

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 Twelfth
Legislature***

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

Volume II

FIRST REGULAR SESSION

December 5, 1984 - June 20, 1985

INDEX

FIRST CONFIRMATION SESSION

August 29, 1985

INDEX

SECOND CONFIRMATION SESSION

October 11, 1985

INDEX

FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

November 13, 1985

INDEX

for the County of Cumberland to Raise Funds for the Construction of a Courthouse Addition, Capital Improvements to the Existing Structure and a Related Parking Facility" (S.P. 547) (L.D. 1460)

Reported that the same **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee "A" (S-160)**.

Signed:

Senators:

TUTTLE of York
STOVER of Sagadahoc

Representatives:

McHENRY of Madawaska
NICKERSON of Turner
ROTONDI of Athens
HALE of Sanford
DAGGETT of Manchester
MASTERMAN of Milo
MURPHY of Berwick
WENTWORTH of Wells

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject reports that the same **Ought Not to Pass**.

Signed:

Senator:

BALDACCI of Penobscot

Representatives:

SALSBURY of Bar Harbor
SMITH of Island Falls

Which Reports were **READ**.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from York Senator Tuttle.

Senator **TUTTLE:** Mr. President, I would move Acceptance of the Majority Ought to Pass as Amended Report.

THE PRESIDENT: The Senator from York, Senator **Tuttle** moves that the Senate **Accept** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report of the Committee.

Is this the pleasure of the Senate?

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator **Black**.

Senator **BLACK:** Mr. President, I request a Division.

THE PRESIDENT: The Senator from Cumberland, Senator **Black** has requested a Division. The pending question is the motion by the Senator from York, Senator **Tuttle** that the Senate **Accept** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report of the Committee.

Senator **BLACK:** Thank you, Mr. President. It is my purpose to bring before you some of the facts on this issue, representing the rural areas of Cumberland County. For years we have realized the rural structure in Cumberland County is such that rural areas do not always have the choice in what we wish to happen.

We have a court house that has been in Cumberland County for a good many years. As things progress, buildings are built, streets are cut off, and now it is in an inaccessible position. There isn't parking area enough there and they do need a new court house. We do not object to having a new court house, but we think is not a good financial investment to put it in the present position. We think it should be out where it is accessible. Rainbow Mall, South Portland, wherever in Portland. I don't think they care. They have asked for a parking garage—part of it will be on city property—part of it on the parking lot. Part of the parking facilities will have to be given to the City of Portland. By the time they get the sheriff's cars and the police cars and the people working in the court house, they will be full, and there will not be much more room—if any—for the people who come to the court house.

On top of that, when they do this and get it done, they'll ask for additional money to go into the jail. All of this money put down there and you the outside people still can't get to it. The rural people want accessibility to their court house. It is just another Portland bill, and we oppose it—strongly! I dare say, there will be more towns asked to get out of Cumberland County. It is gone beyond acceptability. I thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the

Senator from York, Senator **Tuttle**.

Senator **TUTTLE:** Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I will reply on this issue. I understand some of the concerns of Senator **Black**, but I think the ultimate decision on this issue, will be determined by the voters of Cumberland County, those people from Senator **Black's** District as well as other people from other areas of Cumberland County

Essentially a brief review of the Bill. This Bill would essentially authorize a Cumberland County Bond Issue for a Portland court house. For an addition in capital improvements, in a request for an issue six point six million dollars. The intent of the Bill is to authorize the Commissioners of Cumberland County to obtain permission of the voters of Cumberland County, by Referendum, in the areas of Bond Issues, as I have explained before.

It's dealing with the Ninth District Court serving Southern Cumberland County. It was brought up at the public hearing, the tremendous need for improvement in Cumberland County, which has been long overdue for a number of years.

I cut an editorial from the Portland Press Herald. It was dated May 11th, 1985, and with your permission, I would like to read it to you. It says "Cumberland County is being forced to go along a long way round to obtain badly needed new court facilities. But if the long way's the only way available, so be it.

"The Legislature's Local and County Government Committee had a public hearing and heard public comment on a bill to authorize Cumberland County voters to decide whether \$6.6 million worth of self-liquidating bonds should be issued for court construction.

