

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 Eighth
Legislature***

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

Volume I

January 5, 1977 to May 25, 1977

KJ PRINTING
AUGUSTA, MAINE

calls, enactors and various and sundry reports with no place to put them.

One representative for every 6,500 people approaches absurdity. Portland, a city of only 65,000 people is represented up here by 10 Representatives and two and one-third Senators. That is almost overkill. Even at 99 members, Portland would still have six Representatives and two and one-third Senators, and that probably is still too many and I am sure that there is a lot here who think one of us from Portland is one too many.

Our legislative staff is totally inadequate. We can't act upon bills until they are drafted and most of the people who are doing our drafting are also assigned to cover three committees which have been proceeding with hearings. It is little wonder that cloture for bill drafting was only last Friday and that so many bills heard are still in committees and a multitude yet to be heard. We badly utilize our time because of insufficient staff.

In order for the Appropriations Committee and the Finance Office to deal intelligently with close to a billion dollar budget, we should have one program analyst for each executive umbrella of the executive department. While the two people in our Finance Office are doing an heroic job, and that may have been sufficient for the appropriation budget process a few years back, it is totally inadequate for it today. In fact, it borders on the archaic.

There are those here who want to pattern our budget process along the lines recently adopted by Congress, to set priorities early in the session and determine what the percentages of funds will go for what. But I can tell you that that is only going to be a dream until we have additional staff. Although we are better off than we were a few years ago, we still have 184 members who could and need to be better informed. We spend an inordinate amount of time just organizing our desks, putting bills and amendments into notebooks when we should be reading those amendments and bills or finding out what they do.

Well, why do I tie staff into the size of the House? Because you and I both know that staffing costs money, that dollars are scarce and neither this legislature nor any other is going to provide itself that staff unless economies are made elsewhere within the legislature and reducing our number is the only way we have of freeing up a significant number of dollars. Ninety nine members or 93 or 105 would provide better representation and the process could be speeded up and thereby save additional dollars.

You hear that reducing the House will strengthen the lobby. Well, I disagree with that. It will always be easier to work 17 Senators than 50 Representatives. Additionally, you know we have spent a great deal of time lobbying each other. Probably more lobbying goes on between and among ourselves than is done by the professional lobby outside. It is a rather sad commentary, I think, that while I knew every new Senator in a matter of weeks into the session, there are still many freshmen Representatives I still can't identify and it is almost May. It is not uncommon to serve two or three terms here and not know the members of your own party. Who have also served two or three terms. There are those who will say that a large number provides better representation, we are closer to the people, but I have observed that those who make this argument are always the ones who vote against sending this question out to referendum. If the people like the intimacy of small districts, I am sure they will vote to keep it that way.

Finally, there are the rural Representatives who complain about the enlargement of their already oversized districts. There are about 14 states larger than Maine, with less population than Maine and have far fewer Representatives. How do they do it? Are we of less hardy stock

than they are? I guess my answer to that argument would be the famous words of the two great all-American Democrats, Harry Truman and Louie Jalbert—"If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen." Another argument is that rural areas will be gobbled up by the cities, but there are 393 communities in Maine under 2,000; there are only 167 above 10,000. I don't see how that could possibly happen.

If you think the people prefer our present size, what is to be afraid of? Send it out and see your opinion upheld. Let's not be cowards. Let's at least put the question before them to decide and come what may. If they vote yes, the reorganization could be of tremendous and far-reaching value to the state and if they vote no, we could lay this issue to rest for several decades.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Richmond, Mr. Moody.

Mr. MOODY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As has been previously mentioned and so forth about nobody here is being a coward, I am here to represent the people that elected me. I would like to add, do you think that the State of Nebraska looked around to other states when they adopted the Unicameral Legislature? If you think that is so, and that is just about what we have heard here today, then you are solely mistaken.

In land area, true, I represent two thirds of Sagadahoc County and I am proud of that. I don't represent one half of the City of Millinocket, and like I say, my worry is not about myself at all, it is about the people I represent. I want them to have the best representation possible and I even feel a little guilty myself that I can't do better than I am doing.

