclists with spinal cord injuries in Maine in a year. They had no final figures, my guess would be about twenty-five, based on population and share of National injuries. Just generalizations, but nothing valid to justify that particular statement.

Statistics were developed for 1982 from files and information from the State of Maine, the Maine State Police Accident Reports. I would like to read these statistics into the Record, so everybody has a clear understanding exactly what has transpired in Maine. In 1982, there were twenty-eight accidents involving motorcycles: of those twenty-eight accidents, fifteen were involved with excessive speed; twenty of those accidents, and these are fatalities, lost control of bike, twenty of those, which represents 71% of the twenty-eight fatalities. Not wearing helmets: sixteen fatalities were recorded, not wearing helmets. Wearing helmets: nine died, and strange as it may seem there were four of those twenty-eight accidents not

recorded. Now, in addition to that of the twenty-eight accidents: unregistered motorcycles there were three fatalities; and no motorcycle license there were six fatalities. Motorcycle permit there was one; alcohol related operators' deaths there were nine; two of those fatalities were passenger deaths, which were alcohol related; drug related, operators' deaths one; no passenger deaths.

If you correlate all of this information, you will see with the number of increased registrations for motorcycles in Maine that we are not as in serious shape as some people try to make us believe.

Since the repeal of the mandatory helmet law, Maine has had a 18.6 increase in motorcycle registrations, and that does not include off the road motorcycles or mopeds. Also, 1.9 decrease in motorcycle fatalities, but off the road, motorcycles and mopeds are included in these fatality reports.

The basic problem in the State of Maine is the very short driving season that we have and everything, insofar as repealing the helmet law is based primarily upon, it should be based primarily upon education. We need to educate these people more as to the consequences that can materialize. Wearing a helmet or not wearing a helmet is not going to decrease fatalities, it's going to happen because they are inexperienced. Most of these people who drive motorcycles and have these accidents have less than one year experience on that motorcycle. This is where the cause is.

It would be just like myself, for example, if we did not have the different classes of driving different vehicles, as we had at one point in time saying, I have a passenger vehicle license, but all of a sudden a friend of mine has an eighteen wheeler and he expects me to take it down the road. Could you visualize the chaos that could materialize from that? Motorcycles are in the same category. You start with a small motorcycle, a person can afford a larger one, does not have the understanding of the amount of horsepower that machine has, and consequently he is not familiar with the road conditions and just breezes out and kills himself.

Regulation or over regulation is not going to solve the problem. The only problem solving in this situation is more education, and I might say mandatory education in the State of Maine for these people.

Mr. President, I feel very strongly on this particular issue this morning that I'm going to do two things. Number one, I'm going to move the Indefinite Postponement of this Bill; and secondly, I'm going to request a Roll Call.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Diamond.

Senator DIAMOND: Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, Men and Women of the Senate, it was interesting to hear the comments from the good Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Minkowsky. Those of you who attended the hearing on this Bill clearly heard from almost everyone, including those who were opposed to the Bill, that it is indeed safer, at least safer, to have a helmet on your head, if your going to fall to the tar. That question was asked by the good Chairman of the Committee to more than one person opposing the Bill. It was difficult for any of those people to say, "certainly, I'd rather not have my helmet on, if I'm going to fall to the tar." So, that was agreed to, as well as all the doctors, after doctors who testified, Dr. Getson who works in the Trauma Room at the Maine Medical Center, and I've seen him operate. He sees these people firsthand, he agreed. People testified about friends and relatives who had been injured, they agreed. Those of us who were still undecided because of the slogan that's been used since 1977, and it's a good one, "let those who ride decide." That makes a little bit of sense to me, a little bit. Then you ask the next question, given, that it is safer to wear a helmet, "let

those who ride decide"?

