

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the
LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

LEGISLATIVE RECORD

OF THE

*One Hundred and Seventh
Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

Volume II

May 21, 1975 to July 2, 1975

Index

KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley.

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I will be very brief but I am not such a good orator as the last man that spoke but I have got about the same number of towns and I can't name them all, I don't think. I start at Milford line and I go on up through to Topsfield and there are a lot of little towns I never heard of until they were thrown into my district but it includes an awful lot of them and I won't take the time to name them all.

Down through the years I have generally been for lowering the size of the House but I thought when we started off this session we made room for two extra seats in here, that wasn't the concept in here now. If they are just going to shorten up the districts, so to speak, to fill it up with the minority groups in the House, I would rather keep it the way it is.

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

Mr. DAM: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise to support the motion for indefinite postponement because I think my good friend from Solon, Mr. Faucher, made it quite clear when he said the people think we are foolish to send out something now that would affect them in 1985. Personally, if this thing was going to happen a little earlier, I could support it because this might put my town back into a single town and give me back the other third that I lost. To put it out in 1985, I think what we are pretty much saying to the people of the State of Maine that we are willing to accept the fact that Maine is never going to grow in the next ten years, that if anything, we are going to dwindle down so that the legislators can take on more constituents and increase their territory just like the good gentleman just spoke, Mr. Dudley, they have such a territory now that they can't hardly get around it. Then to give them any more they most certainly aren't going to get around it. To project ahead ten years now, I think, this is utterly ridiculous. Maybe this should be defeated now and come up in a later session when we are a little closer to that date.

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

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Relative to the point of we are trying to project something ahead to 1985, I think if you have ever done any work on the whole problem of apportionment, you will realize that you have got to project this thing ahead, you have got to do some of the work quite some time in advance. Actually, the work on starting to do the apportionment for the House that will be elected in 1985 will actually be done somewhere in the year 1981 or 1982. I realize that we are looking quite far ahead but we have just gone through this whole situation and just completed an apportionment last session. I think that we have got to start to face up to these things, at this time, because if we project this ahead and we wait until 1985, it is too late. By 1981 we are going to be into the problem. I think that throwing this type of smoke screen up is completely distorting the whole picture.

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

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

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Solon, Mr. Faucher, that the House indefinitely postpone Resolution Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to provide for Reduction of the Number of Representatives in 1985, to Establish the Number of Senators at Thirty-three in 1985, and to Change the Date of Convening of the Legislature. House Paper 1587, L. D. 1883, and all accompanying papers. All those in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA Albert, Ault, Bennett, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Berube, Blodgett, Boudreau, Burns, Bustin, Call, Carey, Carroll, Chonko, Connors, Connolly, Cote, Curran, P.; Curran, R.; Dam, DeVane, Drigotas, Dudley, Farley, Faucher, Fenlason, Finemore, Flanagan, Fraser, Hutchings, Ingegneri, Jackson, Joyce, Kelleher, Kelley, LeBlanc, Leonard, Lewis, Lizotte, Lunt, MacEachern, Mackel, Mahany, Martin, A.; Maxwell, McMahan, Mills, Miskavage, Morin, Mulkern, Nadeau, Peakes, Perkins, T.; Post, Quinn, Raymond, Rideout, Rolde, Rollins, Saunders, Silverman, Snowe, Talbot, Tarr, Theriault, Twitchell, Tyndale, Walker, Webber, Wilfong, Winship.

NAY — Bachrach, Bagley, Birt, Bowie, Byers, Carpenter, Carter, Churchill, Clark, Cooney, Cox, Curtis, Davies, Durgin, Dyer, Farnham, Goodwin, H. Goodwin, K.; Gould, Gray, Greenlaw, Hall, Henderson, Hewes, Higgins, Hinds, Hobbins, Hughes, Immonen, Jensen, Kany, Kennedy, Laffin, LaPointe, Laverty, Littlefield, Lovell, Lynch, MacLeod, Martin, R.; McKernan, Mitchell, Morton, Norris, Palmer, Pelosi, Perkins, S.; Peterson, P.; Peterson, T.; Pierce, Powell, Shute, Smith, Snow, Spencer, Sprowl, Stubbs, Susi, Teague, Tierney, Torrey, Tozier, Truman, Usher, Wagner.

