

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 Thirteenth Legislature
OF THE
State Of Maine

VOLUME I
FIRST REGULAR SESSION
December 3, 1986 to May 22, 1987

Report was read and accepted, the New Draft given its first reading and assigned for second reading later in today's session.

Ought to Pass in New Draft/New Title

Representative BICKFORD from the Committee on State and Local Government on RESOLVE, to Create Public Recreation Facilities on Certain State-owned Properties (H.P. 834) (L.D. 1125) reporting "Ought to Pass" in New Draft under New Title RESOLVE, to Create Dispersed Recreational Opportunities on Public Lands at Pineland (H.P. 1209) (L.D. 1650)

Report was read and accepted, the New Draft given its first reading and assigned for second reading later in today's session.

Ought to Pass in New Draft/New Title

Representative CARROLL from the Committee on State and Local Government on Bill "An Act to Improve Legislative and Public Access to the Agency Rule-making Process" (H.P. 132) (L.D. 161) reporting "Ought to Pass" in New Draft under New Title Bill "An Act to Establish Greater Communication in the Rule-making Process and to Provide Better Standards for the Adoption of Rules" (H.P. 1210) (L.D. 1651)

Report was read and accepted, the New Draft given its first reading and assigned for second reading later in today's session.

Ought to Pass in New Draft/New Title

Representative WEYMOUTH from the Committee on Fisheries and Wildlife on Bill "An Act Authorizing the Use of Gill Nets by Agents of the State for Scientific Purposes" (H.P. 37) (L.D. 40) reporting "Ought to Pass" in New Draft under New Title Bill "An Act Authorizing the Use of Gill Nets by Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife Personnel for Scientific Purposes" (Emergency) (H.P. 1211) (L.D. 1653)

Report was read and accepted, the New Draft given its first reading and assigned for second reading later in today's session.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Transportation reporting "Ought to Pass" on Bill "An Act to Require the Use of Seat Belts for Children 12 Years of Age and Younger" (H.P. 649) (L.D. 877)

Signed:

Senators: DOW of Kennebec
THERIAULT of Aroostook
Representatives: SOUCY of Kittery
MACOMBER of South Portland
MILLS of Bethel
CALLAHAN of Mechanic Falls
McPHERSON of Eliot
REEVES of Pittston
POULIOT of Lewiston

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

Signed:

Senator: CAHILL of Sagadahoc
Representatives: STROUT of Corinth
MOHOLLAND of Princeton
SALSBURY of Bar Harbor

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Princeton, Representative Moholland.

Representative MOHOLLAND: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I move that the House accept the Minority "Ought Not to Pass" Report.

I am opposed to this legislation because I feel that it is bad policy. It's an attempt by the proponents for the mandatory seat belts to gain a minority victory and get their foot in the door. The people of this state are against the mandatory seat belt for all people. Why does anyone think that the setting of an arbitrary age requirement will make Maine citizens any more receptive to the question of the seat belt requirements? Why should we require a twelve-year old to buckle up, while the fourteen-year old does not have to, or for that matter, any adult? What is the magic about the age of twelve? What is the public policy consideration that determines that a twelve-year old should be the cut off.

What about the problems with enforcement practices, and what if the four young children are traveling in the back seat of a station wagon that only has three seatbelts -- do we fine the driver for the lack of seat belts or how does the police officer know the child that is not wearing the seat belt is twelve or thirteen? Do we make the kids carry an I.D. card? Examples of this are limitless.

The question should be -- do we want to make it mandatory for people traveling in a car to wear seat belts? That is the question -- not just for the children twelve and under.

It is bad public policy to require our children to wear seat belts while we ride without them. The proponents have lost the mandatory seat belt law but they want to win one battle. We don't need to clutter up the books with another law just so the proponents can claim some sort of victory, no matter how small. I am opposed to this legislation because it is bad public policy, plain and simple.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Limestone, Representative Pines.

Representative PINES: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hope you will vote against the motion to accept the Minority Report. Automobile safety seats are one of the most effective safety devices ever invented, when they are used. They are installed in autos from the factory. This is not an additional cost. Automobile accidents are the number one killers of persons five to thirty-four years of age. Our mandatory child restraint law has been very effective. The bill, therefore, will complement and emphasize the importance of continuing to wear seat belts as high school students have the lowest safety seat belt usage of any age group in Maine. By so doing, it is my hope and goal to have established a habit for lifetime. Teenage drivers are involved in more car crashes, per mile driven, than older drivers.

