

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 Seventh Legislature

(First Special Session)

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1976

KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

people in early and probably stay late. I don't like that section.

Section 36 has increased the fee for the identification card from one dollar to three dollars. I think this is quite a stiff increase. I would like some answers to those questions, please.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mrs. Boudreau, has posed a series of questions through the Chair to anyone who may care to answer.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Jay, Mr. Maxwell.

Mr. MAXWELL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I had suspected that perhaps we would have to clarify a few items, so I had an analysis of L. D. 2311 made up and I would like to read it to you.

This was a comprehensive study conducted by the Liquor Control Committee to clarify the present statutes and make several substantive changes. The Committee's proposal clarifies the present liquor statutes in the following ways, and I would like to state at this time that many of these laws haven't been changed since the middle thirties, since we became a monopoly state. I spent a good many hours on this. It was the result of a study that was given to us.

In section 1, pages 1 through 6 of the bill, the licensed premises are defined in our group in alphabetical order.

Section 4 of the bill, pages 8 through 12, the powers and duties of the State Liquor Commission and the Bureau of Alcoholic Beverages are more clearly defined and enumerated than in the present statutes.

Section 5 of the bill, pages 13 through 13, the local option, Sunday sale questions have been significantly simplified without changing the meaning or intent of the present law. Presently, there are 17 questions which have been reduced to 8 in L. D. 2311. This section also places the responsibility for holding elections pertaining to local option, Sunday sale questions upon the local community.

There are a number of substantive changes proposed in the bill which may be described as follows:

Section 2 of the bill, pages 6 and 7, clarifies the present section of the law pertaining to business days and hours of sale of alcoholic beverages. This section would also allow the sale of alcoholic beverages on Election Day and extends the hour of sale to 1:00 A.M. on Monday morning, as it is on every other day of the week.

Section 11 of the bill, page 15, allows the State Liquor Commission to establish the days and hours of sale for state retail liquor stores and special agency stores.

Section 12 of the bill, and several subsequent sections provide limited control over bottle clubs which presently are not regulated by the state.

Section 25 of the bill, pages 17 and 18, revamp the entire licensing schedule. Present licenses and fees are of several types of liquor establishments are based on the population in which they are located. L. D. 2311 establishes a uniform system and reduces license fees for all groups. In addition, the number of different types of licenses is reduced from 41 to 8. Wholesalers fees and certificates of approval fees which have not been changed for many years and which represent national firms have been raised in the bill.

Section 38 of the bill, page 23, establishes a guide post on the southbound side of the Maine Turnpike and gives directions to the Kittery Liquor Store.

In conclusion, L. D. 2311 greatly simplifies and clarifies the present liquor laws and makes the law much more understandable to everyone.

In regard to the changing of the price of the identification cards from a dollar to three, because of the cost of operating this, it was felt that this was justified.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mrs. Boudreau.

Mrs. BOUDREAU: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I thank the gentleman for his response, but I am afraid I don't feel that my questions have been answered properly.

I am very much opposed to the sale of liquor on any election day. This has never happened in the State of Maine and I see no reason for it in the future. We have troubles enough on election day without a lot of people running around with liquor. I still think the municipal officials, the people who know these licensees, should have more authority over granting renewals.

I see no provision here for the State Liquor Commission to check with the officials. It says the officials can send recommendations for approval or disapproval, but I am not even sure that they are going to be aware of the particular time when these licenses are renewed.

I definitely am opposed to hotels and bars being able to reduce their price and offer inducements to attract the people on their way home from work and then they get in there and they stay. If drinks were at the normal price, they probably wouldn't go in.

I am very much opposed to these sections and if they are going to be amended, I would have to move the indefinite postponement of this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. DeVane.

Mr. DeVANE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of anyone on the Liquor Control Committee. As I understand it, the liquor laws in this state now permit Class A restaurants to have inducements, if you will, or lowering prices. I think if a workingman can't walk home and go into a place we call a beer parlor and buy a glass of beer for a little less but somebody who wants to stop in a cocktail lounge can, I don't understand this.

