

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 Fifteenth Legislature
OF THE
State Of Maine

VOLUME I

FIRST REGULAR SESSION

House of Representatives
December 5, 1990 to May 16, 1991

Tardy, Townsend, Tracy, Tupper, Vigue, Waterman, Wentworth, Whitcomb, The Speaker.

NAY - Coles, Gray, Handy, Heeschen, Hoglund, Jacques, Kerr, Luther, Michaud, O'Dea, Pineau, Richardson, Simonds, Simpson, Treat.

ABSENT - LaPointe, Libby, McKeen, Pendleton.

Yes, 132; No, 15; Absent, 4; Paired, 0; Excused, 0.

132 having voted in the affirmative and 15 in the negative with 4 being absent, House Amendment "F" (H-16) was adopted.

Subsequently, the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendments "A", "B", "C", "D", and "F." Sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Yarmouth, Representative Foss.

Representative FOSS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House reconsider its action whereby L.D. 274 was passed to be engrossed as amended and I request a roll call.

Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As most of you know, we debated this issue in depth for several hours on Saturday but I would like to make a couple of comments.

Despite having worked together in a committee since December 26th to find some middle ground, many, many issues still do divide us in the budget. Several are minor and probably would fall into place if the larger issues could be resolved but fundamental, philosophical differences still do remain. I would like to briefly describe my primary two objections to this Majority Report.

First is the funding source, which would recover any restored cuts and I perceive that as a raid on the General Purpose Aid to Education and it is really unacceptable for two major reasons, the first of which is to postpone the need to cut, thus making our biennial problem that much bigger. I am concerned about the cash flow problem at the beginning of the next fiscal year.

Although there has been much discussion about the lukewarm support of Maine Municipal and Maine School Management, I know that Maine Municipal is hoping that we would repay the \$44 million during the next biennium, which means we would have to do 25 payments in 24 months. I also understand that the superintendents would hope that we would make payments in 12 months. I know that that is not the intent of the signers of the Majority Report but I do think that the superintendents and municipal officials out there would prefer it that way and I don't think any of us really believe that we have an extra \$44 million in the next two years.

I also think an equally important problem is that, in the Majority Report, it does not make any real long-term significant cuts in entitlement programs, which have spiraling costs and I think will eventually bankrupt this state. Also there is no attempt in here to really deal with the long-term costs of the Maine Health Care Program and we all know that that cost is spinning out of control. In fact, what really concerns me at this point in time is no one can even define what that future cost is. I think that is fiscally irresponsible. We also believe there are further cuts that could be made in the Legislative Branch and the Judicial Branch so, for those reasons, I hope you will vote against

engrossment.

Subsequently, on motion of Representative Foss of Yarmouth, the House reconsidered its action whereby L.D. 274 was passed to be engrossed as amended.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Thomaston, Representative Mayo.

Representative MAYO: Men and Women of the House: I wanted to rise today to address two issues that I believe are fundamental to this debate. First of all the funding source — there have been a lot of people coming up to me since the last time we debated this for an explanation of the funding source and I wanted to give one more for the Record in case there is anybody else out there that still had some nagging questions.

The Majority Report would delay to the first day of July the June payment. There was some discussion about when the June payment was going to be made and I have yet to see any language from the Commissioner but I understand it was to have been made by the 19th of June. We provided language in the Majority Report to allow school districts to accrue that payment back to this fiscal year. They will get in effect 12 payments this fiscal year and 12 payments the next fiscal year. In other words, they will be made whole in terms of their total payments that are due them. In addition to that, we provide for language in the Majority Report that gives to the school districts an additional \$880,000 over and above what was previously appropriated for the school funding this year to make them whole for their lost interest income in effect because the Commissioner of Education, by her Order, and this legislature by changing that last date, are moving the payments. \$880,000 is to make up out of their lost interest to cover the costs that they incurred because those checks were delayed. The school districts are made whole completely with the Majority Report.