ABSENT — Doak, Dow, Garsoe, Gauthier, Hennessey, Hunter, Jacques, Jalbert, Kauffman, Lewin, McBreairty, Najarian, Strout.

Yes, 71; No, 65; Absent, 14.

The SPEAKER: Seventy-one having voted in the affirmative and sixty-five in the negative, with fourteen being absent, the motion does prevail.

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

House Divided Report — Majority (10) "Ought Not to Pass" — Minority (3) "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-394) — Committee on Health and Institutional Services on Bill "An Act Relating to the Furnishing of Family Planning Services for Minors." (H. P. 988) (L. D. 1253)

Tabled — May 20, by Mr. DeVane of Ellsworth.

Pending — Acceptance of Either Report.

Mr. Goodwin of South Berwick moved that the House accept the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Millinocket, Mrs. Laverty.

Mrs. LAVERTY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I oppose this motion and I ask that you accept the Minority Report, "Ought to Pass" with the amendment that you find on your desk.

This bill, as you know, pertains to a family planning service to minors. This bill refers directly to a bill that was passed in the 106th Legislature, Bill 1823 to set up a program and policy for furnishing family planning services. This family planning service was to counsel and does counsel people who would like to plan their families and know more about contraceptives and be able to regulate pregnancy. This was a favorable service and is today, with the exception that we are finding that more and more teenagers are using this service.

In this bill, the first primary bill, is a paragraph 1908 referring to minors. This is the area to which I address the amendment and this bill in general. I did not frankly know anything about this service until a group of concerned parents came to me and wondered what could be done regulating a law pertaining to this paragraph. What my people did, in my district, was to hold public meetings and then form a committee which set up a plan to work with me to produce what you find here in the Committee Amendment. The idea being that concerned parents want very much to know when a child, under 18 years old, goes for the family planning service and asks for a prescribed contraceptive that is known, as we are all familiar with today, the pill. This involves a bodily change which is not a mechanical device. Parents that talked with me are very much worried about the medical history that might be within their family which the child would not be aware of, and that therefore, the use of the prescribed drug might be very harmful. They, therefore, are asking that they be notified when this particular service with a minor is being used.

I would like to point out how we have come about to be in a society where young people are using sexual contraceptives. To think of a child 13, 14 or 15 is really appalling and yet we have to look at what our society is like today. First, let's look at the family. We would hope that the family would be the basis for teaching values to young people when it comes to the sexual subjects but our family is quite different today, it is a mobile unit, the people in it are moving and the family itself is moving and even the youngest children are getting more information from outside the family than inside the family, unfortunately.

Also, let's look at the young people themselves. Today they move in a very mobile society, in a society that has TV and other visual learning processes. The youngsters today really know much more than you and I knew when we were in those particular areas, junior high school or high school. A great many techniques, technical knowledge and learning have been thrust upon young people so that they have to learn sex almost quicker than they learn to read and write. Therefore, they are very aware of what is going on.

I want to look at TV a minute. TV programs became so popular that it is almost a way of life with us, as intimate, as eating and sleeping. We do everything through TV. The TV programs did damage to the movie trade and for that reason movies began to develop the old saw, they took in the sexual subjects to promote their own business. Out of this development comes the sexual stimulus that is around us all day, every day. We have it in magazines, in movies, on TV, we have it everywhere. Therefore, young people are sexually stimulated, constantly, in one way or another. For us, too, we have to do

quite a lot of thinking to make judgments for ourselves and the young people living in larger groups of their peers are taking on sexual activity as one of the "in" things to do. Therefore, they are going to this family planning service for advice, counseling, and, furthermore, for the pill. My family group that talked with me, my concerned parents, are not against family planning service, but they are asking that when a youngster that is a minor goes for this service that the parent be allowed to know, be given the knowledge that this is going on, and that they may then advise doctors in this service plan of a medical problem at home. I sincerely hope you will give this very deep thought because you are parents yourselves and I ask that rather than accept the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" that you will accept the Minority "Ought to Pass" with the amendment.