As I understand it, right now, except for what we used to call beer parlors, any licensee in this state can offer lower prices and inducements. And as I understand that one point in this bill, it would simply change it to every licensee. I would direct that as a question to somebody on that committee.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Jay, Mr. Maxwell.

Mr. MAXWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This is correct. Places now have the opportunity to offer inducements, and we felt it should go across the board.

Mrs. Boudreau of Portland was granted permission to address the House a third time.

Mrs. BOUDREAU: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: In that particular section, it has the condition that they may advertise this.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Raymond.

Mr. RAYMOND: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The advertising portion of this bill is not what it may seem. Clubs can advertise within their clubs, not in public. But in order to advertise in a newspaper or on the radio, first of all, you have to have permission from the Liquor Commission for the sample of what your advertisements will be. Once the Liquor Commission gives you permission to do this, then you can go on with it.

One of the main reasons we have to have permission is because it seems that some of the ads going to these newspapers should not be seen by many people. You have naked women sometimes with a cocktail in her hands or whatever the case may be, and this is what we are trying to prevent, things of this nature going into the newspapers. So any newspaper advertising, anything on the radio, it has to be approved by the Liquor Commission, but there is nothing to prevent the restaurants, hotels or clubs from advertising to their own membership.

As far as the inducement is concerned, it is

permitted like other restaurants used to have. In other words, you can go and have a meal and if you order a \$6.95 steak, you can probably have champagne or a cocktail with it. It is giving the same authority to everyone only certain people had before.

In answer to the I.D. cards, it was recommended that we increase this from \$1 to \$3. As you well know, the Commission travels throughout the state at certain times of the year to issue these cards to individuals of 18 years to prove their age. But also taking advantage of this are many of our senior citizens who feel they would like to have an identification card. I realize we are not in the photography business and should not be, but for these reasons, the price of fuel has gone up, the traveling expenses of these individuals has gone up and the committee felt that we should go along with the Commission and increase this one dollar fee to three dollars.

Thereupon, on motion of Mrs. Najarian of Portland, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and tomorrow assigned.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act to Exempt Community Based Retardation Services from the Sales Tax" (H. P. 2070) (L. D. 2240)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Second Reading, read the second time, passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

Second Reader

Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act Relating to Conflicts of Interest in Offices Subject to Legislative Confirmation" (H. P. 2127) (L. D. 2279)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Second Reading and read the second time.

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

Mr. PERKINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In view of the fact that the State Government Committee has a bill which I believe is coming before us concerning the transfer of the Executive Council powers and duties in respect to Joint Standing Committees on Confirmation, which the Judiciary Committee did not have the report for consideration when this bill was brought before us, I would hope that somebody might table this in order that we might get a chance to look at it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Before the motion to table is made, I would like the learned gentleman who just spoke or anyone else to once and for all give us a definition of what conflict of interest is.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, has posed a question through the Chair to anyone who may care to answer.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Perkins.

Mr. PERKINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wish I had the wisdom to answer that question. I don't believe this bill specifically gives a definition of what constitutes a conflict of interest.

On motion of Mr. Palmer of Nobleboro, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Thursday, March 25.

Second Reader

Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act to Revise and Clarify the Freedom of Access Law" (H. P. 2226) (L. D. 2316)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Second Reading and read the second time.

Mr. Pearson of Old Town offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" (H-1034) was read by the Clerk.

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

Mr. PEARSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: You have before you a bill that is designed to revise and clarify the right-to-know law or the freedom-of-access law. Part of that bill includes a section on page 3 of the bill to allow live or recorded broadcasts to take place at any public meeting in the state which, of course, also includes the House and Senate. The amendment that I presented intends to delete the House and Senate from that requirement, because under the State Constitution, Article IV, Part Third, Section 4, it says that the House and Senate will establish their own rules.

