

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 II

FIRST REGULAR SESSION

May 26, 1987 to June 30, 1987

Index

An Act to Require Principles of Reimbursement for Intermediate Care Facilities for the Mentally Retarded to Include Provisions for Covering Increases in Insurance Premiums (S.P. 532) (L.D. 1603) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 21, 1987.

Came from the Senate with the bill and accompanying papers recommitted to the Committee on Human Resources in non-concurrence.

The House voted to recede and concur.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Enhance Public Access and Outdoor Recreation Opportunities" (S.P. 427) (L.D. 1307) (C. "A" S-186) which was passed to be enacted in the House on June 15, 1987.

Came from the Senate passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-186) as amended by Senate Amendment "B" (S-222) thereto in non-concurrence.

The House voted to recede and concur.

(Off Record Remarks)

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: By unanimous consent, unless previous notice is given to the Clerk of the House or the Speaker of the House by some member of his or her intention, the Clerk is authorized today to send to the Senate, 30 minutes after the House recesses, all matters passed to be engrossed in concurrence and all matters that require Senate concurrence. After such matters have been sent to the Senate by the Clerk, no motion to reconsider will be allowed.

On motion of Representative Michaud of East Millinocket,
Recessed until 6:15 p.m.

(After Recess)

At this point, the Speaker resumed the Chair.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The following items appearing on Supplement No. 10 were taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

ENACTOR

Emergency Measure

Later Today Assigned

RESOLVE, to Establish the Commission on Children in Need of Supervision and Treatment (H.P. 598) (L.D. 809) (H. "A" H-354 to C. "A" H-351)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed.

On motion of Representative Gwadosky of Fairfield, tabled pending passage to be enacted and later today assigned.

PASSED TO BE ENACTED

An Act to Provide Comprehensive Protection for Ground Water (H.P. 618) (L.D. 836) (H. "A" H-359 to C. "A" H-350)

An Act to Regulate the Profession of Accounting (H.P. 644) (L.D. 867) (C. "A" H-353)

An Act to Establish the Land for Maine's Future Fund (H.P. 995) (L.D. 1341) (C. "A" H-362)

An Act to Amend Maine's Radiation Protection Law (H.P. 1081) (L.D. 1472) (C. "A" H-352)

Were reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed, passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

ENACTOR

Later Today Assigned

An Act to Amend the Maine Turnpike Authority Act (H.P. 1323) (L.D. 1806)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed.

On motion of Representative Gwadosky of Fairfield, tabled pending passage to be enacted and later today assigned.

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 7 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

SECOND READER

Tabled and Assigned

RESOLVE, to Establish the Weatherization Services Study Committee (Emergency) (S.P. 640) (L.D. 1866)

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

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

Representative MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: Permission to pose a question? We have been waiting for an amendment to come to clarify — is that amendment before the body?

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from York, Representative Rolde, who may respond to the question.

Representative ROLDE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I do have the amendment but I have been asked to hold off presenting it because they are waiting for an answer from the Department of Energy in Washington as to whether they can use certain funds for this. I would appreciate it if this would be tabled one day.

On motion of Representative Gwadosky of Fairfield, tabled pending passage to engrossed and specially assigned for Wednesday, June 17, 1987.

The Chair laid before the House the following item: Bill "An Act to Make Supplemental Appropriations and Allocations for the Expenditures of State Government and to Change Certain Provisions of the Law Necessary to the Proper Operations of State Government for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1988 and June 30, 1989" (Emergency) (H.P. 404) (L.D. 538) reporting "Ought to Pass" in New Draft under New Title Bill "An Act to Make Supplemental Appropriations and Allocations for the Expenditures of State Government and to Change Certain Provisions of the Law Necessary to the Proper Operations of State Government for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1987, June 30, 1988, and June 30, 1989" (Emergency) (H.P. 1364) (L.D. 1867) which was tabled earlier in the day and later today assigned pending passage to be engrossed.

Subsequently, the Bill was passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the following matter: An Act to Amend the Maine Turnpike Authority Act (H.P. 1323) (L.D. 1806) which was tabled earlier

in the day and later today assigned pending passage to be enacted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Augusta, Representative Paradis.

Representative PARADIS: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: This L.D., 1806, has been going through this body under the hammer, a unanimous committee report from Transportation. I would like to request someone from Transportation to explain this bill to the body at this time if that is possible.

The SPEAKER: Representative Paradis of Augusta has posed a question through the Chair to any member of the Transportation Committee who may respond if they so desire.

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

Representative MACOMBER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I don't know if I can give you a complete history of this bill. I guess if there were more specific questions, I might be able to respond a little better.

I guess I can only tell you the basic purpose is to widen to three lanes from mile 6 to exit 6A in South Portland. We have had the bill the whole session. Perhaps I could give you a list of some of the people who testified in favor of the bill and some of the people who have had input into the bill. The people who testified for it were Commissioner Connors, Commissioner Robert Pachios from Lewiston, Phil Merrill from the Maine State Employees Association, Edward Johnson from the Forest Products, Clark Neily from Portland PAC, Milt Hunnington from Maine Oil Dealers, Greg DeSota from the Toll Collectors, Ike Johnson from Hannaford Brothers, Dick Jones from Maine Motor Transport Association, John Melrose from Maine Better Transport, Jim Kyle from the Jetport, Tom Howard from the Associated Contractors. These people all testified in favor of the bill at the hearing and they have had quite a good amount of input since then.

At the hearing, we had five people who testified in opposition. They all came from the Lewiston-Auburn area and they had some very valid concerns about how the turnpike would affect their particular area. We met with the Mayor of Lewiston, the Mayor of Auburn and all the people who were involved in that particular area of economic development. We were able to work out an amendment with Representative Mills and Representative Pouliot from the committee who represented that area, and the amendment is now part of the bill. That particular section of the bill requires a study to be done. I think the reporting date is January of 1988. The results of that study will then be discussed with DOT, with the committee, and if the study shows that they are very valid and good concerns, they will be implemented into the DOT program.

I am not sure I can give you all the exact figures. If I recall, the original bond was a \$76 million dollar bond issue to be issued by the turnpike. That was later amended, I believe, to a \$66 million bond with a \$20 million cap. I am not quite sure what else I can tell you about the bill but I would be glad to answer any questions on it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Augusta, Representative Paradis.