Many people in this body have voted against mandatory seat belts for all because they think they should have a choice. Our children are our responsibility and I think this is a good habit and should be taught to them, if not by those in the car, by our public safety. Teenage drivers are involved in more car crashes, per mile driven, than older drivers. Sixteen year olds have by far the highest rates. Safety seat belts can reduce the chances of death or injury in a car crash by over 50 percent. Unrestrained children are 11 times more likely to die in a traffic accident than restrained children.

Efforts aimed at getting parents to encourage usage of restraints must come through education and law enforcement. All of our children today are riding in infant car seats. Visibility has improved and the comfort and position of seat belts are better on the child's body. Fewer than one-half of one

percent are injured because of wearing a seat belt in a car.

I have a photo showing us, in Prince Edward Island, "Island youngsters inspire many adults to buckle seat belts." Children are often the followers in society, but at least in one instance, it seems Prince Edward Island youngsters are setting the example for impressionable adult population.

Their law became effective September 1, 1985. Buckling up has become a way of life for the majority of the Prince Edward Island children under twelve years of age. In some cases, the adults are following the lead. One parent said, "If I'm by myself and going someplace in town, usually I don't buckle up. But if I've got my family, usually I do. If I don't, either my wife or my kids, will remind me to buckle up."

In response to the good Representative from Princeton, I would like to answer a couple of the questions that he brought up. It was brought out at the public hearing that the number of people to be buckled up in a car is determined by the number of seat belts in the car. Asking us all to carry an I.D. card for every law that's on the books is absolutely unnecessary. Infant car seats have been successful and it has not been a problem for the police to find out who the four year olds are in the car.

I have always functioned on the premise that most people are honest. If you wish not to tell the truth to the police when you are stopped, that is by choice and you will pay the consequences. I feel very strongly, very strongly ladies and gentlemen of the House, that if we can do anything to protect our children for the future of this nation, it's developing habit in using seat belts. Again, I urge you to vote against the Minority Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Biddeford, Representative Sheltra.

Representative SHELTRA: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The good Representative from Limestone is correct in many ways with one exception. I do not believe it should be mandatory. A year ago last June, I was listening to the Today Show one morning, and it was reported that at that point in time, that anywhere from 12 to 18 percent of your seat belts will not work. I was amazed at this situation. So I immediately wrote for a transcript of that program. As a matter of fact, I got no results. I also got a former Representative, Arthur Descoteaux, to try to solicit a transcript of that program and we still could not get it. That is just one minute example why I don't like the law.

The principle reason is this, I think morally we all feel obligated that, if we have children in our car, we are going to provide the care necessary to ensure their safety. My thinking is this, and I think if you think it out you will agree with me, when my grandchildren get in my car, I make them buckle up. When I am three or four miles down the road, those buckles are unfastened. Just suppose now that your spouse is taking your neighbor's children to school. You get downtown, all of a sudden you look in the rearview mirror, and the buckles are unfastened, you jam on the brakes, you cause an accident, and those children are injured. You've got an immediate lawsuit pending. This is what I don't like. We have too many lawyer bills here already and I think this is one of them.

I would appreciate it and I think you should vote for the pending motion, Minority "Ought Not to Pass."

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Lisbon, Representative Jalbert.

Representative JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I agree with my good friend, the gentlemen from Princeton, that this is just a foot in the door to later come back with a compulsory seat belt law for everyone. I can just imagine having to take my grandchildren for a ride, I've got so much stuff in my glove compartment that I would hate to have to bring along birth certificates, and find out what age they are.

I agree with the gentleman from Princeton that -- why twelve? Why not fourteen, why not sixteen? I am just as much in favor of safety as anyone else but I feel that there's a trend that when you buckle up, and I have seen it in some states that have the seat belt law, and one example is our neighboring state of Massachusetts, the minute you used to cross the line into Massachusetts, I have felt those people down there the way they drove, they didn't need a seat belt, the man in the white jackets should have thrown a net on them because they go crazy. There is a sense of false security when they have a seat belt on. This way here, they will feel that just because the children are tied down in the backseat that they can do what they want, there is nothing to worry about.

