

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 Ninth
Legislature***

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

Volume II

First Regular Session

May 7, 1979 to June 15, 1979

INDEX

First Confirmation Session

August 3, 1979

INDEX

First Special Session

October 4-5, 1979

INDEX

Second Special Session

October 10-11, 1979

INDEX

Second Confirmation Session

December 7, 1979

INDEX

Brunswick, Mrs. Bachrach.

Mrs. BACHRACH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like you to consider this one case while you are considering this issue.

Imagine to yourself a young girl who is pregnant, whose family has invited her out of the house because they don't like this or they don't approve of anything she does and this is the final straw, she has a job but she is not in good health and she is not able to hold the job, and finally, there she is, she has no source of income. How is she, then, to give birth to this child with no place to go and no source of income? I feel that if we are to say that she is not to have an abortion, and that has been said repeatedly in this House, if she is not to be driven to desperation and somehow acquire an abortion, then I think we owe to her that we will supply her with enough funds so she can carry this baby to term.

I hope you will consider this bill in that light.

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

Mr. PEARSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The committee that I serve on considered this particular measure and reported it out unanimous "Ought Not to Pass." We did it for a couple of reasons, one of which was that there are a number of programs around the state which would cover this sort of situation.

Mr. Norris has said that there are people who fall between the cracks, and I expect that that is probably true, it is probably true in almost any program that we have. If it is true and I think it is, then wouldn't it be better, instead of recalling this piece of legislation from the files, to instruct the Department of Human Services to tell us how these people fall between the cracks? If the programs aren't universally applied statewide, how can they be applied statewide so everybody has access to them so the situation that the Representative from Brunswick, Mrs. Bachrach, described, which I think probably that girl would be able to find this type of help if she knew how, they ought to be able to tell us how they go about getting it, and in the areas where it is not readily available, how to make it readily available through various programs that are already in existence.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The argument that the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee just used was the same kind of "Charlie Cragin" type of argument that was used by the Commissioner of Human Services when they testified in opposition to this bill.

The position that the Department of Human Services took when they testified on this particular legislation was that they neither supported it nor were against it—but and but and but and but and they raised the very argument that you raised, that there were a variety of programs that were available across the state and they cited some of the examples in the same way that the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Tarbell, cited examples of programs which offer, in Mr. Tarbell's case, \$20 a month in cash coupons to those women who are qualified—\$20 a month. You are right, Mr. Tarbell, it isn't very much.

The position that the Department of Human Services took, the new commissioner took personally, and he said this before the committee, was that he would like to see developed across the state, and, indeed, he was going to make it one of the goals of his administration, that there be developed a whole coordinated system providing prenatal care to pregnant women who choose to carry their babies to term. But in the absence, and this was a private discussion that I had with him and some of his staff people, of that coordinated system, a program such as this would indeed be appropriate

if the Appropriations Committee and the legislature saw fit to provide the funds for that program. It was the estimate of Commissioner Petit that it would probably take him a year to a year and a half to develop that coordinated system and that was the money available, there would be no problem at all with instituting this program until such a coordinated delivery system was set up. In the absence of a coordinated delivery system, it seems to me entirely appropriate that legislation such as this be enacted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Boudreau.

Mr. BOUDREAU: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I view this as an expansion of the AFDC program, the program now that is so underfunded that it is almost ridiculous.

I am not going to stand up here and argue that prenatal care isn't important, but the fact of the matter is, we have an L. D. with an eight to ten million dollar price tag on it right now to help the kids that we already have living on AFDC and we can't find the money to do that. If you want to expand the program to include unborn children, that is fine, but I don't know where we are going to find the money. We have L. D. 734 on the table now and I don't know where we are going to get \$8 million to \$10 million to fund it based on some of the conversations I have had. That is why I voted in the committee not to pass the bill.

I am not going to try to argue with Mr. Connolly, because he probably knows more about prenatal care than I do, but the fact of the matter is, we are extending a program that we can't fund now and I just don't see how we are going to fund it or how we are going to pass this bill even if we recall it from the files.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Connolly, that L. D. 867 be recalled from the files. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Berube, Bachrach, Baker, Barry, Benoit, Berry, Brannigan, Brenerman, Brodeur, Brown, K. C.; Call, Carter F.; Cloutier, Connolly, Cox, Davies, Dellert, Diamond, Dow, Dutremble, D.; Dutremble, L.; Fowle, Gwadnosky, Hall, Hickey, Howe, Hughes, Hutchings, Kane, Kany, Leonard, Locke, Lund, Martin, A.; McHenry, McSweeney, Michael, Mitchell, Nelson, M., Norris, Paradis, Post, Prescott, Reeves, P.; Rolde, Simon, Spowl, Theriault, Tierney, Tuttle, Violette, Wood, Wyman, The Speaker.