Representative PARADIS: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I appreciate the explanation that was given to us by the Representative from South Portland. The reason I have held this item up and asked to speak on it tonight is that I, like you, have been listening to the stories and reading articles in the paper regarding the expansion of the

Maine Turnpike. I happen to live right at the end of the Maine Turnpike in Augusta, so if I want to go south, I have a choice of taking the Maine Turnpike or Interstate 95 from Gardiner to Portland or, if I want to go north like I did this morning to the funeral of the father of Representative Cashman, I can go toll free up to Old Town.

I did a little bit of research of the Legislative Record in different debates on this matter. The turnpike was first created at the end of World War II, there was no such thing as an interstate system. The turnpike was created in order to remove the congestion off Route 1 in the York County area. I believe it went all the way up to Portland eventually. It has a self-liquidating bond like we used to put on some of our bridges.

In 1955, after the Interstate Highway Act, the Turnpike was again renewed, the toll was hiked, and it was expanded all the way up to Augusta. Then the Interstate Highway System took over and Augusta to Houlton was created, there are no tolls for that. Also in 1967, those tolls were supposed to expire a third time but they didn't, they were renewed.

In 1981, I was a member of this body and we got locked into a big political debate on the gasoline tax increase. Some of you who were present then will remember that very well. We all knew that the gasoline consumption was going down, the Highway Trust Fund was going down, our roads and our bridges were in bad shape. We were told, over and over again by the administration, if you pass the extension of the turnpike and you take \$4.7 million, we will give from turnpike to the Highway Trust Fund in order to sustain it, raise the tolls a little bit, redo some of the bridges, keep the upkeep, so on and so forth you won't need a gasoline tax increase.

In 1983, we passed a five cent a gallon gasoline increase, not quite two years after we increased by 30 percent the tolls on the Maine Turnpike.

I went down in York County from the very beginning of the Maine Turnpike and I looked at the access roads over the long Memorial Day weekend. They were absolutely and incredibly crowded. These roads are roads that are state funded, state supported and now we are being asked to, without any debate -- this bill was just flying through this body and the other body without a word of explanation or debate. I would like to know from the Committee on Transportation how much is it going to cost us five, six or seven years down the road for us to build up our access roads in the York and Cumberland County areas when we add two additional lanes to the Maine Turnpike?

We are going to have to pay for that out of the Highway Trust Fund and nobody has a higher respect, after what happened in the last 24 hours, for the Transportation Committee and how they guard the Highway Trust Fund.

What I would like to know is, how are we going to pay to upgrade the roads because they aren't sufficient now with only four lanes? How are we going to build that up to six lanes and then up to eight lanes, that is what they are eventually preparing for? You are not going to be able to say we are going to put an additional toll on the Maine Turnpike in order to fix those roads like Route 9, Route 26 and some of those other routes in Cumberland County. That is not going to happen.

We are locking in for 25 years with this bill, the tolls on the Maine Turnpike, 25 years. You and I may not even be members of this body 25 years from now but some other legislators will be sitting here and they will be saying, how did they ever, in the 113th Legislature, in the final hours of that

session, lock themselves into a 25 year plan, \$40 million.

Every time we are going to say we need to expand these access roads because the people of Lewiston and Auburn have had growth -- this bill makes absolutely no case for growth in Oxford, Androscoggin or Sagadahoc County, none whatsoever.

Can we presume here tonight, on June 16th, at 7:25 p.m. that there is not going to be any growth in those three counties in the next 25 years? You don't have to be a member of the Transportation Committee or a member of the Appropriations Committee or a member of leadership to know there is going to be a great deal of growth.

The State Planning Office tells us that Androscoggin County and Oxford County are two of the fastest growing counties in our state right now and yet the turnpike is going to stop the expansion in South Portland. There is not going to be any more expansion for 25 years.

If you want some, you are going to have to raise the tolls again. How much more are we going to raise the tolls? They are already the most expensive in the country, practically.

The State of New Hampshire finances all of its interstate highway system with just a toll on the 18 miles on the turnpike going between New Hampshire and Massachusetts. They finance the entire other interstate system that they have that the state runs just with the tolls on that.

I am not so naive to think that we are not going to be asked to pass another gasoline tax increase somewhere down the road. The East-West Highway is being talked about, probably one of the greatest economic development tools that this body and that this legislator will probably vote on in the next couple of years. It will bring from Calais, Bethel and beyond, cheap, affordable, and efficient transportation. Where are we going to get the money for that? Are we going to look to the Maine Turnpike? No, we locked ourselves in for 25 years when we raised the tolls in increments. It will cost you about \$5 to go from here down to Kittery.

The people that I have talked to from the Maine Turnpike Authority, the people in the know, have asked me -- is there is any difference in the quality of a highway between Augusta and Houlton and Augusta and Kittery? I can't give them anything but yes, there is no quality difference, it is still the same good highway. The Maine Department of Transportation and the Federal Department of Transportation maintain the same quality of highway, Augusta north (and they charge no toll) we pay for it out of the gasoline tax and the excise tax -- we pay tolls from Augusta south. Yet, that is where all the growth is happening.

To lock ourselves in for 25 years tonight is probably one of the most shortsighted things that we can do. If we pass this bill, next spring or in the 114th Legislature, if I am privileged to serve here with you people, we are going to need a three cent a gallon increase to pay the \$150 or \$200 million that it is going to cost to fund the East-West Highway that ought to be built, that hasn't been built, but ought to be built. Where are you going to get the money? If you didn't pass this bill and we put it aside and studied the impact -- we haven't been told anything about the impact that this bill is going to have on the Maine Turnpike. If you give me a million dollars, I can tell you what I can do with it. I am not going to tell you the impact it is going to have on the people. I could spend it on some very good choices and it would be well spent. They are going to do a great job of expanding the turnpike, no doubt

about it, it will be one of the best turnpike's in the country if that is what we want. Do we want an East-West Highway? Think about that. You may not get it, you may have to raise the gasoline tax.

We have debated on two or three million dollar bond issues, we will debate it for hours and hours. This is over a \$40 million bond issue for 25 years, the interest is unbelievable and we didn't even have a word of debate on it until now. I think that is a shame.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Auburn, Representative Lapointe.