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

Mr. DeVANE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would ask you to defeat the Majority Report and to support the lady from Millinocket in accepting the Minority Report. The matter under discussion here today is not, in fact, the matter of family planning, only a very few people, if any, are opposed to family planning or to government activity toward that end. What we are discussing is the furnishing of contraceptive devices and material and instructions to minor children without parental knowledge.

The present law reads thusly, "Family planning services may be furnished to any minor who is a parent." Fine, the fine is mine for the record, "or is married", fine, the fine is mine, "or who has the consent of his or her legal guardian" fine, once again mine, "or who may suffer in the professional opinion or the judgment of a physician, probable health hazards if such services are not provided."

I would like to discuss with you the role of a physician in judgments other than medical judgments. It is not particularly for me, I would say to the gentleman from Gardiner, but as in other issues I am going to say what I think should be said. An attorney, to give you an example, is a person who by training and experience knows what the law is and how it is applied. There is nothing in our society to suggest that an attorney is any better suited to decide what the law should be than any of us. There is nothing in our society that would suggest to me that a physician is any better able to make judgments of this nature than any of the rest of us and certainly not better than a parent. It is hardly a medical judgment in all cases. What is under consideration here is the substitution of the state's judgment for the judgment of a parent or a guardian. The state of Maine, by act of the 106th Legislature has pursued a general public good to the reduction of unwanted pregnancies among minor children by trampling upon what I consider to be an absolute right of a parent or guardian. The state has not abridged this right, it has obliterated this right. If you doubt for one moment that what is under discussion here concerns family planning or the providing of that service to minor children, let me share with you some facts derived from a conversation with a family planning clinic in Ellsworth, Maine. I called them Tuesday. I asked this question of the staff, "What percentage of the clientele you serve are married?" The

answer was, "We don't know." The second question was, "Why don't you know, you are providing a family planning service?" "We don't ask people if they are married." was the answer. Question, "Well, what is your best educated guess?" Answer, "Oh, 50-50 but we don't pay much attention to that". I am simply asking that you look at the matter and call a spade a spade. The matter under discussion is not family planning, I know of nobody in this state and nobody certainly to my knowledge, at least to this representative, has complained of family planning or of the state spending money in that effort. Ladies and gentlemen I suggest to you that if the state of Maine passed an act called the family mortgage plan and you went in to get a mortgage, somebody would ask you if you were married.

A further question, "What percentage of your clientele are minor children?" Answer, "That we do know, 13 percent of our clientele are under 18." Question, "What percentage of your clientele are under 16 years of age, persons 15 years of age and down?" Answer, "One or two percent, not quite as accurate."

I spoke on Tuesday last with a person who worked in a family planning clinic in this state other than Ellsworth and this person told me that in that clinic, the ratio was 50 percent, minor children.

If we could address the issue from another standpoint, the opponents of this legislation assume that all parents if they were aware would object to the service being extended and I don't accept that. I have talked to some parents whose children have received the service, they wouldn't all object. Some of them, in fact, would favor it. I think that is their right to do so. Some are, frankly indifferent, and I presume that to be their right but some do object and, ladies and gentlemen, they have the right to know.

The opponents say that the activities which require this service are going to go on anyway and hopefully they will, they always have, and the answer is, so we must provide as a society for that. Let me pose this to you — we are told on some good authority that 30 some percentage of the minor children in this state are using drugs illicitly. I don't know, I will accept that, and if they are, would you support in every town, a place where they could go at public expense and get drugs because "they are going to get it anyway?" It is illogical, indecent and I wouldn't support it and I would ask that no one else do so.

Ladies and gentlemen, the question here, it seems to me, is both singular and simple, does this state or any state in pursuit of a general public good, have the right to obliterate an absolute private right? And that is to violate the relationship between a parent or a guardian of a minor child? I think they do not. The primacy of the state in matters like this is regrettable and is one further step toward primacy of this or any state in a great many other regrettable areas.

I would ask you to defeat the acceptance of the majority report and at the appropriate time to accept the minority report and I would ask for a roll call.