The next question is those who decide not to wear and are injured to a greater degree, because they don't wear the helmet, then they've decided to have an impact on me, on you, and all the rest of us that have insurance policies, and have an obligation to pay for the ongoing repair of these people. You see, it's a bigger question now. Its not just a question of, if he wants, or she wants to have her or his head injured tremendously and long-term care following that, that's no longer the question. The question is, who's going to pay for it? Now if you and I don't pay for it directly, we'll pay for it through our insurances. There's an impact there, whether we like it or not.

Senator Minkowsky, my friend from Androscoggin County, said that nine died wearing helmets and he listed off a series of statistics from the State Police. Well, we heard those statistics, and he, also, said we're not in as serious shape as some would have us believe. All right, I would say to you this, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, peer on to someone who's just had a motorcycle accident without a helmet. Now, there are certain circumstances where there are going to be deaths, regardless of the helmet or not. If you're going fifty-five, seventy-five miles an hour and you hit a tree, there's probably going to be a fatality there. But there's a whole series of accidents, a whole series of those motorcyclists who obey the law and stay fifty-five or under, but they hit dogs, loose gravel, only have two wheels mind you, not like an automobile. We have a series of accidents, and when their heads are injured without a helmet, they're injured much worse, believe me, and I'm sure some of you have seen as I, much worse, than when they do.

So I would say, as far as being in serious shape, we are, because we do have to suffer and take the responsibility of the impact that we're going to allow. It's a different question, it's a different question now. It's not just they decide for themselves. They're deciding for you and me. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington, Senator Brown.

Senator BROWN: Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen, I feel very strongly about this issue, too, as the good Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Minkowsky has indicated, and I would very much urge you to vote against the Indefinite Postponement of this issue.

He has quoted a number of statistics and facts; there's a couple of facts that I want you to bear in mind: One is that 80% of motorcycle accidents are injuries to the head, not to the spinal cord, 80% are to the head, and the accident rate is two-thirds greater for those people, the fatality rate is two-thirds greater for those people that are not wearing helmets, than it is for those that are wearing helmets.

There's a couple of issues that have been floating around that I'd also like to spend just a moment talking about.

One is dealing with peripheral vision; you've heard the fact that people can't see or hear, if they have a helmet on. I'd like to quote, if I may, from the American Medical Association, some statements regarding peripheral vision. "Opponents of helmet usage claimed that helmet wearing causes a definite serious reduction in peripheral vision. A recent study by the National Highway Safety Administration has proven that full-coverage helmets the most common type in use restrict horizontal peripheral vision less than 3% from unhelmeted cyclist.

Furthermore, that all approved helmets tested exceeded one hundred eighty degrees, well above the minimum required by the State Licensing Agencies for operators of motor vehicles, which require one hundred forty degrees peripheral vision."

Another issue, the other one deals with the

hearing; the fact that you can't hear another car coming, or whatever, with a helmet on. Helmets seriously impair hearing capacity. "Motorcycles can create a hundred and five decibels; it is necessary that in order for a cyclist to hear other sound, it must be louder than that resulting from the cycle. Consequently, as long as the rider can hear the motorcycle itself while wearing a helmet, he can also hear any other sound with a favorable signal to noise ratio, one greater than a hundred and five decibels. The helmet does reduce the loudness of both the sound of the interest and the motorcycle noise proportionately, but does not alter the signal to noise ratio between the two sounds. Critical traffic signals are not lost, and in fact, maybe helped when wind noise is minimized; the more critical sounds become louder."

The good Senator has also mentioned the business of freedom of choice. Freedom of Choice. That I harm only myself and no one else, if in fact, I do damage. There's a lot of damage that's done to family, friends and society in general, and at a time when we talk about tight monetary restraints, we talk about hospital costs containment, and we talk about all the other financial binds that are upon us, to allow individuals to not wear, to ride a motorcycle without wearing a helmet is ridiculous, it costs twenty-five hundred dollars a day for an individual to be in a critical care unit of a hospital. It costs anywhere from a quarter to a half million dollars to rehabilitate that individual and get him back to the point, if he's ever rehabilitated, and back to a point of functioning again.