Representative LAPOINTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As I look at this bill, it really scares me. We have mortgaged our children and our grandchildren and we really don't know what the impact is going to be on our area. I think Lewiston and Auburn has sold itself very, very short for very, very cheap.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Sanford, Representative Hale.

Representative HALE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I stand before you this evening, not as a member of the Transportation Committee, but as a member that has been sitting here and listening and seeing no one jump up and defend the widening of the turnpike. I happen to have had the pleasure of being invited to eat a dinner at the Holiday Inn with members of the Maine Turnpike Authority. As far as nothing being done for the Auburn-Lewiston area, that is not true. They are going to have what I call a turnaround. It is going to help Ogunquit to relieve their congestion. I call it a connector road, they call it something else. I am not well versed on this.

If this does not go through, this is going to set back all the projects of these turnaround connectors in the southern part of the state, way beyond the year 2000. I mean way beyond. This amount of money, the way it was explained to me, (I asked questions) if you think that this is going to benefit me, forget it. I have no access roads. My town and my people have no access road. When you talk about York County, you forget about the western part of York County -- I drive 22 miles to get the Bideford exit so I can get onto the Maine Turnpike. This is not going to benefit me. I go from exit 4 to 6A so I could care less, personally, whether this is widened or not. The purpose of this is to move the traffic, not just for York County, but to get it in the northern part of the state for the tourists, for the skiers. We don't have skiers in the southern part of the state -- all we hear is tourism -- what do they mention -- the coast in the south, well, the coast runs all the way up the coast of Maine, it doesn't stop in York County. When the skiing industry starts, it doesn't start in York County, it starts right outside of Auburn and it goes right up through to somewhere and don't ask me where somewhere is, but I know where Squaw Mountain is. But I tell you ladies and gentlemen of the House, your support is needed for this if you want to open up this state for economic development as well as the East-West Highway.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Scarborough, Representative Higgins.

Representative HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Before I begin, I would ask for a roll call on the motion to indefinitely postpone.

Second of all, I would like to make some comments if I might to the gentleman from Augusta and others

who have some concerns about this bill. I know the gentleman referred to the fact that this is perhaps shortsighted for the legislature to take such action, but I think I would counter that with, it would be shortsighted if the legislature didn't take this action, because if we don't, traffic and safety on that part of the Maine Turnpike is going to be phenomenal. We are not going to be able to stop it. For those of you who live in the northern, western, and eastern part of the state, those people who come through the southern part of the state are not going to be able to get there quicker. This is an economic development issue, pure and simple. The Maine Turnpike Authority is the gateway to the State of Maine to its transportation system. The Turnpike Authority does a fine job of maintaining that road as we all know. If anyone has an opportunity to drive on sections of the Interstate or on the turnpike, most people go on the turnpike because they have additional personnel that they utilize to maintain that portion of the road. But there is no way that people are going to get from Portsmouth to Calais by driving Route 1. They have to take the turnpike. If the state isn't farsighted enough to widen that turnpike so the people can get through the bottleneck and get to other areas of the state, it really is going to be a detriment to every one concerned.

There have been a lot of figures thrown around here tonight and I will try to set the Record straight as far as dollars and cents goes. The total project for the widening of the thirty mile stretch at the end of the existing six lane highway to Exit 6A is over \$100 million. There is no question about it, it is costly. The Turnpike Authority will bond no more than \$86 million of that amount. They will pay for the rest of it out of revenues and they will pay for the balance of it over the period of 20 years or 25 years or whatever it is through the tolls. It is not an obligation of the State of Maine. The users pay and that is one of the real assets of having the turnpike, it is not an obligation of the State of Maine.

I think that we need to get on with the business at hand and stop looking at ways of discouraging economic development. As far as other counties go, the Turnpike Authority has voted, as I understand it, to do a real study and look at the option of proposing a barrier system or some other alternative system for access to the turnpike north of Portland. That was a major concession on their part and I think that anybody that has been involved with the Turnpike Authority for any amount of time realizes that. I think they have tried to do the best they can to accommodate all people concerned.

But to say that this is shortsighted, I think is foolhardy. I think to look at it and study it is a waste of time. There are going to be plenty of studies done, there will be plenty of environmental impact studies done, there will be cost analysis and how do we pay for it and all that sort of issue resolved at some point in time.

As far as the issue about, if we get all these people to Maine and then there is no road system there and we are going to have to raise the gas tax to pay for it, I think that is a fallacy too. The people are going to come to the State of Maine, whether they come on the turnpike or whether they come on Route 1, and it is just a simple matter of -- do you want to expedite it, do you want them to get to the far reaches of the State of Maine, or do you want them parked somewhere in Ogunquit or Kennebunk or Scarborough on the Maine Turnpike, so that they cannot get to other areas of the State of Maine, and discourage them from that? I think it is crazy.

There was a lot of concern about the raising of tolls from the Lewiston area and other areas, there is no question about that. Yes, the tolls are going to have to be raised 20 percent this year, another 20 percent in a couple of years, and finally, 25 percent I believe in 1992 (and I am not sure on that) so the total amount is going to be a considerable amount of increase in the tolls, but it is necessary to pay for it. The only other way out is to take it out of the gas tax revenue or out of the General Fund and I don't think anybody here wants to do that. I think people would generally be willing to pay more in tolls to drive over a safe highway and one that gets them there sooner than to be backed up in traffic for an hour.

I know some of the truckers who were concerned said, we pay \$10,000 a year in tolls and we don't want to have to pay another 65 percent. I can appreciate that but anybody that has a tractor trailer truck that sits in traffic for an hour or a half an hour at \$50 an hour realizes it is pretty cheap if they have to pay an extra dollar or two to travel the turnpike.

So I would hope that you would vote against the motion to indefinitely postpone so that we might get to enact this bill tonight.

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

Representative MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would just like to share with this House tonight what happened when I came up on Monday, Memorial Day weekend. I have been along the coast in York for 17 years now every summer running a guest house there, so I have seen some of the tourists coming into Maine and some of the congestion down there on Route 1. But that night, I left York at nine o'clock and it was late when I hit the York toll booth and they have either 12 or 13 (and I am not positive which one) toll booths there. There were two open, headed north, and all of the rest of them were open, headed south, and cars were backed up. They were literally stopped getting through that toll booth in order to leave Maine. They had come into Maine for the weekend. The first thing that entered my mind was, this is great. I hope they all emptied their pockets while they were here. But in coming up from York to Portland, it was just two lanes of traffic all the way and it was slowed right down in some places where they were probably going 35 or 40 miles an hour. That is how congested that toll road is on a weekend such as that and Memorial Weekend is nothing compared to Fourth of July week or any other weekend in the summer.