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

Mr. GOODWIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have dreaded this bill ever since it was sent to our committee. This is a very emotional bill and I am going to ask the members of

the House here to try to look at it very reasonable and rational.

I have a lot of statistics and a lot of facts that were presented to us by a variety of people in regards to this bill. As you can see, the majority of the committee, 10 members of the committee, went against this bill. I don't think any member of that committee is interested in breaking up the family relationships, I don't think any member of the committee seriously feels that they, by this report, are going to break up the family relationship.

There have been some problems, I guess, with the Family Planning Services in regards to services to minors, but in most instances throughout the state there have not been.

I would like to give you just a few facts here so you can make your decision. 73 percent of the married women, 18 and under, who delivered a live birth in 1972 were pregnant before their marriage, 1,074 women. In 1972, there were 528 births out of wedlock to women in Maine 18 and younger, or 26 percent of all live births. Also, in 1972, there were 440 abortions performed out of state on women 17 and younger. These are figures from the Department of Health and Welfare. This adds up to 2,000 premarital pregnancies in 1972 among Maine teens 18 and younger. 2,000 pregnancies before this law went into effect. The estimates in the Health and Welfare Department are that 10,000 teenage women in the state are sexually active. Of the 262 minors using the Family Planning Program in 1974, 34 had already had one pregnancy, 207 had been sexually active for the past six months prior to them coming to the Family Planning without any method of birth control at all.

The health aspects of minors, 30 percent of the reported cases of syphilis and 23 percent of the reported case of gonorrhea occur in those 18 and younger in the State of Maine. This indicates a high rate of sexual activity and also points out that there is high rate of VD in those 18 or younger and if you don't have family planning clinics for them to go to, this is not going to be detected until it is too late and causes serious damage to those persons infected.

The cost to a minor going to a private doctor for VD treatment is anywhere from \$25 to \$75 in this state, family planning is free. When the pregnant minor gets an abortion it is anywhere from \$200 on up. If the minor has a child and receives AFDC, it is a \$128 for one child, \$48 for the next, and you know the story about the AFDC problems we have in the state. Maine also has one of the highest VD rates in the nation and unless we can begin to detect it, we will not decrease this rate.

I would like to read to you a letter from a physician, I am not going to state his name or where he is from because I don't think it is necessary. I get many of these letters from physicians and family planning practitioners throughout the state and also from many parents who are concerned with this because they know that their son or daughter would not go to family planning if they had to be notified and they felt they had a pretty good relationship.

"As a physician practicing in X-County for the past 4½ years, I noticed a significant decrease in the number of illegitimate pregnancies among minors. I feel this is due to the availability of medical services in the area of family planning. It has been very gratifying for me to have sexually active females come to my office for help prior to pregnancy.

Why are we against this bill? Because if this bill goes into effect, I think you can be pretty well assured that 90 or 95 percent of those teenagers that would seek family planning services will not, because they do not want their parents notified.

I think there is another point in this bill that hasn't been brought up yet which I find ridiculous to say the least — Section B in this bill, the minor requesting the device or drug under this section shall be interviewed by a person with psychological training in counseling. What they want is that any minor that comes into family planning have an interview with a psychologist. What this implies to me is that the people who wanted this bill are implying that if you are under 18, sex is sick. I am sorry, but I can't go along with that and I would like to know who is going to be paying for that counseling. I think family planning outreach workers are qualified to refer minors to appropriate agencies if professional counseling is needed.

I am going to read to you a statement from a group of parents in the Millinocket area who sent this in to me who are concerned about this bill. "The present law does not take away the right of the parents to raise their children as they see fit, nor does it prevent them from teaching morals to their children, nor does it seek to break down communications. The original law rather makes a provision for minors to feel that they cannot discuss birth control with their parents to be able to obtain correct information and to take preventive action.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Gray.

Mr. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill does provide an easy way out, which is probably what many of the young people are seeking today, but a year ago, unknown to her parents, a 16-year-old girl was fitted with a device and yesterday she had an abortion. She thought she was safe. Can you imagine the shock to her mother? The state has no place in the intimate affairs of family life, as we know it, it is contrary to the foundation which this country was founded and built on. I don't think that state bureaucrats have any business meddling in the intimate family life and I support the amendment.