"The money would pay for a new facility for the District Court and Maine Administrative Court as well as renovations for Cumberland County Superior Court and public parking facility.

"No wonder. Anyone who has set foot in the district courthouse knows the need for new facilities is beyond dispute. Clients, witnesses and observers jam cheek by jowl into noisy corridors and courtrooms, waiting for a particular court proceeding. Defendants sometimes must wait two hours for arraignment.

"Surely, the quality of justice is more than strained in these conditions. And a bond issue to be paid for by a 20 year lease to the judiciary is more than justified. The counties financing costs would be charged in the form of rent to the courts. Chief Justice Vincent L. McKusick is willing to pay. As he's said, 'Cumberland Counties critical need for courtroom space doesn't go away just because the people of the rest of the state didn't support it.'

The municipal's in Cumberland County have supported this issue. I think Senator **Black's** comments are important to the people in his area and I respect those, but I think the ultimate decision before us today, is to allow the people of Cumberland County to make that decision in a Referendum. Thank you, I hope you will support the Majority **Ought to Pass** Report.

THE PRESIDENT: A Division has been requested.

Will all those Senators in favor of the **Acceptance of Majority Ought to Pass as Amended** Report of the Committee, please rise and remain in their places to be counted

Will all those Senators opposed, please rise in their places to be counted.

14 Senators having voted in the affirmative, and 9 Senators having voted in the negative, the motion to **Accept** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report of the Committee **PREVAILS**.

The Bill **READ ONCE**.

Committee Amendment "A" (S-160) **READ** and **ADOPTED**.

The Bill as Amended **LATER ASSIGNED FOR SECOND READING IN TODAY'S SESSION**.

There being no objections all matters previously acted upon, with the exception of those items previously held, were sent forthwith.

Senator **BROWN** of Washington, moved the Senate **RECONSIDER** its action of earlier in today's session whereby the Senate **ACCEPTED** the Majority **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report from the Committee on **JUDICIARY** on:

Bill "An Act Concerning Reduction of Damages for Persons, not wearing Safety Belts or Helmet" (H.P. 586) (L.D. 856)

Majority Report **Ought Not to Pass**

Minority Report **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-239)**.

(In Senate May 30, 1985, the Majority **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED**, in concurrence.)

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

Senator **CARPENTER:** Mr. President, I would oppose the motion to Reconsider the Acceptance of the Ought Not to Pass Report, and very briefly explain to the Body what this Bill does and then we can make our decisions whether or not this is something we want to go further with.

This Bill, L.D. 856, is being held as an alternative to Governor Brennan's mandatory seat belt bill. What the Bill would do, and I would point out to the Body, it has to do with seat belts and helmets. What the Bill would do, it would say that if you were in an accident, suffered damage and in fact, went to court, proved the damage was done, sued the other person for one hundred thousand dollars—after that was all over with—the liability had already been established—then there would be an arbitrary—but mandatory—reduction of damages by twenty percent. Without any showing whatsoever that non-use of the seat belt, or non-use of a helmet would have prevented the damages.

It is arbitrary. The theory is that when you get into your car and in the morning you will think I may be in an accident today and consequently I may lose twenty percent of what I have coming to me, therefore I had better buckle up. I agree with the use of an economic incentive if it is properly constructed, to encourage people to use their seat belts. I think this is the wrong way to go about it—this is an after-the-fact mechanism.

We inquired of several insurance companies as to whether or not there was any mechanism whereby they would guarantee a reduction in premiums to persons wearing seat belts on a regular basis, as they do now with smokers. We got no positive response from the insurance industry that this was something they would consider.

So what this Bill would do, if passed, in all but two instances, and those two instances are when your child is thrown through the windshield, and you are the one who had the responsibility for bucking them up, we are not going to punish the child. And also in wrongful death actions, the theory being the same that you would be punishing the widow or the widower and the children. But in all other damage actions, once liability has been established, after you have gone through the entire legal process, you had shown to the court that you were entitled to one hundred thousand dollars damages (and I am just using that as a figure because it is easy to deduct twenty percent of it), then you would automatically have those damages reduced by twenty percent or twenty thousand dollars simply because you were not wearing a seat belt—or simply because you were not wearing a helmet.