NAY — Aloupis, Austin, Beaulieu, Birt, Blodgett, Bordeaux, Boudreau, Bowden, Brown, A.; Brown, K. L.; Bunker, Carrier, Carroll, Carter, D.; Chonko, Churchill, Canary, Cunningham, Curtis, Damren, Davies, Dexter, Doukas, Drinkwater, Dudley, Elias, Fenlason, Fillmore, Garsoe, Gavett, Gillis, Gould, Gray, Hanson, Higgins, Hobbins, Huber, Hunter, Immonen, Jackson, Joyce, Kelleher, Kiesman, Lancaster, LaPlante Leighton, Lizotte, Lougee, Lowe, MacBride, MacEachern, Marshall, Masterman, Masterton, Matthews, Maxwell, McKean, McPherson, Morton, Nadeau, Nelson, A.; Nelson, N.; Paul, Payne, Pearson, Peltier, Reeves J.; Roope, Sewall, Sherburne, Silsby, Small, Smith, Stetson, Stover, Studley, Tarbell, Torrey, Tozier, Twitchell, Vose, Wentworth, Whittemore.

ABSENT — Brown, D.; Gowen, Jacques, E.; Jacques, P.; Jalbert, Laffin, Lewis, Mahany, McMahon, Peterson, Soulas, Strout, Vincent.

Yes, 54; No, 84; Absent, 13.

The SPEAKER: Fifty-four having voted in the affirmative and eighty-four in the negative, with thirteen being absent, the Order fails of passage.

The Chair laid before the House the following matter:

"An Act to Require Parental Notification of a Minor's Abortion" (S. P. 220) (L. D. 604) (C. "A" S-181) which was tabled earlier in the day and later today assigned pending passage to be enacted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mrs. Berube.

Mrs. BERUBE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: First, I would like to thank the 75 people who voted to give me the courtesy this morning of suspending the rules and, as you are aware, we lacked a few votes. I would also like to thank the 78 to table it until this afternoon and I am very grateful to all of you.

It was the first time that I had ever, ever requested permission to suspend the rules in order to speak. I have never believed in stifling free speech but I guess I expected the same courtesy which has so often been extended to others.

Relative to the amendment, the argument yesterday seemed to concern a probable fiscal note, which has since disappeared, and today, I am told, it is a question of church opposition. Well, my personal religious beliefs and moral convictions would never have allowed me to support legislation which was detrimental to life of the unborn, and after personally discussing this with knowledgeable religious leaders of my church, including one theologian, and any hesitancy which I might have had in introducing this amendment has been satisfied.

Yesterday, I also made calls and an obstetrician told me that the first thing he tells the girl who goes to his office for help, tell your parents, and he says that inevitably the girl runs out the door. It is rare, he added, when there is physical abuse as a result of parental notification, but this amendment sought to address this rare instance of physical abuse on a girl, it did not dilute the bill. It is not rare, however, for parents to throw a girl out of the house; many are disowned, and the amendment leaves the bill intact for this form of emotional and mental abuse, if you will.

The amendment further strengthened the bill, as amended by Committee Amendment "A". I would add, because my amendment simply said "in the professional, medical judgment of a physician, if there were serious probability of physical abuse," that is all it said. It retained all else.

I suppose I was a little sickened last week when I stood out back and listened to the remarks of Representative Beaulieu, which were relative to physical abuse of a minor. Although, at the time I still voted against her to defeat that particular amendment, because it was, indeed, vague, I still felt that we should address ourselves to the one case in a hundred in that rare instance.

I have never labeled myself as a self-styled leader of my church nor a defender of all that is good, pro-life or sacred, but I have merely tried to live by the precepts of my church and my beliefs, finding no necessity whatsoever to flaunt them or use them as a means of achieving some creditability, which has alluded some people through the years. I was offering the amendment merely as an attempt to retain a rational and objective perspective, and that was the only reason.