So, restricting freedom of choice. We have a lot, every day we pass measures in this Body that restricts freedom of choice, and we do it because we have a total set of laws that's best for the whole of us. We don't drive on the wrong side of the road; we drive on the right-hand side of the road; we don't run red lights; we obey certain speed limits. Sure, we restrict peoples' freedom because it's best for the whole of us.

I'd like to quote, also. He has talked about the motorcycle gang from the State of Maine that is very much opposed to placing this Legislation back into effect. I'd like to quote from Cycle Canada where, in fact, the motorcyclists are required to wear helmets. They say to avoid this we need helmet laws, and by the way, he's talking about statistics. These are some of the statistics that's gathered nationwide about what happens with people that don't wear helmets. This is a quote: The editorial is called, "We Need Helmet Laws." "To avoid putting too fine a point on it, anyone who rides on the road and won't wear a helmet is so stupid that he needs to be told to wear one." This is a quote from Cycle Canada.

Mr. President, this Body has more than once demonstrated the maturity and wisdom to enact pieces of legislation that are in the best interest of all of us. I urge you to vote from the head, today, while we've still got one, and please vote to not Indefinitely Postpone this issue.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from York, Senator Danton.

Senator DANTON: Mr. President and Members of the Senate, first I'd like to tell you that I've served a few terms in the Legislature, and I also would like to tell you that I've voted to repeal the helmet law and then it went down to the late Governor Longley's desk. He vetoed the bill, and I never got a chance to override his veto, but I perhaps would have voted to override his veto.

I guess with age comes wisdom and perhaps as I look back, if I had it to do over again, knowing what I know now, I would never do it. If that's a confession, so be it.

The number of people legally permitted to operate a motorcycle in Maine is increasing at an astounding rate. In '72, my first term here in the Legislature, there were only thirteen thou-

sand four hundred and twenty-six motorcycle license endorsements in the State of Maine. Ten years later, that had grown to sixty-eight thousand eight hundred and thirty-two with the oncoming of gasoline shortage and going to motorcycles for transportation, I would say that was the cause of the increase.

During the same ten year period, the number of motorcycle accidents rose from four hundred seventy-four in '72 to one thousand one hundred thirteen in '82, ten years later. The fatalities in that same period of time went from twelve to thirty-four. People who ride motorcycles, if they aren't killed they're seriously injured. In most part, they're young people under thirty years old. I'm sure that no one plans when they buy a motorcycle that they're going to be injured or handicapped or killed, but those things happen. Most motorcycle accidents are serious.

The only thing I can say to you as a Senator, who I think is pretty broad-minded in most areas, in most Legislation I know I've heard from different Legislators that they don't want to mandate. If they feel that way that they shouldn't vote on anything up here. Everyday on our calendar there are enactors and we enact, that is mandating up or down, take it anyway you want and we mandate here everyday.

I don't want to belabor this point, but there are one or two things more I would like to say. Just last weekend we had the YMCA mock legislature here. One of the bills that they picked to consider was the helmet law and they passed it, and the YMCA Governor vetoed it and they overrode his veto. That is young people in the State of Maine. Maybe we should take a message, or learn from the younger people in the State of Maine.

Senator Smith the grand lady we honored last week, and I quote her said, "I would rather be in a room with nuclear power than on a motorcycle." Maybe we should learn from that grand old lady.

I can only say this in closing, and I pray that it should never happen to anyone, but when you're home, and you get a phone call and a member of your family is in a hospital on the critical list, because he or she was riding their motorcycle or a moped, going ten or fifteen miles an hour and because of some slippery gravel or whatever the accident was that caused them to fall and hit their head and never recover, I'll tell you, it makes you stop and think. Thank you very much.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Carpenter.

Senator CARPENTER: Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, just very briefly, I think in my eight years here I think that I have voted on both sides of this issue. In 1977 I believe I decided that it was time to let people make those decisions on their own. I can't argue with any of the points put forth by the good Senator from York, Senator Danton, or Senator Brown from Washington, or Senator Diamond from Cumberland they all made good points.