I think that the widening of that road is very important to economic development of this state. We love the tourists down there, but we also don't mind sharing some with some of you people up north. We would like to be able to get them up there so that they can also enjoy the rest of this great state besides staying right there in York County, because we just do not have the accommodations for them. They are not going to come into this state and spend their money, pay their sales tax, if they cannot get out of it within a reasonable length of time.

I think it is a very important part of this state's economy to widen that toll road. As one of the Representative's told you, it isn't going to cost the state anything, the tolls will pay for this. I hope that you would vote against indefinite postponement.

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

Representative SHELTRA: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I agree with everything

Representative Murphy just said. I would like to pose a question through the Chair, please?

Does the state have a right to initiate tolls on the highways and I am thinking in terms of perhaps the East-West Highway?

The SPEAKER: The Representative from Biddeford, Representative Sheltra, has posed a question through the Chair to anyone who may respond if they so desire.

The Chair recognizes the Representative from Princeton, Representative Moholland.

Representative MOHOLLAND: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I don't know.

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

Representative MACOMBER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: To try to answer the question, we have heard a lot of talk about the East-West Highway tonight and the Maine Turnpike and I am not quite sure how they go together. The Maine Turnpike issue is a bonded issue which has no cost to the State of Maine itself. It will be paid by tolls that are raised from the bonds. The East-West Highway -- the money for the East-West Highway comes from the Highway Fund -- the same place that all of your projects that you have in your red book come from.

But as far as the question raised by the gentleman from Biddeford -- could you charge tolls on the East-West Highway legally -- yes, you could.

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

Representative SHELTRA: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: If I may continue, my understanding is, and I am not that well informed on this and I have to agree with Representative Paradis, I don't think we are as informed as we could be. My understanding, as I have it presently, is that the state could acquire ownership of the Maine Turnpike within a two year period and that is when the bonds expire. You might cite \$4.7 million that they are handing over to us, but you cannot tell me that the Maine Turnpike Authority isn't making a very lucrative profit on this pike. As a matter of fact, you can even surmise this by trying to find out how much the toll booth collector is getting for a salary, which is about \$7 to \$8 an hour.

We are getting locked in here for 25 years and that concerns me very much. If this Maine Turnpike Authority, by ownership, the way they have it presently, if it is that lucrative to them, why couldn't we hold off a couple of years and take possession of this pike and put tolls on it all of the way on the pike, all the way to Aroostook and let's share the responsibility. By state ownership we would have an income that would be distributed fairly across the state, plus you would have a fund that maybe instead of \$4.7 million, you probably could realize \$15 million to \$20 million a year in annual income. This is where I am coming from.

It concerns me very much that, in order to have possession of the pike now, the way we are going now by just succumbing to this situation, we won't even be able to talk about this for another 25 years and that concerns me very much.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Eliot, Representative McPherson.

Representative MCPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would just like to point out that, if this bill passes, there are nine interchanges that will be completed by 1995. It involves Lewiston-Auburn, Biddeford, Scarborough, and Ogunquit. If this bill does not pass, there is no saying when those interchanges will be done. They

will have to be done out of funds as it becomes available. I think it is very important to pass this bill in order to complete this interchange program.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Kittery, Representative Soucy.

Representative SOUCY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Just a point to give information to the Representative from Biddeford. I don't believe it is possible to levy a toll on the Interstate Highway System. I think that is illegal according to federal law.

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

Representative MACOMBER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Just to clarify the point I made when I said you could charge tolls on the East-West Highway, you could if it is state money, if federal money is involved, no you cannot.

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

Representative MILLS: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I rise today to explain my position of having a New Draft made on the bill. I guess as a lot of you know ever since this bill came in, I was never very hot on the subject. Basically, I guess, their point is that to most people there are some disagreements as to whether we should have a third lane on the highway. Some people disagree but I think the vast majority of people would probably say that it would be good to have a third lane on the highway. Personally, I don't have too much of a problem with that. The problem that I have is how we go about getting that third lane and who is responsible for it.

When the bill originally came to committee, right now as the current law is, the Maine Turnpike Authority has a \$20 million bond limit. They cannot go over that limit at any one time. When this bill was originally introduced, it called for raising that bond limit to \$76 million. Later on, there was amendment brought in to raise it up to \$86 million and that was at the point we were at when we came to work session.

I was interested in coming up with some different ideas as far as the tolls. I thought it might be nice if, for instance, we charged at peak hours, had a different toll on the weekend or something of that sort. In testimony that came before our committee it was shown that, in the summer, up to 70 percent of the traffic that is on the turnpike on the weekends is people from out of state. I thought it might be better if we had peak hours such as on the weekends and charge them. I thought it would be better. You could do it constitutionally as long as it was peak hours and didn't just try to nail the tourists, so I thought that would be a good idea. There wasn't any support for it.

Right now, the Maine Turnpike Authority gives \$4.7 million out of the money that they collect to our other highways in the state. I wanted to raise that amount. I thought that since we were going to have more traffic in the state, it would be better to raise that amount and I tried to raise it to \$7 million. There was no support for that.

So, I ended up looking at the bill as it was, it was going to raise the bond limit to \$86 million. The thing that bothered me about that was, once this widening project was done, the Turnpike Authority would have an \$86 million limit and they would not have to come to the legislature probably again for anything, ever, because we would have raised that limit so high that they would not need our support any more. So I drew up a New Draft and that is what

we have currently before us. That said, the Maine Turnpike Authority has a \$20 million cap, just as they currently have, and then they have a \$66 million cap to do the widening project and, once the widening project is over, they go back down to the \$20 million cap. The idea behind that was, that later on in the future if they want to have another project, they want to widen the lane or something of that sort, they would have to come back to us to get the permission to get the money for the bonding. That is why I made that motion and the bill was accepted in New Draft. So, after about seven or eight motions, I finally made the motion that flew and passed and it was unanimous. That is the position that we are in.