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

Mr. DeVANE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I did not and fortunately nobody did, produce a list of horrors on either side, the agony of unwanted pregnancy for an adolescent child and that is immensely sad and I am grateful that you didn't drag in a string of them. I am grateful to people who don't agree with Mr. Goodwin did not drag in a list of bewildered children who had found that they had been in a contrived situation with peer pressure or otherwise, but I will be darned if anybody should have to take responsibility for venereal disease or unwanted pregnancies simply because they feel a parent has a primal position with the child and not the state and that is precisely how a number of people who support the minority position on this bill feel.

I should like to address a final remark to a horrendous misnomer. For years and years in this country, ladies and gentlemen of the House, we had a federal department which was called the War Department. In 1949, it was discovered that it was darned hard to get an

appropriation for a war department, so we had a Defense Department and it was considerably easier. Now, the obvious and simple answer is a department of military affairs and then each citizen could decide in what posture his country was.

The matter under discussion here is not family planning. I have heard nobody object to the state assisting anybody in a reasonable expectation of having a family to assist them or to pay it. It is a misnomer. The question is, and I distributed an amendment which I shall not offer, I distributed it simply to focus attention on what the issue is. The issue is the furnishing of certain devices and materials to minor children without parental consent, and that is the only issue. The family planning, in this case, is nothing more than a misnomer and an intended one.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Old Orchard Beach, Mrs. Morin.

Mrs. MORIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would ask that you go along with Mrs. Laverty and accept the "Ought to Pass" Report. I am not against family planning but part of the family planning services is supposed to be counseling, but when one of the opponents was asked if the counseling includes the moral and physical repercussions of minors using some of these pills and so forth, she said that they did not moralize because minors would not go for the services. In some instances, there may be some family medical problem that could be aggravated with some of these medications. When asked if they would take the responsibility for any medical reactions, she said no, she didn't think so.

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

Mr. CURRAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am a signer of the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report and I concur with the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. DeVane to a point that perhaps the family planning is a misnomer and we should call a spade a spade. The issue here is whether or not contraceptives are going to be provided.

However, having sat through committee hearings for over seven hours on two bills, there was one bill here earlier in the session that was reported out as a Leave to Withdraw, and hearing the debate on both sides, the one thing that kept coming back to me during those hearings is the minor, the individual, who doesn't have the parental support at home, who doesn't have the guidance, who doesn't have the relationship. During the hearings, they would lead you to believe that if it ever got out to the teenagers of the state that they could get free contraceptives the family planning services would be flooded. I don't believe that at all. What I do believe and what I have seen is that there are many youngsters who arrive in their teens and are sexually active and really have no place to turn. I think if you check the family planning statistics, you will find that in terms of the girls, none of them who have come in have been virgins and I think this is what we have to take a look at that small minority who do not have parental supervision, the guidance, that don't have a place to turn. The vast majority of our young people are not beating down the doors of family planning.

Now, the Minority Report here, it is always nice to take the extreme. All of the young people going to family planning are not the 13 and 14 year olds, you have

younger people on the other end of the scale, 16 and 17 years old, and using Mr. DeVane's percentages there are many more of them perhaps using the service than there are the 13- and 14-year-olds. Nevertheless, there is a problem there. Nowhere in the hearing that I can remember did we receive testimony about the after effects or adverse reactions to those youngsters who had been treated or prescribed a contraceptive.

It is a very emotional issue. I don't have children and I realize that I stand in a different point of reference here looking at the problem; yet, I have worked for many years with these children and I have seen it over and over again. When I left teaching school in January and I went back for my first visit in February, I was greeted with the sad news that we had just lost another freshman girl because of pregnancy.

I feel for that small minority the service must be made available and I would hope that we are not questioning the trust of the total teenage population.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hope, Mr. Sprowl.

Mr. SPROWL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Very briefly, I also signed out the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report and perhaps I should liken this to the "mother's bill." I do have two daughters, one is 14 and one is 16 and I hope, I pray that if they have any problems they will talk with me but if they feel that they can't, I hope and pray that they will talk with some people like these family planning people.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Morton.