Again, and I emphasize this—without any requirement that there be a casual connection shown. For example: If I am in my car—I do not have my seat belts fastened—I am struck

from the side—my head strikes the post—which it would have whether I had the seat belt on or not. I suffer severe brain damage to the tune of one hundred thousand dollars. If the insurance then shows that I did not have my seat belt fastened, regardless if it would have made a difference, I lose twenty percent. I think it is bad policy and I ask you not to support the pending motion to Reconsider.

Off Record Remarks

THE PRESIDENT: The Senator recognizes the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Berube.

Senator **BERUBE:** Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. My colleague from the County of Aroostook, Senator Carpenter, is quite right in everything he said, because what he is talking to is the original L.D. The Committee Amendment to the Minority Report Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A," does substantially change the initial wording of the Committee of the L.D. It would affect only the adults and their adult passengers. If the child went through the windshield, that would not affect the child—the child could still recover one hundred percent damages, so it excludes them.

It also, and I am reading now from a statement of fact of the Minority Report Ought to Pass. It exempts also, the wrongful death actions from the application of this reduction and damages. It removes the ceiling when we've heard of a one hundred thousand dollars. It has no ceiling in the Majority Report.

Also, you have heard that the insurance companies have been ambivalent, have not said whether or not it would affect premium rates. It is my understanding from speaking to some insurance people, that perhaps the actual present premium rates might not be reduced. However, because they would be paying out less money, it would stem the tide of this increase—continual increase—of premium rates.

Those are the reasons why I supported the Bill and more so the Report—the Minority Ought to Pass Report as Amended. Thank you.

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

Senator **CARPENTER:** Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen. I want to make it very clear—I don't want anybody to think that I mislead the Senate. I thought that I had said—and I believe that I did say—that except for this twenty percent reduction—would apply except in two cases. One where there was a child involved and two, where there was a death involved, because what you are doing there would be punishing those left after the death, i.e., the family in most instances. So those are the two exceptions where you would not get the twenty percent reduction. I don't want anybody to think that I have misled them. It is exactly right—in those instances the twenty percent reduction would not be taken into consideration. In all other instances though, the twenty percent reduction would be taken into consideration. I understand the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Berube's concern. I agree with the thrust of what we are trying to do here, to provide an economic incentive to have people to wear their seat belts.

I would simply say that the insurance companies, if they believe that they are going to pay out less money on claims if more people wear seatbelts, they should do as the insurance industry has done in the case of cigarettes and smokers—they should simply add that incentive up front when they offer the insurance policy. When you go in to insure your car, if in fact, this is the way the statistics hold—and I believe it is—there are less accidents with severe damage where the seat belts are used—then offer it up front and say 'If you will sign an affidavit or something, that you regularly wear your seat belts, we will give you a dis-

count on your policy.' That is the way to go. Not after the fact. And not in all situation where there has to be no showing of causation what-so-ever, where I could clearly show in my case the hypothetical that I just gave you—that the use of a seat belt would have made no difference. My head would have struck the door post, if I had the seat belt on. I can bring in ten witnesses—ten experts—to say that there would have been no difference, most likely would have been no difference—never the less I would still lose the twenty percent.

Again, I would not want anybody to believe I am misleading them. I did not say there was one hundred thousand dollar limit on this. I simply used a figure of one hundred thousand dollars because it was simple in my mind to calculate a reduction of twenty percent, instead of being entitled to one hundred thousand dollars, you would automatically be cut back to eighty thousand.

There is no limit on this Bill, what-so-ever, on the damages issue. Thank you.

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

Senator **BROWN:** Thank you, Mr. President. Men and Women of the Senate. I am pleased that we have the opportunity to debate this issue, at least if it is just for Reconsideration. You know we had in this Chamber, in this Legislature, this year, the issue of dealing with seat belts. It was a Governor's Bill, it was worked hard and it went down resoundingly in defeat. I was very supportive of those efforts and would continue to be supportive of mandatory seat belt bills as long as they come before this Chamber. Never-the-less, the majority did not feel that way—a vast majority I might add.