I have spoken to former Speaker Hewes, President Sewall and Speaker Martin, and to the best of their recollection, television has never been denied in either body in the time that they have been serving here in the legislature.

What I am saying is that it is permissible to have live broadcasts in the House and the Senate as it is now, under the rules as they presently exist. I am not in any way, shape or form trying to say that television or a live broadcast of any sort should not take place here. I am just saying that because the Constitution says that the House and the Senate shall establish their own rules, that that is the proper vehicle that should be used in allowing television or live broadcast in the House and Senate and not by statute.

Thereupon, House Amendment "A" was adopted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. McMahon.

Mr. McMAHON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill rearranges and restructures the present "right-to-know" law, which was extensively amended in the regular session. The bill deletes a portion of the previous right-to-know law which I sponsored, which was ambiguous. That was the now famous section which allowed executive sessions by adjudicative bodies. The bill also continues the philosophy of enumerating those reasons why executive sessions may be held and continues the procedural requirements for calling executive sessions which are contained in the present law. The declaration of intent often seeks to more clearly state the public policy on a citizens right to know. It has added a provision for public notice which, while weak, is quite practical and workable.

I wish to compliment the members of the Legal Affairs Committee for their efforts in producing this law and I hope you support it.

Mr. Garsoe of Cumberland offered House Amendment "B" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "B" (H-1044) was read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Garsoe.

Mr. GARSOE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Very briefly, this merely corrects a grammatical error in Section B of Page 4 in order that it would read that negotiations sessions may be conducted in open session on the agreement of both parties. The bill was inadvertently printed backwards.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Blue Hill, Mr. Perkins.

Mr. PERKINS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Having worked on this committee and having worked on this bill, I would disagree with my good friend from Cumberland, Mr. Garsoe, in the fact that while he may feel this was a grammatical error, it was done by intent. In fact, the previous bill stated that an executive session could be called by one of the two negotiating parties. We make this a permissive piece of legislation and say that both of the negotiating parties are required to agree on executive session before it is called.

Mr. Garsoe has a little different aspect on this than I, in that he is a negotiator and prefers

to work in executive session. Myself, speaking for some of the smaller towns and some of the smaller town school boards, I would like to tip the scales a little bit to the area of the small town school boards and let them decide whether they in fact do desire executive sessions. If they do desire executive sessions, they are perfectly at will to do this and both parties will agree to it, but if they do not, it is within their realm to leave these negotiations open to public scrutiny.

Therefore, I would move the indefinite postponement of this amendment.

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

Mr. TIERNEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Due to one of those very infrequent errors by the Reference of Bills Committee, this subject matter was also directed to the Joint Standing Committee on Labor during this special session and we were able to work out an agreement where we would go forward with the bill presented to the Legal Affairs Committee. But prior to this discovery, the Labor Committee did discuss this issue at length and I would report to you, without getting into the policies behind this, I am sure there is going to be debate, but that the Labor Committee unanimously felt that executive sessions should be allowed unless both parties want the negotiating sessions open. And I would like to communicate to you the unanimous feeling of the Labor Committee on that point and ask you to support Mr. Garsoe's amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Garsoe.

Mr. GARSOE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The gentleman from Blue Hill is correct, it depends upon your perspective as to whether this bill was printed backwards or not.

The concept of executive session negotiations should not be construed as secret, and I think this is what we sometimes conclude, that it is a secret process and, therefore, there is something evil about it. I would just insist that the process itself does not lend itself to being conducted in public for the very reason that we would then have a tendency that I regrettably must point out we sometimes see on the floor of this body, statements and positions being taken for public consumption.