What that motorcycle rider decides to do prior to having an accident, whether or not to wear a helmet, does impact on all of us. But let's not believe for a second that we are operating here in a vacuum that this is a unique situation by any means.

Statistics are very very clear that we could save many lives, many injuries, much anguish, many dollars by forcing people to use their seat belts in cars. That is a fact of life. That impacts on my insurance, that impacts on the State budget, that impacts on hospital costs. There are so many things, I am a smoker there are people in this Chamber who smoke. The fact that we smoke and the fact that there is a group of people who use tobacco products, get cancer, have heart attacks more often than those of you who don't, impacts on hospital costs, impacts on State budgets, impacts on

private insurance policies.

So this is not a unique issue in that regard. I do not disagree that there is an impact there, I don't disagree that there is an impact on the Catastrophic Illness Program of the State of Maine or other programs.

It is just that I feel that when we tell parents that they must restrain their children in child restraint seats, that is a perfectly legitimate State interest, because those children are not able in our opinion and the opinion of our society to make those kinds of decisions for themselves. We have had that proposal before us many times and we have not considered it be to an overriding State issue. This year it happens to be.

As far as motorcycle helmets, I think that there is a freedom of choice issue involved here. I will vote with the good Senate this morning, the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Minkowsky and I would hope that you would do likewise. Thank you.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from York, Senator Hichens.

Senator HICHENS: Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I too would support the motion to Indefinitely Postpone this Bill. When we voted on repeal of the helmet law several years ago, I supported it then on the same case that I would present today that it is a matter of choice.

I have a son-in-law and a son who are avid motorcyclists and both of them have expressed to me the dangers that they see and have experienced in having to wear helmets. They both were relieved when the law was repealed that they did not have to wear helmets under certain conditions. They both when they go out on the open road do wear helmets, but when they are around in heavy traffic they feel that it is more of a danger then it is a help.

We have a gentlemen sitting in the rear of the auditorium today, a former legislator who went across country on a bike and he told me that while he was in the cities he wore his helmet, or took off his helmet rather, because there was so much clouding up on the mask and he couldn't hear that well, but that when he got out on the open road he had the privilege of using that helmet and he felt that it was a help to him. If I have misquoted him he can weave his hand in objection, but I felt that while he was here today that I should quote him, because he was an experienced bike-rider and he knows what he is talking about.

So I hope today that you'll go along with the freedom of choice.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Bustin.

Senator BUSTIN: I would hope that you would go against the motion to Indefinitely Postpone and I just want to say a couple of things. One, when you have a motorcycle accident it's much more expensive to repair that human being, then it is when you have an automobile accident, that is a matter of fact.

Second, yesterday I stood up here very bravely, I thought, because last week when I had mentioned this to my son who has just purchased a motorcycle, for probably the third time, for riding this summer, said to me, I am going to be watching your vote don't you dare vote for that helmet law. Well, I saw him last night, I stopped on the way home from the Milk Pooling Bill hearing, and I didn't have to tell him that I had been one of the sixteen that stood up there, I was well aware that if I hadn't stood up, and stood up on the other side that the Bill would have been killed right then and there. I didn't have to tell him that because there was no recording, but I told him, and what he said was, "well I'm selling my bike. I am not going to have that bike," and then he thought well it doesn't go into effect until October does it, I can ride all summer without the helmet. His wife sitting in the other room and another young friend, said I hope that you do vote for that tomorrow, because we think that

it is important. The wife happens to the daughter of a nurse.

So I think that that points out what you are saying. I wrote a note to Senator Danton this morning, and I explained to him what my son had said, I mean I am putting myself on the line. The love of my son may go because of my vote on this. What Senator Danton wrote back to me was, "If you love him, you will vote for him to put a helmet on." That is the way that I feel about it. Thank you.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Minkowsky.