Another thing is, and I grant anybody that is in favor of this, most constituents that will come to you and say, I am in favor of this because the first thing that comes to their mind is, good, it is going to cost us less. You are misleading the people, you know you are, because we have already heard it mentioned about having legislative staff, about upping the salaries of legislators, that is fine, but at the same point, you are totally misleading the people. I say, lets have less bureaucratic regulation and not people's representation.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hallowell, Mr. Stubbs.

Mr. STUBBS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I stand here in favor of reducing the size of the House. We have heard people say, oh, this would create such huge, large districts, I don't know how I would get from one end to the other. I would suggest that these people ought to go to some of the larger cities in the state and try to get across them, they would find that they could get clear across their districts in much quicker time than they could from one end of Portland at five o'clock in the afternoon. They have just the same number of people to serve, whether it is a rural district or an urban district and it is just as easy to get around, too.

There is the old theory that, oh, the agricultural, rural interests are going to lose out. Well, I submit that if we reduced the size of the House, the number of people representing rural areas will decrease in direct proportion to the number of people in the urban areas.

I will say one thing, Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard would love to belong to the State of Maine. They would be eligible for not one Representative but more than two right now.

Reducing the size of the House would create effective government. We would have fewer bills, therefore, the legislators would be better informed on the remaining bills. Also, they could speak with much more wisdom when they were talking with their lobbyists. I think this place is a classic example of the theory that the

workload increases in direct proportion to the number of people there are. We hear complaints about filing the papers, the number of papers, etc. — well, just look around, there are 151 of us in here creating that; reduce it and we will all be better off.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call, it must have the expressed desire of more than one fifth of the members present and voting. Those in favor 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 before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Curran, that the House accept the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Alopis, Ault, Austin, Bachrach, Bagley, Beaulieu, Bennett, Benoit, Berry, Berube, Birt, Blodgett, Boudreau, A.; Brenerman, Brown, K. L., Brown, K. C.; Bunker, Burns, Bustin, Byers, Carey, Carrier, Carroll, Carter, D.; Carter, F.; Chonko Churchill, Clark, Connors, Connolly, Cote, Cox, Cunningham, Curran, Davies, Devoe, Dexter, Diamond, Dudley, Durgin, Dutremble, Elias, Fenlason, Flanagan, Fowle, Garsoe, Gauthier, Gill, Gillis, Goodwin, H.; Gray, Hall, Hickey, Higgins, Howe, Hunter, Hutchings, Immonen, Jackson, Jensen, Kane, Kelleher, Kerry, Kilcoyne, LaPlante, LeBlanc, Lewis, Lizotte, Locke, Lougee, Lunt, Lynch, MacEachern, Mackel, Mahany, Martin, A.; Masterman, Maxwell, McBreairty, McHenry, McKean, McMahon, McPherson, Mills, Mitchell, Moody, Nadeau, Nelson, N.; Peakes, Pearson, Peltier, Perkins, Plourde, Post, Prescott, Raymond, Rideout, Rollins, Silsby, Smith, Stover, Strout, Talbot, Tarbell, Tarr, Teague, Theriault, Tierney, Torrey, Tozier, Truman, Valentine, Whittemore, Wilfong, Wood, Wyman, The Speaker.

NAY — Biron, Boudreau, P.; Dow, Goodwin, K., Gould, Green, Greenlaw, Henderson, Huber, Hughes, Jacques, Joyce, Laffin, Marshall, Masterton, Morton, Najarian, Nelson, M.; Norris, Peterson, Quinn, Shute, Spencer, Sprowl, Stubbs, Trafton, Twitchell.

ABSENT — Drinkwater, Hobbins, Jalbert, Littlefield, Palmer, Tyndale.

Yes, 117; No, 28; Absent, 6.

The SPEAKER: One hundred seventeen having voted in the affirmative and twenty-eight in the negative, with six being absent, the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report is accepted.

Sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the sixth tabled and today assigned matter:

HOUSE DIVIDED REPORT — Majority (8) "Ought Not to Pass" — Minority (5) — "Ought to Pass" as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-180) — Committee on State Government on RESOLUTION, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Reducing the Size of the House of Representatives to 132 Members and Establishing the Size of the Senate at 33 Members (H. P. 85) (L. D. 105)

Tabled — April 21, 1977 by Mr. Tierney of Lisbon Falls.