I would like to mention also a few points about the toll system as the bill reads. It is true that, over the next few years, the toll system would have a 65 percent increase. You have 20 now, another 20 in approximately three years, which means an approximate 40 percent increase in the next four to five years, and then a 25 percent increase as was mentioned later on in the 1990's. The point is, it is not just a 65 percent increase. That is more than a 65 percent increase because, as you increase the first time, then you add the interest on to that when you increase the next time, and you add the interest on to that when you increase the next time. So it is a little misleading to think that it is going to be (although that is a big amount) a 65 percent increase, it is going to be more than that. So I think that is important to understand.

My biggest problem with this whole bill is the Maine Turnpike Authority and I have said that from the very beginning. I don't really have a problem with the third lane, it is the Maine Turnpike Authority that I have a problem with. Who are these people? How often do we have contact with them? How often do you see your local Maine Turnpike Authority person?

I think the biggest point that was made on this floor is the biggest point that has bothered me on this whole thing. When Representative Higgins said that the Maine Turnpike Authority was willing to have this study and was willing to make this concession to us and that is exactly their attitude about this whole process, they are willing to make a concession to us. I don't think that is the position they should be in. That is the way they are and the way they treat us. I don't think that is right. That is why I had so many problems with this bill. I don't care for an Authority that treats us that way and I think that is basically the way we have been treated about this whole bill.

So I guess that, although it is a unanimous report, I don't want people to think that I am really in love with this bill because I haven't been, but I supported it because that was the best bill I could get out of the committee.

We have had some people mention study, yes, there are some studies that are going to be done on the turnpike. I originally wanted to hold the bill up until after the studies because it seemed as though if we were going to be studying whether or not we were going to have a barrier system, or whether or not we were going to change the tolls on the highway, or even if someday we were going to eliminate them, it seems to me that we ought to be doing that before we lock ourselves into a 25 year program. I thought that was important.

I even had the mayor of Lewiston, I believe it was, say that I was trying to hold the bill hostage if I was to hold this bill up. I didn't feel as though I was because I felt that those studies were important and we should know what they said first.

But that was the feeling at the time and I can understand that. The studies that are being talked about is a study funded by the Maine Turnpike Authority. It is not in the bill, it is nowhere in the bill. It is something that they have agreed to do and I would like to read it into the Record because I think it is important what they did agree to do. Basically they said, "They will be looking into the proposal made by Representative Mills for the Transportation Committee on May 21, 1987 that would raise the \$4.7 million set aside by DOT to MDOT to \$7 million for the purpose of improving highways, accessing the turnpike." It also goes on to mention that they will look into the Exit 10 on the turnpike, north of Exit 10, and will be looking into studying that as to whether or not they will be changing the system such as barriers or whatever else. So those studies are there, there will be studies going on. I just felt that it was the cart before the horse, but that was the best bill I could get out of committee and that is why I supported it and support it today.

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

Representative ALIBERTI: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I think you heard a very, very direct evaluation of this whole problem as it was initiated through the Transportation Committee and some of the invited meetings we had that involved the city of Lewiston. Representative Mills did a magnificent job in addressing some of the major concerns.

I believe Representative Higgins hit an important cord also when he said the users will pay and pay and pay and pay. Since 1950, when it was first initiated, the first 48 miles stopped just before Portland, I happen to know that exactly because I helped in the construction of that, it continued on and here it is 1987, just filled with broken promises. That was supposed to have been (and I think the legislature is responsible for extending that) terminated after 20 years. That would have been 1970.

Broken promises -- sure we are going to get a study out of it. If I passed out a sheet of paper to everyone in this House right now, I am sure that you would have the conclusion that is going to come out of this study. Economic development, of course. It is hitting Androscoggin County the same way that the flash flood hit Portland. We know what the economic impact is going to be. We also know that nothing is going to be addressed to that area for at least five more years.

My concern is -- why do we have just one entrance and exit to that turnpike? I said this in testimony. I brought up the same questions Representative Paradis brought up about the 25 year future indebtedness.

I just loved the dialogue of Representative Mills when he alluded to the Turnpike Authority. He addressed it magnificently, that is just what they are, an Authority that is unquestioned and insensitive. That was brought out in testimony by some of the people from the city of Lewiston when they asked them -- have you ever asked us for any input? The answer was, no.

In all good conscience, I cannot vote against the indefinite postponement of this bill because I favor the widening of the turnpike in a very critical area. It is hindsight not to be able to see what is happening in that area. That has to be addressed, but in the meantime, what about some of the other areas that have been neglected all of these years?

Representative McPherson mentioned, you are going to cut off these new planned exits or entrances while

there is one in operation now and they keep hitting that -- you are going to get that. Where does it go? To an industrial park. What about the area of Sabattus that hasn't had an exit and I cannot get them to address it. You know why? Because it doesn't fit their category as far as a classification of a certain type road.

I have to travel five miles right in the city if I want to hit a turnpike exit. That is the second largest city in the state. There are a minimum of four and five exits in every one of the cities that are addressed by the turnpike areas.

Like I say, in good conscience, I cannot vote against this bill because I support the widening, but for the Record, shame on the Turnpike Authority.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Rumford, Representative Erwin.

Representative ERWIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I agree with Representative Mills and Representative Aliberti regarding the attitude of the Maine Turnpike Authority. I have great concern with locking us in for 25 years and for the more than 65 percent in tolls. I will be supporting Representative Paradis' motion to indefinitely postpone.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Dover-Foxcroft, Representative Thistle.

Representative THISTLE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: May I pose a question through the Chair?

To anyone on the Transportation Committee who may be able to respond -- my question is, is the Maine Turnpike Authority or the Department of Transportation subject to the site location development law?

The SPEAKER: The Representative from Dover-Foxcroft, Representative Thistle, has posed a question through the Chair to any member of the Transportation Committee who may respond if so desire.

The Chair recognizes the Representative from Scarborough, Representative Higgins.

Representative HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I believe the answer is yes.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Dover-Foxcroft, Representative Thistle.

Representative THISTLE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Part of the answer is yes and part of the answer is no, I believe. That in itself causes me some concern. Let me explain.

I originally intended to place two amendments on this bill and I did some investigation in the process of doing so. I got some help from Commissioner Connors of the Department of Transportation and I posed that question to him. He, in turn, turned part of that over to the Maine Turnpike Authority and brought to me two letters. The first one was from the Maine Turnpike Authority addressed to Senator Dow but a copy was placed in my hands. The fact is the Maine Turnpike Authority is subject to the Site Location Development Act which means that they are subject to environmental review through the Department of Environmental Protection. That means the widening of the highway will be subject to that review.