Mr. MORTON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I just want you all to know that there is one guy with gray hair, not much of that, a grandfather, who has raised three children, and I think this is a very bad bill and I hope you kill it.

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

Mr. PERKINS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would just phrase this in my own sense. This bill states that medicines, which I am not allowed to dispense without a prescription, can be given to your child or my child who is under age without my consent. These medicines, when I dispense them, have to have a warning on them with precautions that the Federal Food and Drug Administration has stated that they may be harmful in some cases; therefore, this bill, unless passed, this bill would correct the situation which says these medicinals can be given to your child or my child without our consent.

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

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

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

Mr. BUSTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is one bill that I would like either the House Chairman of Committee or yourself to explain the effect of either a yes or no vote. Isn't this a double negative situation?

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

that if the members of the House are in favor of the "Ought not to pass" Report, they would vote yes; if they are opposed to the "Ought not to pass" Report, they would vote no.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Saco, Mr. Hobbins.

Mr. HOBBS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pair my vote with the gentleman from Mapleton, Mr. Rideout. If he were voting, he would vote no on this motion and I would be voting yes.

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

Mr. BUSTIN: Mr. Speaker, relative to your answer to my question, I could get that far myself. I guess I would like to pose a question through the Chair to the House Chairperson to explain the effect of the vote. To allow minors to have these devices, which way should you vote on this bill?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Bustin, has posed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from South Berwick, Mr. Goodwin, who may answer if he so desires.

The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. GOODWIN: Mr. Speaker, you vote yes to kill the bill, to keep the law as it is; vote no if you wish to go along with Mrs. Lavery and a bill to require parental knowledge for a minor to get contraceptives.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Laffin.

Mr. LAFFIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pair my vote with Mr. Cote. If Mr. Cote were here he would be voting no and I would be voting yes.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mrs. Martin.

Mrs. MARTIN: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I am confused and I wish someone here would explain this.

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

Mr. TALBOT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I just have a couple of things to say, I should be getting back to work. I have heard speakers get up and talk about the law and how it affects them. I have heard them talk about the state and how it affects them and I haven't heard about any parents. So, I am going to give you my version of a parent.

I have four girls, the oldest one being 17 and the next one being 15 and I am not going to kid myself by standing here and telling you that they're not going to have anything to do with sex. But I also want to deal in a little reality. I don't want to deal with the law, I want to deal with reality insofar as the parents and children are concerned. In the 17 years that my children have been coming up, I have gone to the P.T.A. and I have gone to ball games and functions and singing groups and the thing that I find missing from these events are parents. They're not there, only a very, very small group is there tending to their children.

Now, if we are going to deal in reality, that's where we ought to be dealing and reality says that very few of our kids are going to come home to us and tell us all about their sex life, and I want my child, and this is an issue that you are going to be voting on from your own feelings, it is not going to be an issue that you're going to be voting on because of constituents or but because of how other neighbors feel, this is a bill that you're going to be voting on because of the way you feel, at least that is how I am going to vote and I also

understand that I might differ from the way my wife is, because there's a very fine line there where we deal with our children and how we feel. I, being a father, might have different feelings toward my children than my wife does because she is their mother. We have got to take that into consideration. I know that, I am still confused on the vote, but I know that if the law reads that they have to have parental consent, then there are very few minors who are going to come home looking for that consent.

I want my child to have the freedom. I know this is a very, very fine line and it's how you feel toward your children and believe me, I go home every night at two o'clock in the morning and tuck them all in because I love them very much, but I think there is a very fine line there that you have to deal with, and there is no way in the world that I am going to influence the way you feel toward your children and I am not going to try to do that.

But the thing we have to come to grips with is the fact that today more than ever before in the history of this country, young men and young women are leaving their homes for one reason or another; they're leaving, they're going away, that's reality. That is not fiction, that is reality and we have got to come to grips with that. Now if you want to leave it that way, then leave it that way, I don't. I want to have as much contact with my children as I can possibly have, and as one of the speakers said before, I hope and pray that my children, all of them, would come to me for discussion. But in reality, I know that is not always going to be the case.