Senator MINKOWSKY: Mr. President and Members of the Senate, when I was on the Transportation Committee and this Bill was heard during that segment of time, this was also the time when the Federal government decided to curtail its funding to the State of Maine for highway transportation, if Maine did not have a helmet law. They finally came to the realization that they had to change their entire posture, they could not mandate Maine not receiving these funds.

The interesting thing that took place in Washington was this. They had a series of helmets, a whole bunch of them, from different manufacturers, and they had a helmet impact test and some of the helmets that they used, that you can buy for fifteen, or twenty, or twenty-five dollars could not stand an impact of five miles per hour drop. This was one of the major reasons why the Federal government, I believe, changed its posture insofar as allowing the states to receive their Federal grants and not mandate a Federal law for helmets.

During that Committee hearing we had a series of helmets and different ones were demonstrated to the Committee as to what happened to them at different heights when they were dropped. The consequences, and the low cost protective devices, allegedly to protect our heads, caused more problems when a person who had a helmet on their head impacted something very very hard where they couldn't remove the helmet from the persons head and the person died because of the swelling of the head.

Now there are two ways of analyzing this. I believe or as the good Senator from York brought out, if you are on long trips it might be good to have a genuine high quality helmet on your head, but don't be deceived by the helmet alone because it doesn't have the durability it is really false protection when you really get down to it, but saying that you have a helmet on your head for sixteen, or twenty dollars that will not protect you to any degree at all.

I think that there were some excellent examples brought out this morning as to what the long term care and costs will be for people who had injuries. But I think that you" find that the statistics are even greater for those people who have had automobile accidents and have gone through windshields or been thrown from the vehicle for long term care. You'll find that the average motorcyclists if they have in excess of three years experience become very defensive drivers. They are always aware of what is going on.

As I brought out in previous debate it is the people with less than one year of actual experience that need more education, and the only way that we are going to solve this problem is not mandating anything but educating our youth as to what is going on.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Diamond.

Senator DIAMOND: Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, just to defuse that latest argument Ladies and Gentlemen, if you read the Bill you'll see on the very first page it simply says "the Commissioner of Public Safety will prescribe the helmets." You will not be wearing twenty dollar helmets that will smash on five mile per hour impact. It is not the case at all. It will be DOT

approved helmets. Helmets that will stand the impact at a safe speed, and reduce injury. So, that argument now is no longer before us.

Just one more quick point and that is we talked about in the hearing, we talked about those people, we asked those people directly could you please explain to us, those of us who are still swaying, why we should not make you wear helmets based on the fact that you are going to have an impact on all of us? Nobody could answer that. The phone calls that I got this weekend the people could not answer that. That is a legitimate point. One that has to be carried.

Senator Carpenter from Aroostook pointed out made the analogy between seat belts in cars and smokers, and yes all that caused danger too and that had impact on our insurances and on ourselves. Certain, but Mr. Carpenter I know is aware of the odds. He is aware of the odds games. He knows full well what the odds are of driving an automobile and not wearing a seat belt versus riding a motorcycle and not wearing a helmet. He knows full well that that is not a true analogy because the odds are so much greater of injury from the motorcycle, and the same goes for smokers.

So the helmet is unique. It is unique! Lastly I would say that 1977 when this was repealed I was in the House and certainly I recall the gentlemen who drove across country, because he was also Chairman of H and I, and also the leader of repeal of this helmet law. So why wouldn't we use this gentlemen as an example this morning? Certainly we can all cite examples. But I am not going to take your time and cite several others. We do by the way have a law on the books which we all passed last year in the 110th that said that fifteen year olds as passengers have to wear helmets. Why? Because it is safer, we are concerned about them. I ask you to be consistent and vote against the motion to Indefinitely Postpone. Thank you Ladies and Gentlemen.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Minkowsky.