In the Minority Report, though that last payment is not shifted from June to July, they are losing the interest income that they would have gotten normally if Commissioner Bither had not issued an Order and withheld those checks for ten days under her Order for five months, 50 days. Let me say that again, the Majority Report is putting school districts whole, leaving them unhurt by any actions of this legislature with respect to this.

Let me speak briefly as well about the point that has been made over and over and over again about cash flow. Yes, it is true that the cash reserves of the state are low in the first of the month but I submit to you that that is the state's problem, it is the state's budget that is in a mess and we shouldn't attempt to balance the state's budget on the back of the school districts by delaying their checks for ten days or any other means. Yes, it may be difficult for the state to borrow funds on the first day of the month to pay that \$44 million but that is a cash flow problem, it is not a budget problem, it doesn't affect anything beyond that. Let me make that perfectly clear, it is a cash flow problem. As we all know, the state has been experiencing a negative cash flow for some period of time. It does not change the number of checks that the schools will be credited for in each of the next two fiscal years, the one that we are in now and the one that is coming.

As I explained in my remarks before, this problem only becomes a problem when God does the final audit, somewhere way out in the future, way, way beyond when any of us here or any of our children are going to

have to worry about it because I assume that when God does do the final audit, he will be the only one around.

Let me respond to one other issue that I have heard again and again and again about spiraling costs, about costs out into the future. The Majority Report, in good faith, has put the language in that basically caps the Maine Health Program with the current people that are participating in it so we can get a handle on those costs and come back and look at the program. I believe that that was a good faith effort on the part of my party to try to assist with the funding of this program. We recognize that there may be some questions about costs so we put a cap on the program with an effective date five days beyond when we pass this bill. Remember, if we do nothing, current law stands, the program stays on the books. Allow us to come back in a few weeks with an assessment from the department so we can get a handle on the program and then make the adjustments necessary at that time, which is more appropriate in my opinion. We passed a tax increase to fund this program. We owe it to ourselves to make sure that that tax increase that we passed specifically for this program goes to the purposes for which it was designed at that time. I think that that is a reasonable good faith effort on the part of the Majority Party to get a handle on the Maine Health Program. Let's not forget the differences between these two reports is not that great.

There has been a good faith effort here today to put some amendments on this bill to make it more palatable and we will continue through the process.

I intend to vote on the Record for engrossment of this bill and I would urge you to do the same.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Winthrop, Representative Norton.

Representative NORTON: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I believe that we are placing the state's credit rating in jeopardy when we think about moving dates of payment, deferral, if you will, which is an accounting procedure which raises no new money. Taxing to spend is out, taxing to pay our bills is not.

I have trouble supporting a bill which does not raise tax money to pay our way. It would tell the financial institutions that this state does business and that we are, indeed, serious about dealing with our financial status.

I should have made, and I apologize to anybody willing to listen at this point, this speech when we were at the pre-legislative conference. I probably would have been out of order. I have made it before in my own caucus, I believe that we need to show a gesture at least by raising tax money. I think we have known that for some time. I have no plan right now to do it. I don't know how to do it, I don't know how late we are but I have an idea that, if you turned the spigot on now, there will be more water in the bathtub come July 1st, though you wait until July 1st to turn it on.

I will tell you another thing, it may come from a downeast philosophy but I know that taxes are never a popular item but the same factors that place a tax situation as being okay for the next biennium are present right now as we address this minor problem when compared to what we are going to be up against in a very short time regarding the next biennium. I don't consider what I am saying as anything profound but I feel better for having said it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Falmouth, Representative Reed.

Representative REED: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We have had lengthy discussions on this matter, both today and a prior day, and I do not believe that it would be either prudent or productive to engage in further lengthy discussion so I promise you I will not.