I would urge that you vote along with the Representative from Princeton.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Bethel, Representative Mills.

Representative MILLS: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I would like to discuss some of the arguments that have been used for and against this bill today. One of the arguments that is used against the bill is the fact that we have a cut off time for 12 year olds. Currently on the books, we have a law that says that anyone up to four years old has to be kept in a child safety seat. Now, we don't carry around I.D. cards for these four, five and six year old kids at this current time to find out how old they are. I don't think that is a problem with the law. I don't think it will be any more of a problem with 12 year olds.

One of the things I find interesting about most of the people that are arguing against the bill today is that they just don't like the cut off time. Why not 14-year olds, why not 15-year olds, why not 16-year olds? They are not arguing whether or not 12 year olds and younger would be safe, but why don't we have it for 16-year olds, 17-year olds or 18-year olds or all people? I would hope that if that is what they really would like to have for a bill that they would pass this and then, when the bill gets to second reading, I would encourage them to get up and put an amendment on and make it for all people or for 18 and younger, if that is what they really want. But, I don't think that is what they really want. They really want to kill the bill.

I would like to also say that it has been mentioned today that seat belts don't work 12 percent of the time. Now, I don't know if that study is correct. There have been a lot of studies that show that it works more towards 95 to 98 percent of the time. But let's say that that argument is correct. Let's say that seat belts don't work 12 percent of the time. What does that mean? It means that they work 88 percent of the time. That is the more important fact that should be brought out here, I believe, that seat belts do work most of the time. They save lives and I would hope that we would take this a step further from going from 4 year olds up to 12 year olds because it would be a good policy for this state and I hope you support the bill which means you would support voting against this motion at this time so we can pass the bill afterwards.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Lewiston, Representative Nadeau.

Representative NADEAU: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I recall the debate yesterday on endangered species. Red herrings I don't think were among that list but there have been a few tossed around today.

I recall the debate several years ago on the infant car seat. I happened to serve on the Transportation Committee that term and I believe Representative Reeves had the bill. These same arguments were heard during that debate, almost to the word. As Representative Mills has pointed out, that did become law, and I suspect everyone will agree it has worked very effectively since that time.

Today we are faced with a very similar decision. The way I look at it is this -- I have a 15 month old son, our first child. Since the day he was born, he has never ridden in a vehicle without being in an infant car seat and that will be the case until he is four years old or until he can be strapped into a regular seat belt, depending on how quickly he grows physically.

My wife is extremely religious about wearing her seat belt and even more so when it comes to our son. I confess, I am not as religious, I am not a regular seat belt user, but I do more than I don't.

Here is what I think will happen -- my son will grow up with the habit of having sat in that infant car seat, having worn a safety belt for all of his young life, as long as we have anything to say about it. When he gets a little older, my guess is five or six years old, and when we get in the car he is going to say, "Daddy, put your seat belt on." He is going to cause me to wear my seat belt a lot more than I wear it now. It is going to develop a very strong habit in him so when he grows up and is on his own, he will be so conditioned to wearing his seat belt, it is going to be like second nature.

It is very good legislation, it is very smart legislation, there is absolutely no reason in the world why we shouldn't require this to occur. The people of Maine respect the law. If the people of Maine know that it is against the law for children under 12 not to be buckled up, they will be buckled up.

I think we can trust in that and look upon the history of the infant seat legislation to prove it. Ladies and gentlemen, I think we really ought to pass this bill and send it on its way because, in the long run, I suspect you can all believe it will save lives and create a very, very good habit in our children.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Corinth, Representative Strout.

Representative STROUT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Many people have asked me, not only the last few weeks, but over the years, why does a parent of six children oppose mandatory seat belts? It doesn't matter to me today whether we are voting for under 12 or for any seat belt law for that matter -- I am opposed to mandatory seat belts. The reason I have opposed these bills in the past is because the people in District 114 want me to vote that way.

I do have some concerns with the bill that we are voting on in that we are dealing with only those under the age of 12. The bill says, "Only in those vehicles that are equipped with seat belts." My question is, if we want to pass a law requiring the use of seat belts under the age of 12, why don't we include school buses? You know when we passed the law a few years ago that said for four years of age and under in restraint seats -- those children didn't attend school. But now we are putting a law on the

books (if this should pass) that we are going to get involved with children riding on a weekend in an automobile and then, on Monday morning, they are going to be riding on a bus that won't require them to use seat belts.