Someone read into the record, I guess, I forget who it was, they read into the record yesterday that the nicest sound is that of a crying baby. I can attest to that.

Mr. Morton of Farmington requested a roll call on enactment.

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

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

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

Mr. GARSOE: Mr. Speaker, I move that the rules be suspended for the purpose of reconsideration.

Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston requested a roll call.

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

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

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Garsoe, that the rules be suspended for the purpose of reconsideration. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Aloupis, Bachrach, Baker, Beaulieu, Benoit, Berry, Berube, Birt, Blodgett, Bowden, Brannigan, Brennerman, Brodeur, Brown, K. L.; Carter, F.; Chonko, Churchill, Connolly, Cox, Curtis, Davies, Dellert, Doukas, Dow, Drinkwater, Dudley, Dutremble, D.; Elias, Fillmore, Garsoe, Gavett, Gillis, Gould, Gowen, Gwadosky, Hall, Higgins, Hobbins, Howe, Huber, Hughes, Hutchings, Immonen, Jackson, Kane, Kiesman, Leighton, Leonard, Lewis, Lizotte, Locke, Lougee, Lowe, Lund, MacBride, MacEachern, Marshall, Martin, A.; Masterton, Matthews, McKean, McPherson, Michael, Mitchell Morton, Nadeau, Nelson, A.; Nelson, M.; Norris, Payne, Peltier, Post, Reeves, J.; Reeves, P.; Rolde, Sewall, Sherburne, Small, Sprowl, Stetson, Stover, Tarbell, Tierney, Torrey, Tozier, Tuttle, Vose, Wentworth, Wood, Wyman.

NAY — Austin, Barry, Bordeaux, Brown, A.; Brown, K. C.; Bunker, Call, Carrier, Carroll, Carter, D.; Cloutier, Conary, Cunningham, Damren, Dexter, Diamond, Dutremble, L.; Fowlie, Gray, Hanson, Hickey, Hunter, Jacques, E.; Jalbert, Joyce, Kelleher, Lancaster, LaPlante, Masterman, Maxwell, McHenry, McSweeney, Nelson, N.; Paradis, Paul, Pearson, Prescott, Rollins, Roope, Silsby, Simon, Smith, Soulas, Studley, Theriault, Twitchell, Violette, Whitemore.

ABSENT — Boudreau, Brown, D.; Fenlason, Jacques, P.; Laffin, Mahany, McMahon, Peterson, Strout, Vincent.

Yes, 91; No, 48; Absent, 11.

The SPEAKER: Ninety-one having voted in the affirmative and forty-eight in the negative, with eleven being absent, the motion does not prevail.

The pending question now is passage to be enacted, a roll call having been ordered.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Beaulieu.

Mrs. BEAULIEU: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I move the indefinite postponement of this bill and all its accompanying papers and would request a roll call.

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

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Calais, Mr. Gillis.

Mr. GILLIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I urge you to vote against the indefinite postponement of this bill. I don't quite agree with the last amendment that was put on, I think it leaves a loophole for the backroom abortion clinics springing up, but this is a bill that is needed and needed badly.

I believe that a parent should have the right to know what is happening to their children, to

the children that has been entrusted to them by the good Lord or by the laws of the courts. A parent is charged to look after a child for their education, health and welfare and he is charged by law that any punishment that he inflicts shall not be severe and abusive or cruel treatment. The child must have parental consent to go on a field trip or a class trip and a child must have parental consent to have her ears pierced, and here she can go out and have an abortion without the parent knowing anything about it.

We are talking about a minor child, not an adult. We are all aware that anybody having an abortion runs the risk of post-abortion complications, and you know what that can run into, hemorrhaging, perforation of the uterus, sterility, embolism and even death. I don't think anyone will deny that abortion proceedings leading up to, during and after the abortion can be and in many instances are the most traumatic experience that a child will ever have in her life. It is because of this, the psychological and medical future of the child, that a parent should be notified prior to the abortion so they may be there to offer the consolation, assurance and love that only a parent can give.

I am not flag waving or anything else, I am sincere in my comments. The parent should be there also to be watchful of the need of post-operative care that she may need, and who can do this better than a parent? Yes, the doctors are there but to them it is just another operation, and while they are concerned with the condition of the child, they cannot offer the love that a parent can. The child is facing the cold facts of life in a cold, cruel world, and the cold interior of an operating room and a recovery room cannot and does not offer her the warmth and love of a family.