However, I do have two fundamental concerns which I feel compelled to express to you. First, I must respectfully disagree with the Representative from Thomaston and express to you that I feel that the proposal before us has a proposed source of funding which is fundamentally, fiscally, and philosophically, flawed. I do not agree that an accrued entry is cash that these districts can spend and I think that that is a terrible weakness. When I think of that proposed source of funding, I am reminded of the old song, "What a difference a day makes" and by simply moving this obligation by one day that we have somehow addressed a serious financial problem, which escapes me. I cannot believe that we truly believe that. It is inconceivable to me that we believe that that is sound fiscal policy.

On the second matter where I have a deep concern is, in my opinion, the proposal's failure to take significant and unpopular steps to address the long-term costs of a number of service programs, most specifically AFDC, the Maine Health Plan, and Medicaid. Medicaid itself, I am told by Representatives of the Department of Human Services, whom I trust, will in the next biennium expend a combination of state and federal dollars slightly over \$1 billion. It is a tremendously expensive program because it provides overly broad and very expensive services whose costs are escalating at a frightening rate. For those two reasons, I must oppose this proposal and I would submit to you ladies and gentlemen that, if we put this budget to bed in its present condition, which I believe to be critical, we will in the biennium receive a financial wakeup call and we will not like the message.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Old Town, Representative Cashman.

Representative CASHMAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise simply to point out a flaw in the arguments just presented by the previous speaker. He says he doesn't like the idea of using an accrued method of accounting for the school department whereby this money is accrued and they spend it before they receive it. The alternative that has been presented to that proposal is that the state count an accrued payment from telecommunication companies that would be accrued in May of 1991 and would not be paid until May of 1992, 12 months later, yet we were to count that accrued money in this biennium. I think that is a major flaw in the objections raised by the gentleman.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Yarmouth, Representative Foss.

Representative FOSS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: On that particular issue, and I will restate again publicly as I did Saturday, that both budgets have shifts in money that are probably unacceptable for some of us but you can see the difficulty we have had with finding \$40 million dollars worth of cuts. The alternative to some of the funny money proposals would be further cuts. I don't see that as being a realistic goal this session.

As far as the telecommunications tax, it is my understanding, and I am sure the Representative from Old Town knows that that money has always been booked that way and not paid. However, because of the issue of whether it is yet another funny money, it is my understanding now (and I have talked with the Representative from State Planning and as I have said on the Record) that will be paid, the \$12 million, in this fiscal year.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Brunswick, Representative Rydell.

Representative RYDELL: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I feel it necessary to remind people what a vote against this bill means. It means no more money for people who need to move from hospitals to nursing homes and who need to remain in the hospital awaiting a nursing home placement. It means no more money for your hospitals.

It also means that persons living in nursing homes who are ineligible for Medicaid, but whose incomes are low and who have used up all of their assets, will not have any means to pay for the nursing home care that they need.

A vote against this bill also means that the hospitals that are expecting to receive money from the Hospital Shortfall Fund will not receive that money and I remind you that for some hospitals, for example the Aroostook Medical Center, it means \$250,000 from that fund. If we are talking about the hospital in Blue Hill, \$160,000 goes to that hospital from that fund. If we are talking about Redington-Fairview Hospital in Skowhegan, it is \$133,000 that will not go to that hospital. If we are talking about the hospital in Caribou, the Cary Medical Center, it is \$53,000. If we are talking about St. Joseph's Hospital in Bangor, it is \$55,000. If we are talking about the hospital in Houlton, it is \$24,000. The loss of that money combined with the loss of the funds for the Days Waiting Placement combined with the repeal of the sunset on a hospital excise tax would mean a shift to our hospitals. That hospital excise tax brings in approximately \$1.65 million. We have promised the hospitals that that will sunset this year and that it will not be continued without further consideration.