Last week I purchased an automobile, a General Motors automobile. What came with that was a ten thousand dollar policy that if anything happened to an occupant while riding in that car, then this would automatically be in effect. I understand what the good Senator from Aroostook, Senator Carpenter says in regard to the after the fact versus the beginning when the insurance might be initially written—an individual could be given a discount if he were a seat belt user—if he or she were a seat belt user. You know the fact is that we in this State have decided that mandatory seat belt laws are not the way to go.

Presently we do not have any insurance companies to my knowledge that have offered those kinds, other than the free insurance that I got with the car last week, insurance that offer any kind of a reduction in rates as a result of wearing seat belts regularly. It seems to me if we believe, and if we believe strongly, that it is important to leave the issue in the individuals hands, and that was the big argument in here. Individuals ought to have the chance to decide for themselves whether or not they are going to wear seat belts. Don't force it upon people. Let them make their own minds up. Don't force them to wear seat belts. All this Amendment says is that is exactly the way it ought to be. Let them go ahead and make their own minds up as to whether or not they are going to wear seat belts—but—if they don't—and you can't tell me because insurance companies have not responded to the good Senator's letters earlier, that we're not eventually going to get some reductions in rates. It is just as automatic as anything in the world. If there is lesser charges being paid out, eventually it is going to mean lesser rates that you and I are going to have to pay out for insurance coverage.

Those of us who wear seat belts now, on a regular basis, let us have, in the event of an accident, let us have that break. The individuals that do not, let them go ahead and pay that additional twenty-percent that they would not receive when the determination is made. So I would urge that, in the name of individual rights, for people to make their own mind up,

let's Reconsider this and pass the Amended version. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Knox, Senator Chalmers.

Senator **CHALMERS:** Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This Bill is not a substitute bill on the Bill to have mandatory seat belts. This Bill will not lower insurance costs for all of us. This Bill would allow someone who is not at fault, to lose twenty percent of the damages that somebody else caused him. Only because he or she didn't happen to have a seat belt on. How can you say that if I pay the premium, that I am not allowed to get one hundred percent of what I am insuring for, just because I don't happen to have put on the seat belt when I get in the car right now at the curb? I get in the car—I have not had time to put on the seat belt—some idiot rear-ends me—and I can't collect what I pay the premium for. I would ask you to defeat the motion. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Kany.

Senator **KANY:** Mr. President, I wish to pose a question through the Chair, to anyone who may answer it. That is that I am wondering why an insurance company could not contract with an individual policy holder that automobile insurance or medical insurance portion, would not be paid if someone were not wearing a seat belt. Is that not possible under the current law?

THE PRESIDENT: The Senator from Kennebec, Senator Kany posed a question through the Chair to any Senator who would care to respond.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Carpenter.

Senator **CARPENTER:** Mr. President. In my humble opinion, it would be possible, under existing law that again, if the insurance companies wanted to offer incentives to people, lower rates for wearing of seat belts, they certainly could do that. They have taken that initiative in other areas that I have already mentioned, smoking, for example.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Aroostook, Senator McBreaity.

Senator **McBREAIRTY:** Mr. President, Men and Women of the Senate. I would like to pose a question to anyone who may wish to answer. If I had an accident and wanted to get out of the car, in case it might blow up or catch on fire, would I have to sit there with my seat belt on to prove that I had it on, or would they take my word for it?

THE PRESIDENT: The Senator from Aroostook, Senator McBreaity posed a question to the Chair to any Senator who may care to respond.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Carpenter.

Senator **CARPENTER:** Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. In the case of A Senator from Aroostook, I think you word would be sufficient.

THE PRESIDENT: The pending question is the motion by the Senator from Washington, Senator **Brown**, that the Senate **Reconsider** its Action whereby it **Accepted** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report of the Committee. Is this the pleasure of the Senate?

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Carpenter.

Senator **CARPENTER:** Mr. President, I request a Division.

THE PRESIDENT: The Senator from Aroostook, Senator Carpenter has requested a Division.

Will all those Senators in favor of the motion of the Senator from Washington, Senator **Brown**, that the Senate **Reconsider** its Action whereby it **Accepted** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report of the Committee, please rise and remain standing in their places to be counted.