If we have to have a mandatory seat belt law in the State of Maine, I think that it should be for everybody. I don't agree with that but I think that is what we should have.

There was a flyer passed out this morning that says "seat belts saves lives" and there is one part in here that tells about having seat belts on the passenger in the front seat -- as I see this bill, it is not going to require the passenger in the front seat to have a seat belt on. Probably I shouldn't be getting too concerned about this because, as I read the bill, when I take my family out for a ride, under section two of the bill, I am going to be exempted. Do you think that that makes sense to allow some of us to ride on the highways with an exemption and others are going to be required to use a seat belt?

I guess the other thing that I have doubts about is whether the law enforcement is going to be able to enforce this.

I have a couple of boys, one is nine going on ten and I have one that is 13 going on 14 -- and if you put the two boys in this hall today, I doubt if a law enforcement officer could tell which one is which.

The other thing is that when they are riding in the back seat with my younger daughter and there are only two seat belts in the back seat, the 13 year old today wants to use that seat belt, but as I read this bill, he is not going to be able to do it. What is going to happen is, that he and the nine-year old, are going to be fighting as to which one can use the seat belt. I wouldn't want to tell you but I have my doubts as to which one would win out.

I guess I would ask you to support the Minority Report. As I said, I am opposed to a mandatory seat belt law, but if we do have to have one, I would hope it would be for everyone.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Bethel, Representative Mills.

Representative MILLS: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I would just like to, once again, point out a few laws that are currently on the books that deal with seat belts. Currently, if you own a car that was made at the beginning of the 1970's, you have to have seat belts in that car that are in working order. If you do not, that is a violation and you should not be getting your sticker when you have your car inspected. So, anybody who owns a car now should have working seat belts in that car, if the car was made since the early 1970's. If you have a car that was made before that, they do not require seat belts to be in them because, at the time the cars were made, they did not require seat belts to be in all cars. So, you are exempted if you have a car under the early 1970's.

If, as Representative Strout said, he has a car that was made after 1970 and he is missing a seat belt, he is in violation of the law, so he should go out and get a seat belt or, as in some cases, as he pointed out in the Section that says, when the number of passengers exceeds the seating capacity of the vehicle, they can be stopped and given a violation. So, those two sections of the bill do not cause problems in the law any more than what we currently have on the books, it just straightens the bill out. For anyone to be arguing those reasons are just throwing arguments in that just don't exist currently under the law.

Once again, I would like to go back to the argument over 12 versus what other age you would like

to have for the bill -- most people here don't seem to be arguing whether or not the people under 12 would be saved, and I think that is the important thing. Most people here, I think, would agree that seat belts would help save lives for children under 12. They don't even argue that. That is what the bill is about, it doesn't deal with 14, 13, up to 18 or beyond, so why are we arguing that? If you want to argue those points, put a bill in for those people to have seat belts or amend it later on, but don't come in here and try to argue that this bill should not be passed because it doesn't go far enough. That is the same argument we heard yesterday on -- why we shouldn't be having wine coolers returnable because it didn't go far enough, we didn't do it to all bottles. But this body said no, it was a good bill and should pass on its own merits. This bill should pass on its own merits and then if you want to add on to it later on, you all have the ability to do so and I hope you will.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Waldo, Representative Whitcomb.

Representative WHITCOMB: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to share with you for a moment an item on the news last night on one of the Bangor television stations. I don't know if any of you had an opportunity to see that but that, in my mind, was one of the most convincing arguments to vote against the pending motion and in support of the legislation.

A mother and three young children were traveling down I-95 in the vicinity of Newport yesterday when she looked over at her children, lost control of the car, and flipped over at least once, if not more than that. All four occupants had seat belts on, all four were spared any injury. If you had seen that vehicle on television and saw the condition that it was in after the accident, I think you would have been convinced that, in that situation, without seat belts, at least some of those four occupants wouldn't be in the condition they are in today. I would urge your support of the legislation. I would urge you to vote against the pending motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Stonington, Representative Rice.

Representative RICE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I will be very brief. My children are my most precious possession. My sons mean more to me than anything else in this world. I am not worried about the enforcement of this bill, I am not worried about how many seat belts you may or may not have in your car, I am not worried about the driver, because in my car, I buckle up. I am worried about the lives of my children and so should you. I urge you to vote against the pending motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Madawaska, Representative McHenry.