We are talking about a tax, men and women of the House, on our hospitals which will be passed on to the businesses and individuals in your districts. The effort to continue the components of the Maine Health Program is an effort not to place that tax on your hospitals, on your small businesses, on your individuals who are purchasing health insurance and paying for their health care. Yes, we do have to assess the effect of the Maine Health Program, we do need to figure out how we can cut costs and we do know that there are some ways we can do that. We can institute more managed care, we can go after more federal funds, we can reconstruct the program in a slightly different fashion if necessary and, therefore, we have placed a cap on it by not allowing further adult applicants. We cannot, I repeat we cannot, deny to our hospitals, our businesses, and consumers the purchase of health insurance and health care, the relief that they so desperately need, and we cannot continue to collect a tax from the people of the State of Maine on cigarettes, on liquor sold in bars and restaurants, on the sale of used boats, we cannot continue to collect that tax which was attached to the bill on the Maine Health Program unless we are committed to continuing that program.

I also want to tell you that, in the Majority Report, we are making some changes in Medicaid, we are deappropriating from the Medicaid a payment to provide as accounts a certain amount of money, almost \$1.5 million for the rest of the fiscal year, from implementing fee schedules, from moving into second opinions, from getting pharmaceutical discounts, but we are not eliminating any services. We are streamlining programs, we are attempting to make it more efficient and to better serve the people of Maine. We are committed to taking a look at all programs as we move into the discussion of the next biennial budget. We are not committed and we will not remove services from people in the middle of the winter and in the middle of the service for which are now receiving help. We cannot take away medical care from people right in the middle, perhaps, of their hospital stay. We can't do that and we need to take the time to look at our programs and to make sure that when we make changes they are appropriate and they do not do harm to individuals.

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

Representative WHITCOMB: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise to discuss, not the Minority Report which sounded a little bit like the discussion of the previous speaker, but simply to express my objections to the Majority Report.

I have heard from the good Representative from Thomaston that there have been good faith efforts to make the Majority Report more palatable for the entire body. I simply suggest that we have in good faith, perhaps, applied band-aids to a bad injury. In fact, the Majority Report, even as amended, is fundamentally flawed and still contains fundamental differences as to how we proceed with Maine government.

I stand and urge this body to reject the Majority Report simply because it continues to spend at a rate that Maine taxpayers cannot afford.

I understand that the incoming members of this body heard yesterday that legislation never dies in this place — if that is the case, then my brief history here would suggest that that may be. I can suggest to members of this body the rejection of the Majority Report today does not bring about any of the suggestions of the previous speaker but in fact the rejection of the Majority Report allows a process to continue.

I do not pretend to debate as one of the financial heavyweights of this body but only to remind this body that we have a responsibility in looking at this budget to also project the costs of what we do into the problem that we have in the already before us in printed form in the biennial budget. It is our clear objective, those of us who speak as the Minority, to bring the costs of this Supplemental Appropriation, to a level that we can afford, to a level where we can proceed to tackle the much more difficult job of finding a way to make our biennial budget balance.

I urge rejection of the report before us.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Fryeburg, Representative Hastings.

Representative HASTINGS: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: My concern, as voiced earlier, was reiterated in a statement or article in the Portland Press Herald this morning regarding any of these budgets and particularly are more exacerbated by the Majority Report in that the deferral of money

from one fiscal year to another most likely will change the bond rating of this state. We are one of nine states having the highest bond ratings currently. States who have this highest rating are not expected to defer their payments from year to year so as to make do in a given year. That cost, if we only go down one rating, is about \$13 to \$15 million and it would take about 15 years or more to rebuild our credit worthiness in the market place. If we go down two rating positions, that is closer to \$26 to \$30 million per year.

We talk about Maine Health Care and who can be against it. We are talking money that we may jeopardize the state to have to pay in the future with this proposal. We have to, under our Constitution, meet our obligations and to do it with a shell game is clearly not what money people out there want to hear. You can vote it but think in the future that you have cost this state that kind of money.

I would urge you to consider your vote today carefully and see if we can't work out something that would void this kind of jeopardy to the state. Keep in mind that the federal government now spends 30 percent of its money each year paying interest. Do we want to get in that kind of boat?