Will all those Senators opposed, please rise

in their places to be counted.

4 Senators having voted in the affirmative and 26 Senators having voted in the negative, the motion to **RECONSIDER FAILS**.

Divided Report

The Majority of the Committee on **LOCAL AND COUNTY GOVERNMENT** on Bill "An Act to Annex the Towns of Brunswick and Harpswell to Sagadahoc County" (S.P. 374) (L.D. 1008)

Reported that the same **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-161)**.

Signed:

Senators:

BALDACCI of Penobscot
TUTTLE of York
STOVER of Sagadahoc

Representatives:

SALSBURY of Bar Harbor
DAGGETT of Manchester
MASTERMAN of Milo
MURPHY of Berwick
WENTWORTH of Wells
NICKERSON of Turner

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject reported that the same **Ought Not to Pass**.

Signed:

Representatives:

McHENRY of Madawaska
SMITH of Island Falls
ROTONDI of Athens
HALE of Sanford

Which Reports were **READ**.

The Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill **READ ONCE**.

Committee Amendment "A" (S-161) **READ** and **ADOPTED**.

The Bill as **Amended ASSIGNED FOR SECOND READING LATER IN TODAY'S SESSION**.

SECOND READERS

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

House As Amended

Bill "An Act to Protect Freshwater Wet Lands" (H.P. 567) (L.D. 838) (C "A" H-191)

Bill "An Act Relating to the Regulations and Distribution of Funds for All-terrain Vehicles" (H.P. 723) (L.D. 1032) (C "A" H-222)

Bill "An Act to Clarify the Discretionary Authority of the Harness Racing Commission to License Pari-mutuel meets and Assign Racing Dates" (H.P. 790) (L.D. 1120) (C "A" H-162)

Bill "An Act to Amend the Liquor Laws" (H.P. 852) (L.D. 1208) (C "A" H-213)

Resolve, Relating to the Development of an Interdepartmental Plan to Identify Needed Resources for a Statewide Network of Out-of-home Placements and Aftercare, Follow-up and Transitional Services (Emergency) (H.P. 936) (L.D. 1342) (C "A" H-216)

Bill "An Act to Reauthorize the Forest Resource Assessment and Marketing Program" (Emergency) (H.P. 1026) (L.D. 1478) (C "A" H-217)

Bill "An Act to Establish a 5-day Special Muzzle-loading Hunting Season" (H.P. 1027) (L.D. 1479) (C "A" H-221)

Bill "An Act Concerning Unemployment Compensation Contributions by Home Knitting Businesses" (H.P. 1037) (L.D. 1511) (C "A" H-215)

Which were **READ A SECOND TIME** and **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED, as Amended**, in concurrence.

Bill "An Act to Update and Improve the Education Laws of Maine" (H.P. 801) (L.D. 1135) (C "B" H-201)

On motion by Senator **Brown** of Washington, Senate Amendment "A" (S-147) was **READ**.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator

Gauvreau.

Senator **GAUVREAU:** Thank you, Mr. President. At this time, I would move for the Indefinite Postponement of Senate Amendment "A", and would speak briefly to my motion.

Mr. President, Men and Women of the Senate. As I understand it, the Amendment that is being offered by the good Senator from Washington, Senator Brown, would require persons using the Teacher Placement Office to pay a registration fee—a filing fee of some thirty-five dollars, which would amount to an increase of seven hundred percent over the current filing fee of five dollars. I am a bit bemused as far as to why the amendment is being offered.

The monies which would be generated from that level would go into the general fund. We have a problem which we discussed yesterday, dealing with the Teacher Placement Office. Once again, the Department that came into the Committee on Education this year, proposed abolition on the Teacher Placement Office and that the staff be transferred to the Certification Unit in the Department to gear up for the Teacher Certification requirements which will be going into effect in 1988.

There is no question that we need to beef up the staff in the Department so they can properly attend to their certification responsibilities. It strikes me that adopting a seven hundred percent increase in the Teacher Placement filing fee, will not accomplish that end, in fact, the money will go into the General Fund. It will have no effect at all as far as the problem which the Department faces.