Representative MCHENRY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I care about my children also and I make sure they wear seat belts. I don't need the state to tell me that they should be wearing seat belts. If the state wants to raise my children, fine, let them foot the bill. If I have an accident, I have insurance, but if I have an accident, let the state pay the difference. If the state wants to poke their nose in everything, fine. I can be socialist also. Why don't we have Workers' Comp -- provided by the state? Why don't we have everything provided by the state? I think it is going overboard.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Berwick, Representative Murphy.

Representative MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think this bill is just a plain common sense bill. I have quite a few

grandchildren and, when I have them in my car, they buckle up. I never demanded anything of my own children that I didn't demand of myself; therefore, I buckle up also and do it almost all the time. My husband chooses not to. As I tell the grandchildren, "If anything happens and we are in an accident, we will be around, Papa may not." That is his choice and his decision. When I drive down the road and I see children bouncing around in the back seats, especially some that I don't think are 4 years old, it upsets me. I think that the state has to come out and say, you will buckle up your children. Even in minor accidents, their little heads can be banged and we can have handicapped children and I say it is unfair to these kids, they are smart, and let's keep them that way.

Representative Martin of Eagle Lake requested a roll call.

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 and voting having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from South Portland, Representative Macomber.

Representative MACOMBER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have been a member of this body now for seven years and I have served all my time on the Transportation Committee. This is the first time in the history of this state that there has ever been any positive report on a seat belt bill. The names you are looking at on the "Ought to Pass" Report -- for years in the past, they have been very strongly opposed of a mandatory seat belt law. I think you will find that, by approaching it as a safety measure for 12 year olds, these people have seen that perhaps that is the best way to go and that is the way I intend to go.

There have been things that have been brought up here that really don't have too much to do with the bill outside of the fact that they are trying to kill it by many different means.

I think if you get a child in a seat belt until he is 12 years old that he has acquired a habit. You are only three years away from the time that that child is going to be driving a car. If he has been in a seat belt for 12 years, I think the chances that he will continue to use a seat belt, are much better.

As far as the enforcement goes, I don't think the enforcement is a very important part of it. Just the fact that the law is on the books will have people use the seat belts for the kids that are 12 years old and under.

We have heard the word mandated here several times today. I don't think mandating has a thing to do with this bill. If you recall, just 24 hours ago, 106 people in this body voted to mandate that you cannot smoke in public buildings. So, I don't see where mandating is the question we are talking about at all. We are talking about children, we are talking about trying to keep them alive until they are 12 years old and hopefully beyond that.

I hope you will just discount some of the rhetoric that we have heard year after year here. I hope you will support the bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Princeton, Representative Moholland.

Representative MOHOLLAND: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: There are just a few other points that I would like to bring up. I think all the children from 12, 13, 18 or whatever age they are, I think their mother and father should still have a choice to tell them to buckle up and I know they do.

Down in committee last week, we had three or four other seat belt bills. Everybody on the committee voted unanimous "Ought Not to Pass" — school buses, 18 and under, so I don't know why they particularly want to do the kind of a job they are trying to do on this 12 and under.

I think if the people in the State of Maine will mandate their own seat belts, like Mr. Nadeau said, his child is growing up to wear a seat belt. I am sure if he doesn't buckle it up when he is 12 or 14 or whatever age, the gentleman is going to tell him.

Two years ago, we had the same seat belt law here in the House and the people were saying, we don't want that seat belt, our children, no matter what age they are, 6, 7, 8 years old say, "Daddy, don't forget to buckle up." Why has it reversed now so that we have to tell the children? What if your grandfather takes the grandsons out and he has a couple of children that get in the back seat, he might have to pay a \$25 fine; next time he might have to pay a \$50 fine. So, I think we ought to go along with the Minority "Ought Not to Pass."

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from South Portland, Representative Macomber.

Representative MACOMBER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I feel I have to respond to the remarks that have just been made by the gentleman from Princeton regarding the four bills. It is correct we did have four bills regarding seat belts. The Committee was in agreement that we would kill the other three and this would be the main bill that we would use to bring the item of seat belts to this House.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Buxton, Representative Kimball.