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Thomaston, Representative Mayo.

Representative MAYO: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I didn't want to rise prior to the previous speaker but I have heard this issue and I do want to speak to it. First of all, I am sure Representative Hastings is talking about increases that would reflect a change in the interest rate of the current debt that the state has. As we all know, the debt, once issued, has a fixed rate of interest and would not change. He, of course, is speaking about any new debt that might possibly be issued after, if our bond rating was affected.

I have had several discussions with people about the bond rating in the State of Maine. As we all know, we are quite proud of the fact that it is Triple A. I spoke specifically with the State Treasurer yesterday or the day before, I can't remember which, about accounting gimmicks (so called) or accounting maneuvers. The State Treasurer has been on the phone practically on a daily basis with the bond houses and I believe he spoke to Standard & Poor's and described the provision that is in the Majority Report. He asked if that would downgrade our bond rating. The response he got was that Standard & Poor really isn't looking at what is done in this budget so much as what will be done in the next budget so to suggest, out of hand, that any action we take in the Majority Report, any single action that we take, is going to be in and of itself responsible for the downgrading of our bond rating, I think, might be overstating the case slightly.

Obviously, this legislator would have preferred not to have had these type of maneuvers in the bill but they are here in both reports.

I congratulate the Representative from Winthrop, Representative Norton, for his forthright statements. I am not necessarily endorsing them, but we all know that we would prefer to handle our budget problems with either cuts in spending or increase in taxes. What has come from the committee is not that and I am ready to accept what I think is the best report of the two offered before us. Let's not vote against it today because we are under the impression

that our bond rating is going to go down immediately and that the interest costs to the State of Maine are going to go up immediately by \$30 million because that clearly, clearly is not the case.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Hallowell, Representative Farnsworth.

Representative FARNSWORTH: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I think there are many more than 101 people in this body today who would like to see us resolve this situation and do so by full agreement.

I would like to speak particularly to those people who are troubled as I was when I left here when we discussed this bill before about the \$43 million. It was very difficult for me, to be very honest, to understand how it was that we were not shorting the school systems from that amount of money out of this fiscal year and how we were not doing, as has been suggested, a deferral to next year. There were two or three points that I finally absorbed in talking with a number of people and talking with a CPA that helped me understand what I think the members of the Appropriations Committee (in particular) and others who immediately understood this whole situation were able to see. I also have understood that there has been assurances received from Standard & Poor and, as was just mentioned the State Treasurer, that it is clear that we do not have any reason to believe that our credit rating will be affected so I am satisfied on that point as well.

I understood this proposal when the Speaker explained about it being like a house mortgage — what I had trouble with was, if that is the case, then where does the extra payment go? What I finally understood was that this is like a house mortgage in a sense that we continue to make the school subsidy payments — the difference is, we have no end point in mind for the school subsidy program. It is not a 20 year mortgage or 30 year mortgage. As far as we are concerned, there is no expectation that that program will end next year. If it were to end next year or the year after that, we would have to come up with the \$43 million but this is an ongoing payment. If there is anybody here who knows of an expected end point to that, then they could say so, but I don't and I certainly don't advocate one. That made a big difference to me because it explains why you can stop worrying about where the extra payments comes from because it will be next century or something to that effect. The real issue is the timing of payments.

My next question was — all right, then does that mean all school systems have to adjust their fiscal year in order to not have a problem in coming up with the full amount they were supposed to get for this fiscal year? The CPA that I ran into on the street said, "No, they will call this an "Accounts Receivable" and that helped me a lot because it means that this year, although if their fiscal year is from July 1, 1990 to June 30th of this year, they will not in that 12 months actually receive all the payments. The last payment would be an "Accounts Receivable" just like some of their other income may well be, but they will receive early in July and it will be considered part of this year's payment. Similarly next year, essentially what we have said is that they will get 12 payments for the next fiscal year and they will be paid on the first day of the month following the month that they are for. That means that next year at the end of the year, there will be an "Accounts Receivable" again for another \$43

million. I found that really important and helpful to allow me to understand.