However, with respect to the Department of Transportation whose function it will be to be responsible for the interchanges along this road and whatever future interchanges may be constructed in the Lewiston-Auburn area, the Department of Transportation is not subject to this review by the Department of Environmental Protection. They are, in fairness, subject to a good many other federal

regulations of environmental quality with respect to waterways, if they do anything over or near waterways.

Nevertheless, I believe it is a significant area of consideration as to whether or not we feel secure that the Maine Turnpike Authority or the Department of Environmental Protection is concerned enough with environmental quality as it now stands. I have some questions about that but I withdrew that amendment because the subject is far greater than an amendment would deal with. I believe you will see that introduced next session so that we may have a complete public hearing on the issue.

Another point I would like to make though is that, when Representative McPherson spoke, he implied I believe, and correct me please sir if I am mistaken, that the barrier system and the new interchanges for the Lewiston-Auburn area along the turnpike were a "fait accompli," were already in the works. It is my understanding that that is not the case and that, at the very best, the best hope of the people of Lewiston and Auburn is that a study will be done to determine the feasibility of that system. That is not to say that they will get it, it is merely to say that the subject will be under consideration.

I believe we ought to make both of those organizations subject to the site location law. In addition to that, I have grave reservations about a super governmental agency, which some of us have spoken to, the Maine Turnpike Authority. But I believe in addition to that, that when we consider widening of Maine highways, when we consider additional interchanges, that we not only should review environmental quality and its impact on that, but we should also review subjects such as existing businesses, the impact on those businesses, growth and development patterns with respect to new interchanges or widening, and we should even look at the questions of community identity and what is the impact on community identity if we place interchanges in the midst of neighborhoods or if we take land for widening.

I agree with Representative Paradis of Augusta that this bill is far too expensive for us to give a cursory look at and pass in the waning hours of this session. I support his indefinite postponement.

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

Representative MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I must admit that when I first heard that this bill would be coming before the legislature at a future date, I was very skeptical in terms of one who pays those tolls, in terms of coming to work here and the work that I do away from here and in terms of shopping and just the mobility that is in our lives.

I agree with the gentleman from Lewiston in terms of the Turnpike Authority, those people who run the Turnpike Authority. I probably have the worst relationship with those people who run the Authority or at least tied for the worst relationship with those people. But despite that skepticism and despite what I think of certain individuals connected with that Authority, the more I thought about it, the more I weighed it, and the more I got out onto that turnpike, I realized that if we really are concerned about the future of this state, every region of this state, that we have to act.

I guess the best analogy that I can think is that that Maine Turnpike is like a tree trunk. Some of us who live near it are the direct beneficiaries of it, but it becomes the base from which branches grow. In terms of transportation, the goods that we need, the means of getting to work, that if that tree trunk

does not grow like a good living tree, those branches will no longer see growth and they will begin to wilt. It is not just holiday weekends, morning a.m. traffic, evening time to go home traffic, we have reached the point where the Maine Turnpike has reached its physical limits. It is not tourists, they add to that, moving toward what is called gridlock, but go on that turnpike any morning and you will see people from Lewiston-Auburn on their way to work to Portland, Portland people on the turnpike going elsewhere, people from Kennebunk being able to earn say a higher living there in the Portland market. Maine people are using that turnpike, we need that turnpike.

Now if we defeat this and we allow that gridlock to develop on the southern reaches, it is really not going to impact the citizens of my town because the tourists will still get there. They will just go onto Route 1 and they will suffer through 8 to 10 miles of Route 1. We will take the back roads and we will get to work, those of us who live in Kennebunk and have to go to work elsewhere, but if you are from Washington County or if you are from Aroostook or if you are from western Maine, or Penobscot, the trucks, and we have to admit it ladies and gentlemen of this House, we are becoming more dependent upon trucks as the railroads begin to leave this state, they need that turnpike. Our goods are going to be more expensive, our ski slopes, our hunting camps, our tourism industry, which is dependent upon these people moving quickly through our transportation system and that, once those people from away, sit in gridlock, and if you have ever been in New York City when gridlock hits, that means you can't back up, you can't go forward, you can't go sideways, and gridlock at certain times of the day and the weekend, exists right now on the Maine Turnpike. If we are looking not only to the economic well being right now of the State of Maine, we have got to be looking ahead to the future for our children. It might be easy here this evening to turn around and maybe beat up on the Turnpike Authority, and if there was ever the opportunity to do it, I would love to join with you, but what we really would be doing is beating up on ourselves and beating up on our children. For once, there is a proposal before us dealing with the future. If we do not act in the late 1980's or early 1990's, people will be asking, why, who, why did they not plan? And you have a very responsible proposal before you. I would hope that you would reject the motion to indefinitely postpone this bill, that we can enact it this evening, and begin planning for the transportation future of the entire State of Maine.

At this point Representative Michaud of East Millirocket was appointed to act as Speaker pro tem.

The House was called to order by the Speaker pro tem.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Lewiston, Representative Pouliot.

Representative POULIOT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I really don't know how to begin this because I never thought I was really going to be getting up in these later hours and speak on this subject. But I would like to have you know something, if there was ever a bill that I had any concern for, this is the bill. When I came here in December, I made up my mind that I was not going to put myself on many bills because if there was ever an

issue that I wanted to pay attention to, this would be the issue. I must say that I worked with an awful lot of people on this issue. At times, I felt that I was very much alone, seeking help here, seeking help there, nothing would happen. Made contacts with the Turnpike Authority like everyone else is saying, very difficult to make an agreement with. So I went home and spoke with many of the people back home and made up my mind that, if there was one thing that I wanted to do, it was either hold the bill over or get an impact study.

So, having worked with some of the Turnpike Authority people, I knew that the concerns I had were not being heard by them. I went home and spoke with the mayor and a few other people and some of the engineers back home and we put a proposal together. It would take too much time to really go through this whole proposal right now and give you the complete details. We had a meeting with the commissioner and members of the Maine Turnpike Authority. They saw our proposal. I think it really awakened them and they were hearing our concerns. After we heard the bill, the people from my community came to testify, the mayor of Lewiston, the mayor of Auburn, other concerned citizens and they all came from that one area. They wanted an economic impact study because we wanted access to the turnpike. Those were our true concerns. But all through the months of December, January, February -- yes, I was the obstructionist, that is what I was being told. Lewiston is the obstructionist again. Let me tell you ladies and gentlemen, there was no other way I knew how to fight because I knew I was up against a giant but I did the best I could.