I discussed this with the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Mulkern, we ride back and forth every night and we discuss this back and forth and back and forth and back and forth. This is a very, very private vote that you're going to be taking. The vote that I am going to be taking is very, very private. I am not going to say it is going to be right, it is going to be to the best of my ability and I hope it is right. Just give that some thought when you take the vote.

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

Mr. CURRAN: I would like to correct what has been stated, both by you, Mr. Speaker, and by the gentleman from Portland. In all fairness to Mrs. Lavery's bill it does not call for consent. It calls for knowledge. They do not have to consent and I did want to clear that up.

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

Mr. PERKINS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I know it is very late, I will try to be very brief, but to express the parent's position, I would just like to say that the bill as it stands does not require my knowledge or consent if my child decides to seek out advice and information, the distinction is contraceptives or birth control pills or other devices. If my daughter died as a result of obtaining some medication in the form of a contraceptive, I will tell you right now, there is no law around that would hold me back from hunting down the man or woman that gave it without my knowledge until she reached the age of 18, and that is how strongly I love my kids and how strongly I feel about this bill. I will vote no.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes

the gentlewoman from Bethel, Mrs. Saunders.

Mrs. SAUNDERS: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: We seem to be talking about girls and for every girl who gets pregnant, there is a boy and there is heartache on both sides. I think we need to think about that.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Berwick, Mr. Goodwin, that the House accept the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Albert, Bachrach, Bagley, Berry, P. P.; Bustin, Byers, Carroll, Chonko, Clark, Connolly, Cooney, Cox, Curran, P.; Davies, Drigotas, Dudley, Durgin, Fenlason, Flanagan, Fraser, Goodwin, H.; Goodwin, K.; Greenlaw, Hall, Henderson, Hennessey, Hewes, Hughes, Hutchings, Ingegneri, Jackson, Jensen, Joyce, Kany, Kennedy, LaPointe, LeBlanc, Leonard, Lewis, Lunt, Mackel, Martin, A.; Maxwell, McKernan, McMahon, Mills, Miskavage, Mitchell, Morton, Mulkern, Nadeau, Najarian, Norris, Peakes, Pelosi, Peterson, P.; Peterson, T.; Pierce, Post, Powell, Quinn, Raymond, Rolde, Rollins, Saunders, Silverman, Smith, Snow, Snowe, Spencer, Sprowl, Stubbs, Susi, Talbot, Tarr, Tierney, Torrey, Wagner, Wilfong.

NAY — Ault, Bennett, Berry, G. W.; Berube, Birt, Blodgett, Boudreau, Bowie, Burns, Call, Carey, Carpenter, Carter, Churchill, Connors, Curran, R.; Curtis, Dam, DeVane, Farley, Farnham, Finemore, Gould, Gray, Immonen, Kelleher, Kelley, Lavery, Littlefield, Lizotte, Lynch, MacEachern, MacLeod, Mahany, Martin, R.; Morin, Perkins, S.; Perkins, T.; Shute, Strout, Teague, Theriault, Tozier, Truman, Twitchell, Usher, Walker, Webber, Winship.

ABSENT — Doak, Dow, Dyer, Faucher, Garsoe, Gauthier, Higgins, Hinds, Hunter, Jacques, Jalbert, Kauffman, Lewin, Lovell, McBrearty, Palmer, Tyndale.

PAIRED — Cote, Hobbins, Laffin, Rideout.

Yes, 79; No, 49; Paired, 4; Absent, 17.
The SPEAKER: Seventy-nine having voted in the affirmative and forty-nine in the negative, with four paired and seventeen being absent, the motion does prevail.

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

Mr. GOODWIN: Mr. Speaker, I now move we reconsider our action and hope you all vote against me.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from South Berwick, Mr. Goodwin, now moves the House reconsider its action whereby it accepted the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report. All in favor will say yes; those opposed will say no.

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

Sent up for concurrence.

The following papers were taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

An Act Extending the Time Limit During which School Budgets May be Adopted by Certain School Administrative Units (H. P. 1623) (L. D. 1899)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 125 voted in