Again, I would just point out that this does not mean that they have to be secret. I understand the concern of the gentleman from Blue Hill and I would only point out that any school board that feels itself overwhelmed or being subdued in private sessions has the perfect authority to bring into their negotiating team, citizens from the community and municipal officers, they should have hopefully not agreed with the union to have the union control whom they put on their negotiating team. I don't see that this is a hazard, but the way it is written, if the parties wish to conduct the negotiations in public session, they have the freedom to do it. I would merely point out that if this open session is forced on either party, it would be detrimental to the process.

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

Mr. PEARSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Because of the quirk that Representative Tierney told you a little earlier, this bill was reported to both the Legal Affairs Committee and the Labor Committee and I introduced the original bill to go to Legal Affairs because of a problem that I recognized serving as a member of the city council in the City of Old Town. At that hearing in Legal Affairs, there were people from both management and labor who appeared and supported the same concept that Representative Garsoe is trying to put across to you today. I would repeat, both labor and management supported Mr. Garsoe's position, so, I would urge you to defeat the motion of the gentleman from Blue Hill, Mr. Perkins.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Blue Hill, Mr. Perkins.

Mr. PERKINS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would just remind you that the legislation as written, without the amendment, is entirely permissive in that by having a non-executive session, it hampers the negotiations and both parties can agree to have executive sessions. This does not mandate that one party can arbitrarily put the whole negotiation into executive session, it takes two parties the way it is written.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will order a vote. The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Blue Hill, Mr. Perkins, to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "B". Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken. Whereupon, Mr. Perkins of Blue Hill rejected a roll call.

The SPEAKER: For the Chair to order a roll call, it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. 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 Chair recognizes the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Greenlaw.

Mr. GREENLAW: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think I would like to urge you to support the motion of the good gentleman from Blue Hill, Mr. Perkins, that this amendment be indefinitely postponed. I think both he and I see the situation in our constituencies where negotiations regarding school contracts have in fact been closed to the public and has created a great deal of consternation.

It seems to me that we are all under attack, perhaps without due cause, for trying to conduct business of government in less than an open and frank manner. It seems to me that this would be one opportunity that we would have to allow discussion of what amounts to public business before the general public, and I would like to pose a question to either Mr. Tierney or to Mr. Garsoe as to the reason or rationale why we should start off in a position of having these matters considered to be closed to the public rather than having them to be considered automatically to the public unless the two parties would agree otherwise.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Greenlaw, has posed a question through the Chair to either the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Garsoe or the gentleman from Durham, Mr. Tierney.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Garsoe.

Mr. GARSOE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I don't know if this would help illustrate the matter, but collective bargaining being performed in public would be similar to spending your honeymoon on the traffic circle down here in Augusta.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Spencer.

Mr. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question to the gentleman from Durham, Mr. Tierney. My question would be the same as the question posed by Mr. Greenlaw. He said that the Labor Committee felt unanimously that they should start off in closed sessions and that he wouldn't explain the rationale why, and I would ask him to please explain the rationale.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Standish, Mr. Spencer, has posed a question through the Chair to Mr. Tierney of Durham.

The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. TIERNEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I always enjoy answering the questions of the noble gentleman from Standish, Mr. Spencer, and I will certainly try to explain at least my own feelings for sup-

porting this amendment. I would certainly not dare speak for the other members of the Labor Committee, because I am sure that they are quite capable of speaking for themselves.

I support this amendment, first of all, because it preserves the status quo. I speak for this amendment, second of all, because although the negotiations could potentially be secret if at least one party wanted it under this amendment and any final ratification of any collective bargaining agreement would have to take place in public under the present system. There is no question that any citizen can go to a school board meeting, a final meeting which ratifies any collective bargaining agreement, so the eventual ratification is public no matter what we do under this law and that eventual ratification, it seems to me, is the proper place for input on the part of the concerned citizenry.