It is obvious that we have a problem in Maine regarding teenage pregnancies, we all recognize this. The agencies that have been handling teenage abortion problems have not accomplished the purpose for which they were established, because an abortion unknown to the parents does nothing to resolve the problems of the child, the underlying problems of a pregnant teenager. They have not been dealing with the total person.

A more comprehensive program that takes into consideration the problems, the underlying problems, of the pregnant teenager has been proven very successful elsewhere, because this approach deals with the total person. It has been proven that pregnant teenagers handled in this comprehensive manner do finish their education, they do form stable families, they do have healthy children and they do not get pregnant again. L. D. 604, in my estimation, brings about this compromise care by placing a pregnant adolescent back into the arms of her family who can supply the necessary care.

Several agencies in Maine who are dealing with pregnant teenagers have spoken out in support of this document, this bill. They realize the position of the family in these matters. They recognize the family as the most basic support system for the pregnant adolescent who, in time of crisis and stress, because of her pregnancy, needs them. However, the family will not be in a position to provide this support and care unless they are first notified of the child's pregnancy and planned abortion. Without parental notification, the minor child remains totally in a psychologically traumatic situation.

This bill, L. D. 604, involves only the pregnant minor who is unmarried, under the age of 18 and who lives at home with her parents. Wouldn't you want to know if your minor daughter was going to have an abortion? I think I would. Please think about it? Please vote against the indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Newcastle, Mrs. Sewall.

Mrs. SEWALL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I hope you will support the motion before you on this bill. I haven't spoken on the

amendments. I think the amendments that were offered, especially the one that was offered today, were kindly amendments and would have helped the bill.

I can just promise you that passage of this bill will be about as effective as asking to have parental consent before you become pregnant. Is this going to force the notification of parents or is it going to force the young girls to go out of state to an abortion clinic? Is it going to force them to go to some illegal person performing abortions or is it going to force them into a dilemma where they might do something drastic to themselves like suicide?

You cannot push your morals on somebody else. If a child of yours, at age 17, has decided that she is pregnant and she is not going to tell you, chances are she is not, she will go somewhere else. The jurisdiction only lasts that far.

The second thing and the last thing I want to say on this and hopefully on this issue for the session, the court has spoken to the notification and I would like to just read to you a paragraph from Wynn vs. Carey, which was the United States Court of Appeals, 7th Circuit. If anyone is interested I can give them the exact cite. I just want you to understand why the notification, in my opinion, and I know that there will be someone in my row who will disagree with me, will be struck down by the court eventually.

I will read the opinion: "We do not hold that parents can not be notified of their daughter's condition. To the contrary, because we believe that parents should be involved in their minor's decision whenever possible, they generally should be informed, nor do we hold that a minor should be free not to inform her parents merely because such a disclosure may cause family disharmony. The objectionable feature of this statute is, rather, that it requires that parents be informed in all cases, thereby precluding an independent assessment, whether by a court or by a physician, that it would not be in the minor's best interest for her parents to learn of that condition."

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Beaulieu.

Mrs. BEAULIEU: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have sat here with you for weeks listening to debate. I have voted for three abortion bills. I am not opposed to parental notification, but when you refuse to accept a fact that there are circumstances where it is and would be totally wrong to notify, and that this decision would be handed down by the professionals who would be working with this young lady, then I can not abide with it. You are hiding your heads in the sand. There is probably not one parent here whose child would not come to them. Why? Because of who we are, because we are people who care, but I guess you are not willing to look around your communities and see what is happening.

I heard the other day debate on complications of abortions and it was raised again today. What if the parents agreed with the daughter that she should have an abortion? What would be there to prevent that abortion could go on?

In about a week from now, ladies and gentlemen, I will probably be representing this legislature at a Conference on Family Violence and Child Abuse. I think that I will use this kind of example of why I am fighting so hard or why I fought so hard to try to get this bill amended and to get you to accept the fact that not every parent is like us that there are young women, young people out there who would be the recipients of abuse, physical abuse, which results in deformed and retarded babies and unhealthy babies. But oh no, you feel so strongly that you know it all, well I say to you, unfortunately, maybe you should go home and really learn about the communities you are serving. You might be surprised to find out what goes on in the homes in your own neighborhood and in your districts. I say to you, to allow the possi-

bility of just one young person being abused and having her own unborn child the recipient of something drastic because of that abuse, the fact that you will not accept that as something that happens out there is abysmal. That is why I have chosen to ask you to kill this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Stetson.