After we had the hearing, the Maine Turnpike Authority did agree to an impact study. I have the letter here in my possession given to me by the Department of Transportation signed by Dana Connors, whom I have great respect for and trust. This is not a deal that was cut ladies and gentlemen, it is not a deal. We need access to that turnpike. The town of Sabattus may need access to that pike. The whole corridor in our area, 56 miles, we have three interchanges in 56 miles of road. In the Portland area, you have roughly 15 with the new ones going up. On the I-95 from 6A going up to Gardiner, there are 24. We have three.

All we wanted and all we asked for is, give us the study, let us have access to that pike. The Maine Turnpike Authority has put in \$50,000 for an impact study. The people that will be serving on this study will be people from Sabattus, Lewiston-Auburn, some of the outlying towns, there probably will be 17 people serving on this committee, this task force. They will report back in the month of January. I feel that, in all good faith, and I have trust in my committee and I have dealt with them in all honesty and fairness and I will be fair with them tonight and I am going to stay with them. I would expect when I come back in January and we do the study that, whatever comes out of the study, be it up or down, if it is good for our area, I would hope that they would implement it. If it is not, then I will live by the rules.

I would hope tonight that you kill the motion to indefinitely postpone.

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

Representative MOHOLLAND: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: You will recall here a week ago, we had trouble with the railroads. We voted 140 to 0 to help the people in the railroad bill. They did the same thing down in the other

body. Tonight we are trying to kill a bill that helps the whole industry in the State of Maine, the trucking industry. The railroads are going out of business, nobody to haul the freight out of Maine, they are cutting them all up into little pieces. I live in the most eastern part of the state. Our tolls are going to be tremendous on this turnpike, but still in all, we must have that turnpike to get our stuff to market. I hope tonight that you will vote as it was unanimous on this bill.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Biddeford, Representative Racine.

Representative RACINE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Basically, I have to agree with what has been said by previous speakers. I do not intend to repeat what was previously said. The Maine Turnpike is definitely the gateway to Maine, just like St. Louis, Missouri was the gateway to the west. I agree that the turnpike should be extended to three lanes rather than staying the way it is.

The concern that I have is the fact that the Maine Turnpike Authority is a quasi-governmental agency which means that it has complete autonomy. It does exactly as it pleases. As an example, when we in this body increased the speed limit from 55 to 65 miles an hour, the Maine Turnpike Authority could have, if they so desired, turned down our request. They had a meeting, they voted on it, and I see somebody shaking their head, and I got that directly from a member of the Maine Turnpike Authority and they could have turned down the legislative intent. Now what I am trying to convey to you, the concern that I have is the fact that there is no fiscal responsibility to this legislative body.

Approximately a month and a half ago, I looked into the possibility of placing legislative oversight over the Maine Turnpike Authority. I was in the process of preparing an amendment that would have put the Maine Turnpike Authority under the legislative oversight of the Transportation Committee. This cannot be done, not the way it has been set up. There is nothing that we can do about it.

The only thing that I was able to come up with was to require them to submit a semi-annual report of all their income and expenditures, a copy of which will be going to the Turnpike Authority, the Maine Department of Transportation, and one copy to the Legislative Program Fiscal Review, whatever it is. However, there is nothing that we can do on the expenditures that they make. They could buy 300 widgets as compared to something else and there is nothing we can do. That really concerns me because I feel that their wages have escalated to a point where their employees are getting paid higher than state employees. Of course the answer to that is that they have better union representation. I don't know if that is the case or not. But as an example, some of the salaries that I have been able to compare based on reports that I have received is that a highway maintenance foreman for the Maine Turnpike Authority gets \$501 a week compared to \$394 at the same step for someone that works in DOT. That is quite a bit of difference in salary. You take a highway maintenance truck driver at the highest step level, the DOT employee gets paid \$6.78 an hour compared to \$9.16, that is quite a bit of difference.

Now what I had proposed to do and I realize that it is impossible for me to do this, and it is difficult for me to understand or comprehend why we can't change this, was to ensure that their expenditures were in consonance with other state directives that we may have in order to be able to reduce the amount of funds that are being spent from the Maine Turnpike Authority. This could have an

effect on the amount of rate increase that has been scheduled. You have heard that there is a proposal to increase the fees 65 percent over the next seven or eight years. Now if they were better controlled, had more fiscal responsibility, instead of increasing to 65 percent, possibly the rate could be increased let's say 40 percent and they could still live within their budget. That really bothers me, the salary and there is nothing that we as legislators can do. I certainly hate to see this thing extended for another 25 years and, by approving this, we are extending their authority. Like previous speakers have said, we are sort of locked into this. I am locked in, I wish I could support Representative Paradis' motion but I can't because I feel that we have got to extend the Maine Turnpike by another lane.

Possibly back in 1983, if we had not extended the Maine Turnpike Authority, that possibly today we could be looking at federal funds to increase the width of the Maine Turnpike, now we can't. So we are sort of locked into this and I hope that with 151 of us here maybe someone can come with some ideas as to how we can establish legislative oversight over their expenditures.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Ellsworth, Representative Foster.

Representative FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: My heart goes out to the people in southern Maine and I will tell you why. They ask for little. Their tax dollars on sales tax and gas tax make life for the rest of Maine more pleasant. You think about it, you think about the dollars, the tax dollars, that come out of those southern counties, the gas tax money that comes out of those southern counties and they make our life more pleasant. The people of southern Maine have said it is inconvenient, there is a safety factor involved. They are not asking us to pay anything, they are going to pay themselves. I think its time that we thank them. I think that we should look at ourselves and say, what do they ask for? They ask for little and that is why I think it is important for someone like me, who comes from a part of the state that benefits from their tax dollars, to listen to the Representatives from southern Maine, to listen to their cries of -- we want to push these people up into your part of the state, we are reaping the benefits of tourism -- and these people mean it. They want to share. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, let's think about it and let's be thankful that they are that prosperous and, in their prosperity, they make our lives much better.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Auburn, Representative Dore.