I honestly believe from having spoken to several members of the Minority Party as well as my own that there are people who are still struggling to figure out how it is that we are not hiding this \$43 million and I only go through this in hopes that it will help some people be comfortable with supporting the Majority Bill which is not perfect by anybody's standards but it is, in my opinion, far better than anything else we have. I believe that most people here have reason to want to be able to support it if they just could get rid of that discomfort and I would urge people to vote for it.

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 Bethel, Representative Barth.

Representative BARTH: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Back in December, the 21st, we soundly defeated 140 to 3 the Governor's proposal to defer payments into the Teacher Retirement System. To me, this deferral of \$43.3 million from this fiscal year to next fiscal year, although the numbers may differ, the method of payment may differ, philosophically it is the same thing. I cannot support the Majority Report on that.

It begs the question that we must begin and we must begin now (not wait until the biennial budget) to process the downsizing of state government.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Harpswell, Representative Coles.

Representative COLES: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I was moved to stand up by the previous speaker's comments. I think there is a very critical distinction between the proposal we rejected in December and the proposal before us today.

The proposal in December would have involved payment over a number of years in the future which is well beyond the control of this legislature. The proposal in the Majority Report is totally within the control of this legislature. It has to be dealt in the next biennial budget, which we control completely.

I would also like to make one brief comment on the Minority Leader's well-meant concern about responsible cutting of costs. It is one thing to cut costs, it is another thing to simply cut state contributions to costs. To reduce the state's contributions to the Health Care Program, to reduce the state's contribution to AFDC, does not cut the costs involved. It shifts those costs.

The Representative from Brunswick made this point in some ways but I wanted to reemphasize it because it is not responsible budget policy for the state budget to simply cut its own contributions to costs that did not disappear. The only way we can responsibly reduce the state budget is to actually reduce the costs, not simply shift them to the local property taxpayers, to help insurance payers which include local government's and local property taxpayers.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Hampden, Representative Richards.

Representative RICHARDS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I guess the reason why I am rising is to vent some of the frustration I have been having over the last 40 days and some of the frustration that I think has been echoed within my district. I would first like to say that I really applaud and I appreciate the hard work that the Appropriations Committee has put in in this 40 days and 40 nights. I was reminded that it is still raining outside and luckily the water is not coming over the window jams.

However, I have had some very grave concerns over the last 40 days in dealing with the politics that entered into this whole scheme of negotiating a budget, this \$160 million dollars, the grave concerns where I label the politics as being political muckery. Those people that would take gain and advantage for this period of time to make statements — for instance, that the Republicans won't agree or that we want to make state government smaller but the Republicans don't agree.

I was driving my daughter to school this morning about seven-thirty and, to her protest I was listening to NPBN, and a statement was made that the Republicans won't agree. My daughter and my son has heard my wife and I talk about the problems in the state. Every time I come home, my wife asks me, "Well, what is going on?" I try to explain to her what is going on but I always end by saying that the political process is not properly working because of the level of politics that is involved at this point. While driving my daughter to school, she asked me, "Why won't the Republicans agree?" I wanted to say, "Well, the Democrats want to paint the Republicans as being the prodigal child" but I am not sure she would have understood that. What I merely said is that "It is an easy way to say that the Democrats won't agree with the Republicans and they are passing the buck to us."

I guess I want to further say that I will vote no on the Majority Report and will continue to vote no on the Majority Report because I think there are some serious problems that need to be addressed. I don't see a package that is before this body that everyone dislikes and everyone likes and that is a true compromise. That compromise has not ripened and I feel where the process works is that it would go back to Appropriations to address the concerns and come out with a compromise.