Pending — Acceptance of either Report.

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

Mr. CURRAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that we accept the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report.

I am not going to belabor this. I stand opposed to it for the same reasons that I stated when we debated the last item. I really think that during the last debate, and many of the issues will

probably come up on this particular debate too, that the people of the State of Maine and I compliment the gentlewoman from Cape Elizabeth on her research. I am not really interested in how they compare statistically to other states but whether or not they are being represented and I think that is the issue here. I hope that you will support the Committee Report "Ought Not to Pass."

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lisbon Falls, Mr. Tierney.

Mr. TIERNEY: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I rise to concur wholeheartedly with my good friend from South Portland. I think the issue has been deeply debated today and I think the intentions of this House to remain as it is are very clear and I would certainly hope that we would deal with this issue today without any further delay.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Marshall.

Mr. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Unfortunately, there will be a little delay in the fact that this bill differs somewhat from the first bill in that it establishes a four to one ratio. It reduces the House from its present 151 to 132, that is a reduction of 19. My basic reason for introducing this type of legislation was to ease the apportionment system here in the state. Presently, there are 4.5 Representative Districts for each Senatorial District. As Mr. Moody has suggested a little earlier, he represents two Senatorial Districts or two Senatorial Districts are included in his Representative District. That would not be so under this new bill.

If passed, this would establish a 132 Representative Districts to 33 Senatorial Districts, which is a ratio of four to one. Such a change would greatly simplify the apportionment system here in the state. Mr. Pearson stated earlier about population figures. My bill, as proposed, would increase the average Representative District a total of 1,024 people. That a reduction of 19 would not only greatly provide for a easier apportionment system, a minimal number reduced, but it would also only call for a 1,024 increase. This is not the 3,000 increase that would come under the Masterton Bill, but I think that this selling point, the fact that it will greatly enhance the apportionment system, deserves a little attention, and I wanted to bring that to the attention of this body today.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Kelleher.

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I direct this particularly to you members who come from the rural areas. Just by the previous speakers remarks, I think we in the city would have adverse advantage over you people from the rural areas. I believe that we in the cities would be able to account for more representation in this House than you, from the rural areas, and if there is anything I like, it is good advice from my country cousins when I need it.

Mr. Speaker, I move that this bill, both reports, and all its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gorham, Mr. Quinn.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I find myself this morning in complete agreement with my Majority Leader on one aspect of this question and in some disagreement on the other. The first thing with which I find myself in agreement is that we should handle the matter today, not table it, play with it any longer or spend longer periods of time. I think we all understand the bill. I think it deserves treatment this morning.

The area which I disagree with him is on the general approval of the bill. I think this idea is an idea that is long overdue. I think it is something that will give us a great deal of

credit if we could accomplish it, and I would say only one further thing in this connection. We are not asking to make the change ourselves. This is a Constitutional Amendment and for all of those of you who say that they want the people to make the decisions, for those of you who have 17 towns, plus 19 plantations, plus four unorganized territories, then fine, I am sure those people will vote against it when it comes to constitutional question. What we are talking about here is the matter of theory of government which the people themselves most certainly should be allowed to make in the referendum next Fall.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Stow, Mr. Wilfong.

Mr. WILFONG: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I rise to take objections with my Assistant Majority Floor Leader, Mr. Quinn. I think that the system, when it was set up for changing the Constitution, allowing for a referendum, is quite a different matter than a referendum we would attach to a bill as it was moving through the legislature. That is part of the safeguard and that only should go out to referendum after two thirds of this legislature feel that it is a good enough idea to be passed into law. I don't think that we should merely send it out to referendum just because we should let the people have a decision on this vote, because the system wasn't set up that way. The system was set up to protect the people from the legislature if we were to pass something that was a change in their Constitution. I don't think that argument holds a lot of water. It may be in other cases but not in the case of a constitutional change.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mrs. Masterton.