We had a hearing on a bill in the regular session which dealt with this subject and we heard opposition, not surprisingly perhaps, from virtually every segment of the public sector. We had opposition from Maine Municipal Association, from the Maine School Management Association, from the Maine Association of Superintendents, from the Maine Teachers Association, you name it, they were all in against the bill. The only people that I have spoken to in favor of this bill, and which is why the good gentleman from Blue Hill and the good gentleman from Stonington I am sure are involved, is from the press. You see, the press just loves this issue because they just love the ringing sound of open meetings.

I had a very long discussion with one editor in my area, a very fine individual who I have a lot of respect for, and I asked him a very simple question. I said, well, if you want the open meetings, let me ask you this, would you cover them? He said, of course not, we don't have enough reporters to go to all the collective bargaining sessions of all the different contracts in all the different towns within my readership. I said, well, when would you cover them? He said, we cover them when someone calls us up and tells us there is going to be a hot and juicy item discussed that night. You see, that is precisely the point.

This bill, unless we adopt this amendment, leads us into a situation where the parties in a collective bargaining relationship, when they want to score points in the press, when they want a posture for the press, slip that phone call into the local reporter and he shows up and your collective bargaining takes place in the headlines, and when that happens, the reporters start calling all the city councilmen and people and people freeze into their initial positions in the collective bargaining process. They don't have room for flexibility any more once they have made a statement to the press and once it is plastered over the headlines. What happens then is, if you don't have the parties moving towards each other in collective bargaining, you have the parties staying far apart, and when that happens under our law, eventually you are going to march your way through mediations, through fact finding and eventually to some out-of-state arbitrator who is going to come in and write a contract for your little town.

I don't think that that is what the good gentleman from Blue Hill really wants, although I understand his need to placate the particular newspaper in his area who sends us all copies of his editorial page from time to time in the mail. Maybe I am the only one who got them.

I do think that this is a good amendment. I think it leads to rational collective bargaining. I think it cuts down on posturing and I think it reduces the amount of time that our towns and cities are currently spending in the collective bargaining process. I think that is a very important factor. I think these negotiations go on

much too long and if you have the press in there, I can guarantee you it is going to go on a lot longer.

If you are concerned about the particular question of public ratification, I urge you to address the bill sponsored by my good friend from Stow, Mr. Wilfong, and my friend from Skowhegan, Mr. Dam, dealing with line items and the amendment that Maine Municipal has put on, but don't try to do it here, it is the wrong place.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Blue Hill, Mr. Perkins.

Mr. PERKINS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am pleased to learn of the honeymoons on the circle and my honeymoon with the press. I only call your attention to an instance which I think draws the merit of killing this amendment and this instance is, you have your members of the small town school board meeting in negotiation with the teachers and the representative of the Maine Teachers Association being present on behalf of the teachers. The expertise and the balance of power lies with the negotiator because this is his business and this is where the expertise lies. There is no expertise given to the members of the school board unless it is by their education, but they are usually people off the street who have been elected to fulfill this job and have had no expertise other than past experience.

Therefore, I would ask you in benefit of the small towns to support my motion to indefinitely postpone, because I feel that in the interest to the small town — if it is a large town in a large area, the paid negotiator may be brought in and in this case, both parties may agree to go into executive session, but let's tip the scales back a little bit and even them up just a little bit by leaving this bill the way it is.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sabattus, Mr. Cooney.

Mr. COONEY: Mr. Speaker, under Joint Rule 19, would a teacher be in conflict on this vote?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would rule that there is no conflict, in part based on the precedent which has been issued by the Ethics Committee which used to operate in this legislative body prior to the new commission. The commission at that time ruled that teachers were members of classes and, therefore, were not individually affected, either negatively or any other way under the basis of the proposed legislation. If under the rules, the state law under which we operate, which defines conflict of interest for legislators, is specifically defined to mean that it will directly have a financial gain for the individual legislator.