Representative DORE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: My good colleague from Kennebunk said that the health of the tree trunk affects the entire tree and that is true but I would like to point out that that tree has been split by lightning in Portland, and that the part of that tree that runs up along coastal Maine, the free part, grows green and fertile and has many branches. And the part of that tree that runs from Gray to Augusta and costs money to ride on and is not free, languishes with only four branches. Having said that, I would also like to say that I certainly wouldn't sell a \$66 million vote for a study, I would get a little more for it.

I don't like bringing home to the people of Auburn tripling of their tolls, I am not comfortable with it, but I also travel to Massachusetts a lot on many occasions -- we have family there or can I say the family there is prolific -- and that southern portion of the state is dangerous when it is

crowded. When we come up to Augusta, we have to represent the interests of the entire State of Maine and, although many of my people do not travel to southern Maine often, it is not fair to the people who do travel through the southern part of the state to put them at risk. So I am going to vote for this. I am not happy with what Lewiston-Auburn has now for access or actually any of the smaller communities from Gray to Augusta but I think it is a statewide safety issue.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Augusta, Representative Hickey.

Representative HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hate to oppose my good friend, Representative Paradis, in regard to the value of the Maine Turnpike. When we think of our state before the turnpike, it took six hours to drive to Boston through each town and city on less than adequate roads. Certainly without the turnpike today, we would have few visitors coming into our state. Today our state enjoys a lucrative tourist business, providing many jobs and helping our economy. If we review the past twenty years, Maine's greatest accomplishments have been the construction of the turnpike. It has opened our state to the rest of the world and also has given us a chance to drive on good highways.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Mechanic Falls, Representative Callahan.

Representative CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Very briefly, I would like to say that we are very fortunate to have the tool, the Maine Turnpike Authority. Why do I say this? Because there is no way we could raise the gas tax and do such a major project and because Maine is second in the nation on what they have to spend on highways on a per capita basis. The State of Wyoming is number one, Maine is number two. It is because in this state we have about 14,000 miles of road and just a little over a million population. So I would hope you people would realize this and realize what the turnpike has already done in this respect. I would certainly hope you would defeat the motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Old Orchard Beach, Representative McSweeney.

Representative MCSWEENEY: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: The Maine Turnpike is the most important industry -- one of the most important industries in the whole state, if you can call it an industry, by bringing in the people, the tourists, for southern, central and northern Maine. This is why it is important to widen it because it brings nothing but tax dollars into this state and it is one of the most important industries in the whole state.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Portland, Representative Conley.

Representative CONLEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Well, we have debated this bill about an hour and a half, about an hour and a half more than we debated the budget, I would point out. We have had a nice time playing kick the can with the Turnpike Authority. I don't mind kicking it one more time -- let's get rid of the Turnpike Authority and put Dana Connors in charge of the turnpike. I don't have any problem with that, but let's not let the Turnpike Authority stand in the way of passing this bill which has been worked on very hard by the members of this committee, all of whom have explained to us is a very delicate decision making process which they went through, the concessions which they got for their constituents, to make this bill possible. You have been through the

eleventh hour attack on this bill, let's put it to rest and pass it.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: 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 PRO TEM: The pending question before the House is the motion of the Representative from Augusta, Representative Paradis, that L.D. 1806 be indefinitely postponed. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 159

YEA - Clark, M.; Coles, Erwin, P.; Gould, R. A.; LaPointe, Martin, H.; Mayo, Mitchell, Paradis, P.; Priest, Thistle, Tracy.

NAY - Aliberti, Allen, Anderson, Anthony, Armstrong, Bailey, Baker, Begley, Bickford, Bost, Bott, Boutilier, Bragg, Brown, Callahan, Carroll, Carter, Chonko, Clark, H.; Conley, Cote, Crowley, Curran, Davis, Dellert, Dexter, Diamond, Dore, Dutremble, L.; Farnum, Farren, Foss, Foster, Garland, Greenlaw, Gurney, Gwadosky, Hale, Handy, Hanley, Harper, Hepburn, Hichborn, Higgins, Hillock, Hoggund, Holloway, Holt, Hussey, Ingraham, Jackson, Jacques, Jalbert, Joseph, Ketover, Kilkelly, Lacroix, Lawrence, Lebowitz, Lisnik, Look, Lord, MacBride, Macomber, Manning, Marsano, Matthews, K.; McGowan, McHenry, McPherson, McSweeney, Melendy, Michaud, Mills, Moholland, Murphy, E.; Murphy, T.; Nadeau, G. G.; Nadeau, G. R.; Nicholson, Norton, Nutting, O'Gara, Paradis, E.; Paradis, J.; Parent, Paul, Perry, Pines, Pouliot, Racine, Rand, Reed, Rice, Richard, Ridley, Rolde, Rotondi, Ruhlin, Rydell, Salsbury, Seavey, Sheltra, Sherburne, Simpson, Small, Smith, Soucy, Stanley, Stevens, A.; Stevens, P.; Stevenson, Strout, B.; Strout, D.; Swazey, Tammaro, Tardy, Taylor, Telow, Tupper, Vose, Walker, Warren, Webster, M.; Wentworth, Weymouth, Whitcomb, Willey, Zirkilton.

ABSENT - Cashman, Duffy, Hickey, Kimball, Mahany, Reeves, Scarpino, The Speaker.

Yes, 12; No, 129; Absent, 8; Vacant, 2; Paired, 0; Excused, 0.

12 having voted in the affirmative and 129 in the negative with 8 being absent and 2 vacant, the motion to indefinitely postpone did not prevail.

Subsequently, the bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker pro tem and sent to the Senate.

The following items appearing on Supplement No. 9 were taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

SENATE PAPERS

Ought to Pass in New Draft

Report of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on Bill "An Act Creating the Maine Low-level Radioactive Waste Authority" (Emergency) (S.P. 205) (L.D. 561) reporting "Ought to Pass" in New Draft (Emergency) (S.P. 639) (L.D. 1865)

Came from the Senate, with the report read and accepted and the New Draft passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendments "A" (S-218) and "B" (S-221).

Report was read and accepted, the New Draft read once.

Senate Amendment "A" (S-218) was read by the Clerk and adopted.

Senate Amendment "B" (S-221) was read by the Clerk and adopted.