Mrs. MASTERTON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I just want to clear up a couple of things. There is no way that the people of this state can effect a change in the size of this House, or the other body for that matter, except through this process that we are going through now. That is for this House and the other body to pass a Constitutional Resolve by a two-thirds vote and then have the people vote on it in referendum. They may not initiate a constitutional amendment. The only other way for the people to participate in this decision is if the legislature should call a constitutional convention. There is a provision in our Constitution for a constitutional convention. A convention of that sort has never been called because there is absolutely no procedure for calling one in the Constitution, so the people's hands are tied, and it isn't as if people haven't approached me and said to me, I wish you would go on with their reducing the size of the House, I think it is important, I would like to see it come about.

There are a couple of other points that keep cropping up here — one of them is enlarging districts. It is true, of course, that some Maine legislators have now and will always have very large geographical districts and they will always have a great number of towns that they represent.

Either one of these bills, these reduction bills, however, are not the cause of this problem. I am speaking particularly of House Districts 14, 38, 63, 82, 96 and 101. These districts would have to expand further to embrace more people, of course. How these districts would work at this time is impossible for us to judge. It would be mere speculation, because we must wait for the 1980 federal census and we have to sit down and we have to reapportion all over again. And Representative Najarian is correct, both of these bills would take effect in 1985. In the 1984 election would be the one in which Representatives would run in the new districts.

I know that it isn't easy on legislators with large districts. I am in great sympathy with

them. I have talked with the gentleman from Danforth about this problem and we have agreed to disagree on this issue, but the point is, you have these large districts now, you will always have them. Given the kind of population distribution that we have in this state, such large districts are inevitable, and it isn't reasonable at this time to assume that enlarging the districts isn't inevitably going to add another 100 miles onto your travels. It might only be 20 miles. For example, if the good gentleman from Danforth, would like to have the town of Eastport and Perry added to his district, it would only be a matter of another 20 miles.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Mills.

Mr. MILLS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to bring the young lady down into the territory that I had before. That was 84 miles long and 40 miles wide, bigger than the State of Rhode Island. Now, if she wants to dream up any more of these things where people can travel around through the boondocks and locate people, be able to meet with their constituents, I will invite her down and she can travel with me. She will be tired when the week is out, there's no question on that. There is no way that you can reduce the size of this House and give decent representation to the people outside of the municipalities.

I have stood here for five years, five terms I should say, and seen these same choice baubles come in that somebody has dreamed up, either out of a college or somewhere else, that has never been off the concrete sidewalk.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Town, Mr. Pearson.

Mr. PEARSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I thought there probably would be some difficulty in trying to give Eastport away, but I would like to ask for a roll call vote.

The SPEAKER: For the Chair to order a roll call, it must have the expressed desire of more than one-fifth of the members present and voting. Those in favor 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 before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Kelleher, that L.D. 105 and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Alopis, Ault, Austin, Bachrach, Beaulieu, Bennett, Berry, Berube, Blodgett, Boudreau, A.; Brennerman, Brown, K.L.; Brown, K.C.; Bunker, Burns, Bustin, Byers, Carey, Carrier, Carroll, Carter, D.; Carter, F.; Chonko, Conners, Connolly, Cote, Cox, Cunningham, Curran, Davies, Devoe, Dexter, Diamond, Dudley, Dutremble, Elias, Fenlason, Flanagan, Fowlie, Garsoe, Gauthier, Gill, Gillis, Goodwin, H.; Hall, Hickey, Howe, Hunter, Hutchings, Immonen, Jackson, Kane, Kelleher, Kerry, Kilcoyne, LaPlante, LeBlanc, Lewis, Lizotte, Locke, Lougee, Lunt, MacEachern, Mackel, Mahany, Martin, A.; Masterman, Maxwell, McBreairty, McHenry, McKean, McMahan, McPherson, Mills, Mitchell, Moody, Nadeau, Najarian, Nelson, N.; Peakes, Pearson, Peltier, Perkins, Peterson, Plourde, Post, Prescott, Raymond, Rideout, Rollins, Silsby, Smith, Stover, Strout, Talbot, Tarbell, Tarr, Teague, Theriault, Tierney, Torrey, Tozier, Truman, Twitchell, Valentine, Whittemore, Wilfong, Wood, Wyman.