Mr. STETSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I just wanted to straighten out one minor point. In all due respect to the gentlelady from Newcastle, she mentioned the 17-year-old daughter. Please not that although the original bill calls for notification for a minor under the age of 18, that the committee amendment dropped that to a minor under the age of 17. So, we are not talking about 17 year olds, we are talking about 16 year olds and below.

We are also talking about unemancipated 16 year olds and below.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Owl's Head, Mrs. Post.

Mrs. POST: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I would like to pose a parliamentary question to the Chair. Is the only way that those of us who wish to put this amendment on can do so by a majority vote? Does that take place if it comes back in non-concurrence from the other body?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would answer in the negative. The rules can be suspended for the adoption of an amendment.

Mrs. POST: If we wish to put an amendment on by a majority vote, the way that can be done is only if it comes back in non-concurrence?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentlewoman that that is one possibility.

The gentlewoman may continue.

Mrs. POST: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I guess I rise today to speak on an abortion bill for the second time this session, and I do because I feel very strongly about the amendment. I agree with the comments that were made by the gentlelady previously. I think that many of us are unwilling to face the kinds of conditions that many of our children live in today.

Representative Gillis mentioned that our teenage girls, and they are at that point girls, if they have an abortion or have to deal with a pregnancy at the age of 15 or 16, need the assurance of their families and they need the love of their families. I think that is true. The problem is that many children are not able to get that assurance or love from their families. They do need the warmth and the love and they need to go back in the arms of their family, and that would be good if everyone were in that kind of situation. Unfortunately, that isn't what meets some of those children.

Whether you like it or not, rather than being welcomed with the open arms, they are sometimes welcomed back with fists and slaps and abuse. It is not very pleasant to think about that but those kinds of conditions do exist.

I personally have had experiences, when I worked as a nurse, with child abuse. In many of those instances, the abused children that I happened to deal with, because of a situation where I was working with in the hospital, they were with younger children. We saw children with hot water burns, we saw children with cigarette burns, we saw children that were bruised. Those same kinds of conditions continue to exist when the children get older. The parents who are not able to accept children, who are not able to give the children the warmth and support that they need and certainly would never be able to do so in cases of incest within the family. Those are not pleasant conditions, they exist, and the kinds of situations those young girls are going to be faced with is, they are not going to be able to go to the doctor knowing that the doctor is going to have to notify the parents and they are therefore going to be subject to abuse. They are then going to be faced with getting illegal abortions.

When teenagers go about that kind of thing, the results are extremely unpleasant.

As I see it now, the only way that this amendment can be adopted, or the amendment that had been proposed, it was not, as Mr. Gillis said, adopted, the only way that this amendment can be proposed at a future time is if we vote indefinite postponement of this bill. It will come back from the Senate and we will have another chance. But if you feel strongly about this amendment, I urge that you really think very carefully about it, not only in your situation and how your daughter might feel but think of other people in your neighborhood or in this state that this is going to effect. I would ask you to vote for indefinite postponement of this bill now, knowing that we will have another chance at the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from South Portland, Ms. Benoit.

Ms. BENOIT: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I will try to be brief. I really wanted to vote for this bill this time. As you know, I have voted against the other bills, but I really did want to vote for this bill with Representative Berube's amendment on the bill. I feel very strongly about that.

I also feel very strongly about the comments made by Representative Gillis. I have an 8-year-old daughter and I am sure many of you know her. She has run around here enough and bothered enough of you. Perhaps someday, I hope not, but perhaps someday this will happen to my daughter. I want my daughter to come to me and I want to know if she is pregnant and if she is considering having an abortion—I want to know that. I would even go so far as to say that I want to be notified of that, but what about those few children that will not be welcomed with open arms, that will not be welcomed or received with love and good advice and sit down and discuss the situation with their parents, what about those children who will be physically abused? Perhaps harm will even come to them as well as the unborn fetus.

With the bill the way it is now, you have not protected that child in any way. Keep in mind that this bill does not require parental consent. All it requires is parental notification. Now, what have you done for those few children who might be beaten, might be abused? You have done absolutely nothing but send them possibly to a home where they will be physically abused or perhaps you have driven them to the back alley where they can get an illegal abortion and perhaps they will die too. So, I would ask you to please vote to indefinitely postpone this bill.