I might also point out that the Teacher Placement Office is providing a valuable service, not only for potential teachers, but also for our communities, and they rely to a great extent upon that office to determine the available pool of perspective teachers when positions become open in the various communities.

It seems to me we ought not to discourage people from utilizing that office, because it does perform a valuable service, there is no question that we are subsidizing the service now, the cost of that operation of that office are not being defrayed by the five dollar filing fee. The important purpose here is that we are making available throughout the State a current list of all perspective teachers, so that vacancies may be promptly filled.

I would suggest, and urge the Body to defeat the prevailing motion. Certainly we are going to have to come back next year and take a good hard look at the Department and see how we can deal with certification responsibilities the Department must face. But I do suggest that this Amendment will do absolutely nothing toward assisting the Department and for that reason I would ask that you join me and vote for Indefinite Postponement of the Amendment. Thank you.

Senator **Gauvreau** of Androscoggin moved the **Indefinite Postponement** of Senate Amendment "A" (S-147).

(Off Record Remarks)

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

Senator **BROWN:** Thank you, Mr. President, Men and Women of the Senate. It is always interesting to me, how we have such a difficult time when it comes time to in any way rearranging or changing a department—or even the budget. How we have such a difficult time turning loose something once it is established.

We had the Department of Education come in this year with a proposal, which was included in several other ideas, (by the way this Amendment that is being offered is an Amendment to one of the Ought to Pass versions of the Bill), suggesting that because of the fact that they do not have adequate personnel this year, that they needed to reallocate some of those people to deal with certification—to

process the applications for certification. They requested that. Not often do we have a department that comes in and says it is a valuable service, but we need to make some priorities. We don't have the people that we've requested. We have requested through the Governor's Office position, we didn't get all the positions, we requested through the Commissioner. He makes cuts—the Governor's Office makes cuts—the Appropriations Committee only has a certain amount of money. We have a problem then, of reallocating resources.

We always have to do that in our families. We have to do it in State Government. The Placement Office within the Department of Education—the cost per person is ninety-two dollars. About ninety-two dollars to operate—there is some-over five hundred people who utilize the service. The proposal that I am suggesting is that we increase that five dollar registration fee to thirty-five dollars for registration.

Now, that doesn't seem—the good Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Gauvreau, said a seven hundred percent increase—which sounds kind of dramatic. We've had that five dollars on the books for many, many years and it was just a—I guess—an amount that was chosen at some point to say that there is a fee attached to register.

The fact is that with the Federal regulations that exist and the amount of advertising that is being done in the newspapers, every single branch of the University system has a placement office—it costs you thirty to forty dollars to register at any one of those offices. Thirty to forty dollars to register at any University office. If you were to go to a private placement bureau, an unemployment bureau, to be placed as a teacher, an administrator, or an educator somewhere, you would pay between seven hundred and fifty to eight hundred dollars. That is what you would pay in a private place.

All I am saying is that we ought to increase that to a reasonable fee. Now, the question has been brought up here, is that the money is going to go into the General fund, anyway, we are going to lose it. Ladies and Gentlemen, whose money is that? We have a pool of money that the appropriations Committee has to carefully look at. If that money—between fifteen and twenty thousand dollars more is brought in and it is allocated to shelters for abused women, or whatever we decided to use that money for in the Appropriations Committee, it is still State dollars that we have to account for in some way.

And all I am saying is that if, in fact, we want to keep the Placement Office, and I for one want to keep it too, I think it is doing us a service—I think, however, if I had to make some priorities as to whether or not to have these positions or that position, I will probably go ahead and say "I may not care to keep that position right now, that office." All I am saying, is if we are going to keep that office, let's make it partially pay for itself by charging those that register thirty-five dollars rather than five dollars.

That doesn't seem too much to ask. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

Senator **PEARSON:** Mr. President, Men and Women of the Senate. We have had from time to time, as we have gotten on the issue of education in the Appropriations Committee, quite a few dilemmas that we have been faced with. We have mandated an arts program in the school, but we have no arts consultant. We have been talking about the necessity of having that, and we have been trying to figure out how we are going to pay for it.

So it is because of that and because I believe that a person who is in a placement office is also important, that I would support Senator Brown's Amendment.