NAY — Bagley, Benoit, Biron, Birt, Boudreau, P.; Churchill, Clark, Dow, Durgin,

Goodwin, K.; Green, Greenlaw, Henderson, Higgins, Huber, Hughes, Jacques, Jensen, Joyce, Laffin, Lynch, Marshall, Masterton, Morton, Nelson, M.; Norris, Quinn, Shute, Spencer, Sprowl, Stubbs, Trafton.

ABSENT — Drinkwater, Gould, Gray, Hobbins, Jalbert, Kany, Palmer, Tyndale.

Yes, 109; No, 32; Absent, 9.

The SPEAKER: One hundred and nine having voted in the affirmative and thirty-two in the negative, with nine being absent, the motion does prevail.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Bustin.

Mr. BUSTIN: Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I now move that the House reconsider its action whereby this bill was indefinitely postponed. I hope you will all vote against me.

The SPEAKER: Mr. Bustin of Augusta moves that the House reconsider its action whereby L. D. 105 was indefinitely postponed. Those in favor will say yes; those opposed will say no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion did not prevail.

Sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Bustin.

Mr. BUSTIN: Mr. Speaker, relative to Item 5, L. D. 1026, Resolution Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Provide that the Membership of the House of Representatives shall be Three Times that of the Senate and that Each Senate District shall be Composed of Three Contiguous House Districts, I now move that the House reconsider its action whereby the House accepted the "Ought Not to Pass" Report. I hope you all vote against the motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Bustin, moves that the House reconsider its action where by L. D. 1026, was accepted. Those in favor will say yes; those opposed will say no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion did not prevail.

The Chair laid before the House the seventh tabled and today assigned matter:

Bill, "An Act to Provide County Commissioner Districts in Washington County" (H. P. 1225) (L. D. 1359) In House, Passed to be Engrossed on April 12. In Senate, Indefinitely Postponed.

Tabled — April 21, 1977 by Mr. Tierney of Lisbon Falls.

Pending — Further Consideration.

On motion of Mr. Tierney of Lisbon Falls, tabled pending further consideration and specially assigned for Wednesday April 27.

The Chair laid before the House the eighth tabled and today assigned matter:

Bill "An Act to Clarify the Authority of the Board of Registration in Medicine to Conduct Programs of Medical Education" (H. P. 1349) (L. D. 1621) In House, Referred to Committee on Health and Institutional Services on April 13. In Senate, Referred to the Committee on Education.

Tabled — April 22, 1977 by Mr. Goodwin of South Berwick.

Pending — Further Consideration.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Berwick, Mr. Goodwin.

Mr. GOODWIN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adhere.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Livermore Falls, Mr. Lynch.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This does concern medical education and the Education Committee has had three bills dealing with medical education. I would move that we recede and concur and would request a roll call.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Owls Head, Mrs. Post.

Mrs. POST: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is my bill, It is L. D. 1621 and deals with three issues. One issue is whether or not when money is spent from the Board of Medical Registration to educate other doctors, whether some of that money should go for developmental disability. This is a result of a study that Health and Institutional Committee carried on for one year when this need was brought up.

Another issue that the bill deals with is to better define programs of medical education. The bill which originally allowed the Board of Medical Registration to carry on medical education of its own doctors went to, Health and Institutions Committee last year. An earlier bill dealing with the Board of Medical Registration and the education that it carries on with the doctors who belong to that program was earlier referred to Health and Institutions Committee this year.

One of the reasons that I had this bill was that when we allowed the Board of Medical Registration to carry on continuing education, we set some guidelines for them and then during the summer, while on the Health and Institution Committee, I found out what the Board of Medical Registration spent their money for. They were supposed to educate doctors. They gave \$5,000 to the Maine Medical Association for sufficient report in accreditation system. They gave \$14,000 to the Pine Tree Organization for Professional Standards and Reviews to compile a hundred percent file of discharge data and they only spent about \$500 for actual continuing education for doctors.