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

Mr. SIMON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We debated this issue fully a week ago today. The same points were raised then, the same points are being raised now. The other body debated a similar amendment last week. The results in both bodies were the same.

The answer to the problems of physical abuse is not a simple one. It is one, however, that the state has sought to address by separate statutes. If a young girl, who is in an abusive family situation, believes that she needs an abortion, she can be protected under present statutes. The doctor is under an affirmative obligation, subject to criminal penalties, if he or she does not report the potential for abuse to the Department of Human Services.

We have enacted an informed consent bill that provides a 48-hour waiting period before the abortion can be performed, except in cases of medical necessity.

There are horror stories on both sides of this issue and I don't choose to recount any of them. The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Cloutier, began to recount the horror stories that can result from teenage abortions without the support of a family, whether it is as good as we think ours is or not, and chose not to continue to read the examples into the record because of

the gruesome details contained therein.

This bill is addressed to those abuses. We have other laws that are addressed to the fists and other forms of abuse that may greet a young girl who is in an abusive family situation. I would respectfully suggest to the members of the House that these two bodies of law together, L. D. 604 that we are considering today and the laws on child abuse that we have on the books now and are seeking to improve, address both problems at the same time.

I would further address myself to the comments of the gentlelady from Owl's Head, Mrs. Post, concerning the prospect of nonconcurrency. We have only nine legislative days to go and Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would suggest that if you would like to vote for this bill, with or without any conceivable amendments, that you vote against the motion to indefinitely postpone lest it die in nonconcurrency. Please vote no.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Augusta, Ms. Lund.

Ms. LUND: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: When I came into this legislature, I was asked whether I was running on a women's lib platform, how I felt about women's issues. When I ran for the legislature I did not consider myself primarily a woman, I felt like a person.

Let me tell you, during the last two weeks, I have felt more and more like an embattled minority. If you have listened to the debate, you have heard the women speaking about feelings and you have heard the men speaking about laws and relating cases and saying that they are doing it for the best of the poor girls. I am getting a very strong feeling of a double standard.

We had a bill this morning on dogs, if you remember, and I am paraphrasing a little bit, but somebody said if you have your female dog tied up, how can she get pregnant? Didn't it sound like that?

I don't think that we are always addressing the right issue here. Nobody mentioned parental notification on the part of the father. I think we ought to pass a law that the father of every unborn child should be notified and his family also. I think that might do more to solve our problems than pinning it on the poor girl.

We were told that we could not cost benefit argument earlier on. We could not say that we were going to save money by not carrying these children full term. Today, we refused to consider a cost benefit argument that would help to carry a child to full term. Again I see the men using a double standard.

I ask you seriously, women, but also particularly men, listen to the feelings of the mothers in this legislature who have carried children and who have daughters of their own. Listen to them carefully, because those are the people who are going to be suffering if we pass this law without the amendment.

I urge you to vote for the indefinite postponement.

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

Mrs. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am a woman too, and I don't feel I am in the minority. I am going to be on the men's safe side today.

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

Mr. BRANNIGAN: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: When this bill first began to come across the calendar in reference and so forth, I had some problems in trying to make up my mind in how I would feel about it. There were sponsors of this bill, both legislative sponsors and people promoting the bill who are not members of the legislature, who were interested in my comments and how I felt about it, but I was interested in theirs. So, one of the things that I asked them separately, two of them, two people I have known for many, many years and in many capacities, two people that I respect very much, I asked them independent-

ly— my discussion with them went as follows. Your argument went, you say you believe definitely in parental notification on many issues, that parental notification is now needed for many issues, things that happen with your children in schools, ear piercing, etc. Now you are pushing very hard for notification dealing with this very, very serious issue. Does it also follow—and I was trying to test not their sincerity but their logic, and I guess I am the man here in that case—do you believe that you want notification when a young girl receives birth control information and birth control devices? Both of them independently said no. It was that answer that helped me make up my mind and will help me to vote for indefinite postponement of this bill.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question is on the motion of the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Beaulieu, that this Bill and all its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Aloupis, Bachrach, Baker, Beaulieu, Benoit, Berry, Birt, Bowden, Brannigan, Brennerman, Brown, K.L.; Connolly, Cox, Davies, Davis, Dellert, Doukas, Dow, Fenlason, Garsoe, Gavett, Gowen, Hall, Hobbins, Huber, Hughes, Hutchings, Jackson, Kiesman, Leonard, Lewis, Lowe, Lund, Masterton, McPherson, Mitchell, Morton, Nelson, A.; Nelson, M.; Post, Reeves, J.; Reeves, P.; Rollins, Sewall, Small, Sprowl, Tierney, Tozier, Twitchell, Whittemore.