As far as the \$44 million jeopardizing bonds, I think that that is a legitimate concern. Perhaps it is not a legitimate concern, as the Representative from Thomaston has indicated, because taxes might be raised and if you generate \$80 million, perhaps half of that will be made up so you have lost a potential revenue of \$44 million that could be used for something else if we trim state government, if we are committed as a body to trim state government. Then again, if we do trim state government and we don't free up the monies that we need, we have potentially lost revenue if we are going to pay off this \$44 million.

We are also taking and passing on to the next biennium further cuts, which means that we are further delaying costs to the future.

I guess I would like to end by saying something that perhaps might be constructive to all of us and it is a quote out of a book that I have been reading called, "Love and Will", which I never knew existed until about three months, ago written by Rollo May in

1969. He also wrote other books, "Freedom and Destiny" and "Man's Search for Himself." He is writing another book called, "A Person's Knack for Saying What Really Isn't" — this book deals with interpersonal relations, with individuals and us as we get along in society together and basically tries to work toward a consensus of ideas. This quote, which I think is in line with the politics that has been introduced here for the last 40 days is, "Our error was that we let our convictions limit our perceptions."

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is passage to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" (H-11), "B" (H-12), "C" (H-13), "D" (H-14), and "F" (H-16). Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

On motion of Representative Vigue of Winslow,
Adjourned at 2:12 p.m. until Friday, February 8,
1991, at ten o'clock in the morning.

ROLL CALL NO. 11

YEA - Adams, Aliberti, Anthony, Bell, Boutilier, Cahill, M.; Carroll, D.; Cashman, Cathcart, Chonko, Clark, H.; Clark, M.; Coles, Constantine, Cote, Crowley, Daggett, Dipietro, Dore, Duffy, Dutremble, L.; Erwin, Farnsworth, Gean, Goodridge, Gould, R. A.; Graham, Gray, Gurney, Gwadosky, Hale, Handy, Heeschen, Hichborn, Hogle, Holt, Hussey, Jacques, Jalbert, Joseph, Kerr, Ketover, Ketterer, Kilkelly, Kontos, Larrivee, Lawrence, Lemke, Luther, Macomber, Mahany, Manning, Martin, H.; Mayo, McHenry, Melendy, Michaud, Mitchell, E.; Mitchell, J.; Morrison, Nadeau, Norton, Nutting, O'Dea, O'Gara, Oliver, Paradis, J.; Paradis, P.; Paul, Pfeiffer, Pineau, Plourde, Poulin, Pouliot, Powers, Rand, Richardson, Ricker, Rotondi, Ruhlin, Rydell, Saint Onge, Sheltra, Simonds, Simpson, Skoglund, Stevens, P.; Strout, Swazey, Tammaro, Townsend, Tracy, Treat, Vigue, Waterman, Wentworth, The Speaker.

NAY - Aikman, Anderson, Ault, Bailey, H.; Bailey, R.; Barth, Bennett, Bowers, Butland, Carleton, Carroll, J.; Donnelly, Duplessis, Farren, Foss, Garland, Greenlaw, Hanley, Hastings, Heino, Hepburn, Hichens, Kutasi, Lebowitz, Lipman, Look, Lord, MacBride, Marsano, Marsh, Merrill, Murphy, Nash, Ott, Parent, Pendexter, Pines, Reed, G.; Reed, W.; Richards, Salisbury, Savage, Small, Spear, Stevens, A.; Stevenson, Tupper, Whitcomb.

ABSENT - Farnum, LaPointe, Libby, McKeen, Pendleton, Tardy.
Yes, 97; No, 48; Absent, 6; Paired, 0;
Excused, 0.

97 having voted in the affirmative and 48 in the negative with 6 being absent, the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended and sent up for concurrence.

At this point, Speaker Martin appointed Representative Gwadosky of Fairfield to act as Speaker pro tem.

The House was called to order by the Speaker pro tem

(Off Record Remarks)