Senator MINKOWSKY: Mr. President, and Members of the Senate, I am certainly very glad that the Senator from Cumberland brought out part of the Bill which says "that wearing protective head gear conforming to those minimum standards of construction and performance which the Commissioner of Public Safety may prescribe." Does this presently mean that everybody who has helmets that does not meet his particular specifications must discard those helmets? Is there a fiscal note attached to this bill to put on more State Troopers to address this particular problem, if there is one?

I think basically we should be talking of how many more State Troopers are we going to have on the road to enforce this particular part of the mandate?

It is very important and I do not think that anywheres in God's creation is the State Police, the local police departments are going to go out and test, and what mechanisms are they going to have to test these particular helmets to be sure that they can stand in excess of five miles per hour impact?

Did the Committee analyze that very closely? I certainly hope that the Senate does vote today with me for the Indefinite Postponement of this Bill.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington, Senator Brown.

Senator BROWN: Thank you, Mr. President. I would that the good Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Minkowsky might have checked some of those latest statements a little more carefully before those were made, also. One was about the type of helmet, the quality of that helmet. The American National Standards Institute, the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard number 218 those are now, since March 1, 1974 in continuing testing.

Those that the cyclists presently own are able, the tests that were done back in 1977 or 1975 were done with helmet that perhaps were not the quality that they are today.

The other things that he mentions was about cross country maybe that that is the time to wear a helmet. Most of the accidents occur very close to home at a rate an average rate of thirty-two miles per hour.

He's talking about the number of deaths that occur when individuals are thrown through automobile windows. It is three times—the death is three times as great in motorcycle accidents as in automobile accidents.

Those are not pertinent to the issue and the facts at hand. I would urge that we would, also, not Indefinitely Postpone this issue.

The PRESIDENT: Is the Senate ready for the question?

A Roll Call has been requested.

Under the Constitution in order for the Chair to order a Roll Call it requires the affirmative vote of at least one-fifth of those Senators present and voting.

Will all those Senators in favor of ordering a Roll Call, please rise and remain standing until counted.

Obviously more than one-fifth having arisen a Roll Call is ordered.

The pending question is the motion by the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Minkowsky that L. D. 1072 be Indefinitely Postponed.

A Yes vote will be in favor of Indefinite Postponement.

A No vote will be opposed.

The Doorkeepers will secure the Chamber.

The Secretary will call the roll.

ROLL CALL

YEA—Carpenter, Charette, Clark, Dow, Emerson, Erwin, Hichens, Kany, McBreairty, Minkowsky, Sewall, Shute, Teague, Trafton, Twitchell, Usher.

NAY—Baldacci, Brown, Bustin, Collins, Danton, Diamond, Dutremble, Gill, Hayes, Najarian, Pearson, Perkins, Pray, Violette, Wood, The President Gerard P. Conley.

ABSENT—Redmond.

A Roll Call was had.

16 Senators having voted in the affirmative and 16 Senators in the negative, with 1 Senator being absent, the motion to Indefinitely Postpone, Failed.

Which was Passed to be Engrossed, in concurrence.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington, Senator Brown.

SENATOR BROWN: I move for Reconsideration.

The PRESIDENT: The pending question before the Senate is Reconsideration.

Will all those Senators in favor of Reconsideration, please say "Yes."

Will all those Senators opposed, please say "No."

A Viva Voce Vote being had, the motion to Reconsider Failed.

BILL, "An Act Relating to Boards of Voter Registration" (H. P. 1146) (L. D. 1509)

Which was read a Second Time.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Pearson.

Senator PEARSON: Mr. President, I present Senate Amendment "A" to House Paper 1146, L. D. 1509 and move its Adoption.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Penobscot, Senator Pearson offers Senate Amendment "A" to L. D. 1509 and moves its Adoption. Senate Amendment "A" (S-88) was Read and Adopted.

Which was Passed to be Engrossed, as amended, in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

Senate

BILL, "An Act to Require Physicians, Chiropractors and Podiatrists to Post their Policy