NAY — Austin, Barry, Berube, Blodgett, Bordeaux, Boudreau, Brodeur, Brown, A.; Brown, K.C.; Bunker, Call, Carrier, Carroll, Carter, D.; Carter, F.; Chonko, Churchill, Cloutier, Conary, Cunningham, Curtis, Damren, Dexter, Diamond, Drinkwater, Dudley, Dutremble, D.; Dutremble, L.; Elias, Fillmore, Fowlie, Gillis, Gould, Gray, Gwadosky, Hanson, Hickey, Higgins, Howe, Hunter, Immonen, Jacques, E.; Jalbert, Joyce, Kane, Kelleher, Lancaster, LaPlante, Leighton, Lizotte, Locke, Lougee, MacBride, MacEachern, Mahany, Marshall, Martin, A.; Masterman, Matthews, Maxwell, McHenry, McKean, McPherson, McSweeney, Michael, Nadeau, Nelson, N.; Norris, Paradis, Paul, Payne, Pearson, Peltier, Prescott, Rolde, Roope, Sherburne, Silsby, Simon, Smith, Soulas, Stover, Studley, Tarbell, Theriault, Torrey, Tuttle, Violette, Vose, Wentworth, Wood, Wyman, The Speaker.

ABSENT — Brown, D.; Jacques, P.; Kany, Laffin, McMahon, Peterson, Stetson, Strout, Vincent.

Yes, 49; No, 93; Absent, 9.

The SPEAKER: Forty-nine having voted in the affirmative and ninety-three in the negative, with nine being absent, the motion does not prevail.

The question now before the House is on passage to be enacted. A roll call has been ordered. All those in favor of this Bill being passed to be enacted will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Austin, Barry, Berube, Blodgett, Bordeaux, Boudreau, Brodeur, Brown, A.; Brown, K.C.; Bunker, Call, Carrier, Carroll, Carter, D.; Carter, F.; Chonko, Churchill, Cloutier, Conary, Cunningham, Curtis, Damren, Dexter, Diamond, Dudley, Dutremble, D.; Dutremble, L.; Elias, Fenlason, Fillmore, Fowlie, Gillis, Gould, Gray, Gwadosky, Hanson, Hickey, Higgins, Hobbins, Howe, Hunter, Immonen, Jacques, E.; Jalbert, Joyce, Kane, Kelleher, Lancaster, LaPlante, Leighton, Lizotte, Locke, Lougee, MacBride, MacEachern, Mahany, Marshall, Martin, A.; Masterman, Matthews, Maxwell, McHenry, McKean, McSweeney, Michael, Nadeau, Nelson, N.; Norris, Paradis, Paul, Payne, Pearson, Peltier, Prescott, Rolde, Roope, Sherburne, Silsby, Simon, Smith, Soulas, Stover, Studley, Tarbell, Theriault, Torrey,

Tuttle, Violette, Vose, Wentworth, Wood, Wyman, The Speaker.

NAY — Aloupis, Bachrach, Baker, Beaulieu, Benoit, Berry, Birt, Bowden, Brannigan, Brennerman, Brown, K.L.; Connolly, Cox, Davies, Davis, Dellert, Doukas, Dow, Drinkwater, Gavett, Gowen, Paul, Huber, Hughes, Hutchings, Jackson, Kiesman, Leonard, Lewis, Lowe, Lund, Masterton, McPherson, Mitchell, Morton, Nelson, A.; Nelson, M.; Post, Reeves, J.; Reeves, P.; Rollins, Sewall, Small, Sprowl, Tierney, Tozier, Twitchell, Whittemore.

ABSENT — Brown, D.; Garsoe, Jacques, P.; Kany, Laffin, McMahon, Peterson, Stetson, Strout, Vincent.

Yes, 93; No, 48; Absent, 10.

The SPEAKER: Ninety-three having voted in the affirmative and forty-eight in the negative, with ten being absent, the motion does prevail.

Signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

By unanimous consent, ordered sent forth with the Senate.