Health and Institution Committee had the original bill. I think it is up to them now to have the next bill which may set the guidelines a little closer. I have no doubt at all that the Maine Medical Association and the medical establishment would rather have this bill go to the Committee on Education, and I am making that argument because a part of it does deal with the Board of Medical Registration's ability to provide some funds for medical education for students who want to become doctors. However, all that particular section of the bill does is to a little bit better define what intent to practice in rural Maine means. So, out of three major issues of the bill, two of them have only been dealt with by the Committee on Health and Institutions. I would ask that you oppose the motion to recede and concur.

I would support the motion to adhere. I know fully what that may mean to the state of this bill, but I think somewhere along the line the people in this House have to make clear that the issues of Reference of Bills need to be dealt with by the people within the halls of both Houses, not by those in the lobby. I request the vote be taken by the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Livermore Falls, Mr. Lynch.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill is only symptomatic of bills that we are going to be discussing. One of them I have been tabling now several times dealing with Optometrists. It is time that the legislature took a look at what it is doing in providing future M.D.'s, Osteopaths, Veterinarians and Optometrists in this state. It is getting to be a real problem, and I think we ought to have one vehicle for providing opportunities for students in the state to have one of these forms of education. We are diluting our efforts if we go in too many ways.

We are going to have an extended debate later over a number of M.D.'s, a number of Osteopaths, a number of Veterinarians and a number of Optometrists that the state is going to be contracting for, for various medical schools for spots for the young Maine students.

I simply ask that you vote to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt.

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise to concur with the thinking and the motion of the gentleman from Livermore Falls, Mr. Lynch. It does appear from reading over the bill that it is pretty much consistent with the philosophy of some of the other bills we have in the Education Committee and I do feel that this is the committee that it should belong with and I hope you will recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Berwick, Mr. Goodwin.

Mr. GOODWIN: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I am sorry to get involved in this reference today but basically this is a situation where a bill could probably go either way. If you take a look at the bill, it does deal with areas the Health and Institutional Services Committee is concerned with and does deal with. It doesn't deal with medical education programs that the Department of Education runs. It deals with continuing education programs of people that are already doctors and how they should use the funds of their registration fees and also there is one section there on a special scholarship program. I think it basically deals with the titles that the Health and Institutional Services Committee have worked with and are working with now on other bills.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mrs. Lewis.

Mrs. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hope that we will recede and concur. If you look at the bill, a major portion of it has to do with the contracts that the state has with medical students studying various types of medicine, and since the Education Committee has been dealing with just this type of bill, I think it would be too bad to dilute it, just as the gentleman from Livermore Falls has said, and I hope that you will recede and concur and let the committee that has been studying this continue to study the same issues.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call, it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will say no.

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

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Livermore Falls, Mr. Lynch, that the House recede and concur. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote so.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Aloupis, Ault, Bachrach, Bagley, Beaulieu, Birt, Boudreau, A.; Boudreau, P.; Brown, K. L.; Brown, K. C.; Burns, Bustin, Carter, D.; Carter, F.; Churchill, Clark, Connolly, Cote, Cunningham, Dutremble, Fenlason, Flanagan, Garsoe, Gillis, Gould, Gray, Hall, Hickey, Hunter, Hutchings, Immonen, Joyce, Kilcoyne, Laffin, LaPlante, LeBlanc, Lewis, Lizotte, Lougee, Lunt, Lynch, MacEachern, Mahany, Marshall, Martin, A.; Masterman, Masterton, McPherson, Mills, Morton, Najarian, Norris, Peakes, Peterson, Plourde, Quinn, Rideout, Rollins, Shute, Silsby, Sprowl, Stover, Stubbs, Tarbell, Tarr, Teague, Theriault, Tierney, Torry, Tozier, Truman, Twitchell.

NAY — Austin, Bennett, Benoit, Berry, Berube, Biron, Blodgett, Breneman, Bunker, Byers, Carrier, Carroll, Chonko, Connors, Cox, Curran, Davies, Devoe, Dexter, Diamond, Dow, Dudley, Durgin, Elias, Green, Greenlaw, Henderson, H.; Goodwin, K.; Green, Greenlaw, Henderson,