The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Blue Hill, Mr. Perkins, that House Amendment "B" be indefinitely postponed. A roll call has been ordered. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Ault, Blodgett, Burns, Carpenter, Carroll, Chonko, Churchill, Connors, Curtis, Dudley, Durgin, Dyer, Farnham, Faucher, Fraser, Goodwin, K., Gray, Greenlaw, Higgins, Hinds, Hunter, Hutchings, Immonen, Kauffman, Kelley, Laverty, Leonard, Lewin, Littlefield, Lovell, Lunt, Mackel, MacLeod, Maxwell, McBreairty, McMahon, Morin, Najarian, Norris, Peakes, Perkins, S.; Perkins, T.; Peterson, P.; Rideout, Silverman, Strout, Torrey, Tyndale, Walker, Webber.

NAY — Albert, Bachrach, Bagley, Bennett, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Berube, Birt, Boudreau, Bowie, Bustin, Byers, Call, Carey, Carter, Clark, Connolly, Cooney, Cote, Cox, Curran, P.; Curran, R.; Dam, Davies, DeVane, Dow, Drigotas, Farley, Fenlason, Finemore, Flanagan, Garsoe, Goodwin, H.; Hall, Henderson, Hennessey, Hewes, Hobbins, Ingegneri, Jackson, Jacques, Jalbert, Jensen, Joyce, Kany, Kelleher, Kennedy, Laffin, LaPointe, LeBlanc, Lewis, Lizotte, Lynch,

MacEachern, Mahany, Martin, A.; Martin, R.; McKernan, Mills, Miskavage, Mitchell, Morton, Nadeau, Palmer, Pearson, Pelosi, Peterson, T.; Pierce, Post, Powell, Quinn, Raymond, Rolde, Saunders, Shute, Smith, Snow, Snowe, Spencer, Sprowl, Stubbs, Susi, Talbot, Tarr, Teague, Theriault, Tierney, Tozier, Truman, Twitchell, Usher, Wagner, Wilfong, Winship.

ABSENT — Doak, Gauthier, Gould, Hughes, Mulkern, Rollins.

Yes. 50; No. 94; Absent, 6.

The SPEAKER: Fifty having voted in the affirmative and ninety-four in the negative, with six being absent, the motion does not prevail.

Thereupon, House Amendment "B" was adopted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Spencer.

Mr. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose an inquiry through the Chair to anyone on the committee. In the law that we passed last session on Legislative Investigating Committees, one provision says that a witness who is being investigated may object to having his testimony televised. I am wondering if the Legal Affairs Committee in preparing the bill that is now before us have taken that into consideration or whether we will end up with a conflict in the law?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Standish, Mr. Spencer, has posed a question through the Chair to any member of the Legal Affairs Committee who may answer if they so desire.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Carey.

Mr. CAREY: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I can't answer the question but we have a further problem with the bill in that it may, in fact, be incomplete. First of all, there is no statement of fact on it and if someone will table this for one day, we may be able to get the answer for Mr. Spencer and make sure that the bill is complete when we finally pass it.

On motion of Mr. Rolde of York, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and tomorrow assigned.

Bill "An Act to Change County Budgets to an Annual Basis" (H. P. 2094) (L. D. 2253)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Second Reading and read the second time.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. McMahon.

Mr. McMAHON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question to the Chairman of the County Government Committee and also the gentleman who has signed this bill out. I would suggest that all of you look at it, L. D. 2253. I would ask the gentleman to tell us whether or not this allows the county commissioners to set the county tax rate without the involvement of the legislature, as is presently the case? If the bill does not do that, if the bill continues the present situation, I would ask the gentleman to elaborate on that also.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. McMahon, has posed a question through the Chair to any member who may care to answer.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Dam.

Mr. DAM: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: If you would look at the statement of fact on the bill, it says, "The purpose of this act is to change the county budget from the biennial to an annual basis."

This is now possible because it is changed to annual legislative sessions. This does not, in any way change the system of setting up budgets by the commissioners and having their public hearing in their local communities and then the budget coming to the legislature. They would still do that under this bill.

The only thing that this bill would do is allow the budget to be for a one-year term only and