The Chair laid before the House the following matter:

An Act to Provide for the Issuance of a Warning for Operating an Unregistered Motor Vehicle within One Month of the Expiration of Registration (H. P. 858) (L. D. 1058) which was tabled earlier in the day pending passage to be enacted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. McKean.

Mr. McKEAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I move the rules be suspended for the purpose of reconsideration.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Limestone, Mr. McKean, moves that the rules be suspended for the purpose of reconsideration. Is there objection?

The Chair hears objection; the Chair will order a vote. All those in favor of the rules being suspended will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. This requires a two-thirds vote of all the members present and voting.

A vote of the House was taken.

79 having voted in the affirmative and 17 having voted in the negative, the rules were suspended.

On motion of Mr. McKean of Limestone, the House reconsidered its action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed.

On motion of the same gentleman, under suspension of the rules, the House reconsidered its action whereby Committee Amendment "A" was adopted.

The same gentleman offered House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" (H-556) was read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. McKean.

Mr. McKEAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: All this House Amendment does is clarify a conflict that we had when we enacted the original bill.

There are two sections that are involved in the registration, Section 102 and Section 106. We inadvertently left out Section 106. Actually, what we are doing is, we are giving the citizens of the state 30 days. What happens is this. If you are caught on the highway with an automobile within the 30-day period after the automobile is due to be registered, you have three business days to get your automobile registered. You will not get a ticket or citation. You will receive a warning, which means you have the three days. After that particular period of time, however, you fall under the purview of the law, which means after a 30-day period, you would be picked up and given a citation and go to court.

Also what it does, if your automobile is disabled or you don't use the car for a period in excess of 30 days and you can prove it, obvious-

ly, if you had the car on the highway after 33 days or 60 days or whatever, then you have automatically proved that you used the Vehicle, which means you would go to court, but in those cases where you do not use that particular vehicle, be it that the engine is bad on it, you have had to order parts and it has taken six months, or three months or four months to get the parts in, then all you have to do is prove to the Bureau, when you go down to reregister the car, that you did not use that vehicle and then they can give you a registration from the date that you go to reregister the automobile.

However, if you do get caught on the highway at any time, even the 30 day period or after, and you did use the automobile, then, of course, your registration goes back to the date that it was supposed to be registered. If you were caught in July and the car was to be registered in May or June, then the registration would be in effect from that period of time. This makes up for the loss of the excise taxes, which is presently being experienced by the towns.

I move for the adoption of the amendment.

Thereupon, House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" was adopted.

Committee Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto was adopted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lincoln, Mr. MacEachern.

Mr. MacEACHERN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: My interpretation of this bill is that it just gives everybody 13 months instead of 12 months on their registration. I wonder if it shouldn't have a fiscal note to determine how much it is going to cost.

Secondly, I just think it is a bad bill. It gives everybody an extra month on their registration. I think we all know that we should register our car every year in the same month. I have been registering mine now, ever since we adopted this system, in March. I know it comes in March and I know that everybody else feels the same way about theirs. I just think this is a bad bill.

I would move the indefinite postponement of this bill and all its accompanying papers.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lincoln, Mr. MacEachern, moves that this Bill and all its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Limerick, Mr. Carroll.

Mr. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In the past, I have mentioned to you that we had what we call a cash flow problem on the new stagger system of registration of automobiles. We do have some people that have four or five different vehicles, all expire at a different time. Due to this, they overlook their registration, not intentionally, but they actually overlook the time when these vehicles were to be registered. This legislation corrects this, it corrects it from the point of view that when they do go in, that vehicle goes back to be registered at the time that that vehicle's registration expired.

Now they can go to the town clerk and say, I want to register it from today forward, and they do register it from that day forward. Some of them have even gone three months over, not thirteen months but they have gone fifteen months on last year's registration, fifteen months on last year's excise tax, and a new automobile isn't \$10, it isn't \$15; some of your excise taxes are as much as \$140 or \$150.

This is a good piece of legislation. It plugs up the loopholes that we have in the law. And it has just a little bit of this on the other side of the totem pole where we are picking up the excise taxes that communities are losing and we are closing this gap in the tax laws. I think we have tried to address. We kept this bill in our committee a long time for the purpose of trying to be sure we were moving in the right direction. You saw this bill amended at the last minute before enactment, and I would urge you all not to vote for indefinite postponement but