Representative KIMBALL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I won't prolong this debate any longer either. I did want to mention when you think about 12 years old and younger, that is a major difference when you look at all the seat belt legislation that is going in. The major difference is that we are talking about kids and we have a responsibility for kids as adults. We have a responsibility for kids as parents. I think that, when parents model behavior for kids, that is exceptional and I think that is wonderful when it happens. But I think that we, as a legislature, model behavior for the general public too. What we are doing here today, by passing this bill, would be to model that it is good behavior, it is good practice to have kids, 12 and under, wear seat belts.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Gorham, Representative Brown.

Representative BROWN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have been here for every one of these mandatory seat belt bills and I vote against them every time. My constituents have told me they didn't want to be mandated as adults to wear seat belts. But I have watched my little two-year old granddaughter as she gets into her car seat and it really has proven to me that that has worked and has formed a habit for her. I believe that we should pass this today and make it mandatory up to 12 years old to be buckled up in the seat belt. By that time, they can make up their own mind, if they don't want to be buckled up, that is up to them. I

hope you will go along with my good seatmate with her bill. I don't always agree with her but today I do.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is the motion of Representative Moholland of Princeton that the House accept the Minority "Ought Not to Pass" Report.

The Chair recognizes the Representative from Palmyra, Representative Tardy.

Representative TARDY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to pair my vote with Representative Nadeau of Saco. If he were present and voting, he would be voting nay; I would be voting yea.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is the motion of Representative Moholland of Princeton that the House accept the Minority "Ought Not to Pass" Report. Those in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 68

YEA - Anderson, Armstrong, Begley, Bragg, Carter, Cashman, Davis, Dexter, Erwin, P.; Farren, Garland, Gould, R. A.; Gurney, Hale, Harper, Hepburn, Hichborn, Holt, Ingraham, Jackson, Jalbert, Joseph, LaPointe, Mahany, Martin, H.; McHenry, Moholland, Norton, Parent, Perry, Racine, Ridley, Rotondi, Salsbury, Sheltra, Smith, Strout, D.; Tamaro, Tracy.

NAY - Aliberti, Allen, Anthony, Bailey, Baker, Bickford, Bost, Bott, Brown, Callahan, Carroll, Chonko, Clark, H.; Clark, M.; Coles, Conley, Cote, Crowley, Curran, Dellert, Diamond, Dore, Dutremble, L.; Farnum, Foss, Foster, Greenlaw, Gwadosky, Handy, Hanley, Hickey, Higgins, Hillock, Hoglund, Holloway, Hussey, Jacques, Ketover, Kilkelly, Kimball, Lacroix, Lawrence, Lebowitz, Lisnik, Look, Lord, MacBride, Macomber, Manning, Marsano, Matthews, K.; Mayo, McGowan, McPherson, McSweeney, Melendy, Michaud, Mills, Mitchell, Murphy, E.; Murphy, T.; Nadeau, G. G.; Nicholson, Nutting, O'Gara, Paradis, E.; Paradis, J.; Paradis, P.; Paul, Pines, Pouliot, Priest, Rand, Reed, Reeves, Rice, Richard, Rolde, Rydell, Scarpino, Seavey, Sherburne, Simpson, Small, Soucy, Stanley, Stevens, A.; Stevenson, Strout, B.; Swazey, Taylor, Telow, Thistle, Tupper, Vose, Walker, Webster, M.; Wentworth, Weymouth, Whitcomb, Zirkilton, The Speaker.

ABSENT - Boutilier, Duffy, Ruhlin, Stevens, P.; Warren, Willey.

PAIRED - Nadeau, G. R.; Tardy.
Yes, 39; No, 102; Absent, 6; Vacant, 2; Paired, 2; Excused, 0.

39 having voted in the affirmative and 102 in the negative with 6 being absent, 2 having paired, and 2 vacant, the motion did not prevail.

Subsequently, the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report was accepted, the Bill read once and assigned for second reading later in today's session.

CONSENT CALENDAR
Second Day

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

(H.P. 373) (L.D. 494) Bill "An Act to Make Allocations from the Transportation Safety Fund for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1988, and June 30, 1989" (Emergency)

(S.P. 500) (L.D. 1517) Bill "An Act to Clarify Eligibility for the Group Accident and Sickness or Health Insurance Program" (Emergency)