

# 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**  
**House of Representatives**  
**One Hundred and Twentieth Legislature**  
**State of Maine**

**Volume III**

**Second Regular Session**

March 7, 2002 – April 25, 2002

**First Special Session**

November 13, 2002 - November 14, 2002

Pages 1771-2574

**Appendix**  
**House Legislative Sentiments**  
**Index**

On motion of Representative SAVAGE of Buxton, the House voted to **ADHERE**.

---

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEE  
Ought to Pass as Amended**

Report of the Committee on **HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES** on Bill "An Act to Reduce Medical Errors and Improve Patient Health"

(S.P. 419) (L.D. 1363)

Reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-527)**.

Came from the Senate with the Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-527) AS AMENDED BY SENATE AMENDMENT "A" (S-532)** thereto.

Report was **READ** and **ACCEPTED**. The Bill **READ ONCE**. **COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-527)** **READ** by the Clerk. **SENATE AMENDMENT "A" (S-532)** **TO COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-527)** **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED**. **COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-527) AS AMENDED BY SENATE AMENDMENT "A" (S-532)** thereto **ADOPTED**.

Under suspension of the rules, the Bill was given its **SECOND READING WITHOUT REFERENCE** to the Committee on Bills in the **Second Reading**.

Under further suspension of the rules, the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-527) as Amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-532)** thereto in concurrence.

---

**SENATE PAPERS  
Non-Concurrent Matter**

Bill "An Act to Eliminate Department of Professional and Financial Regulation, Bureau of Insurance Travel Restrictions for Obtaining Health Care"

(H.P. 1462) (L.D. 1959)

Bill and accompanying papers **INDEFINITELY POSTPONED** in the House on March 26, 2002.

Came from the Senate with the Majority (7) **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report of the Committee on **BANKING AND INSURANCE** **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-965)** in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

On motion of Representative O'NEIL of Saco, the House voted to **ADHERE**.

---

**Non-Concurrent Matter**

**JOINT RESOLUTION - RELATIVE TO MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO CHANGE THE SCHEDULED DESIGNATION OF MARIJUANA TO ALLOW FOR LIMITED MEDICAL USE**

(H.P. 1725)

**READ** and **ADOPTED** in the House on April 2, 2002.

Came from the Senate **READ** and **FAILING** of **ADOPTION** in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

Representative KANE of Saco moved that the House **ADHERE**.

On motion of Representative KASPRZAK of Newport, the House voted to **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

---

Majority Report of the Committee on **BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT** and the Committee on **LEGAL**

**AND VETERANS AFFAIRS** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-1035)** on Resolve, to Study the Impact of a Maine-based Casino on the Economy, Transportation Infrastructure, State Revenues and the Job Market

(H.P. 1700) (L.D. 2200)

Signed:

Senators:

BROMLEY of Cumberland  
SHOREY of Washington  
YOUNGBLOOD of Penobscot

Representatives:

THOMAS of Orono  
RICHARDSON of Brunswick  
BRYANT of Dixfield  
DORR of Camden  
MICHAUD of Fort Kent  
MORRISON of Baileyville  
DUPREY of Hampden  
LABRECQUE of Gorham  
CHIZMAR of Lisbon  
COTE of Lewiston  
PATRICK of Rumford  
DUNCAN of Presque Isle  
ESTES of Kittery  
TUTTLE of Sanford  
O'BRIEN of Lewiston  
HEIDRICH of Oxford  
HATCH of Skowhegan

Minority Report of the same Committees reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on same Resolve.

Signed:

Senators:

WOODCOCK of Franklin  
DOUGLASS of Androscoggin

Representatives:

MAYO of Bath  
MURPHY of Kennebunk  
CLOUGH of Scarborough

**READ**.

Representative RICHARDSON of Brunswick moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from York, Representative Andrews.

Representative **ANDREWS**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I am going to ask you to oppose this Majority Ought to Pass Report and go on to the Minority Ought Not to Pass Report. I would like to tell you why.

From the beginning the casino issue has appeared to have a life of its own. To the residents of York County it has appeared as if there have been many dealings going on that they were not privy to. This item here only adds to their concern. I will tell you why. It has to do with process. When this item was originally proposed, I was going to testify neither for nor against because I, like many others, felt that the bill had merit. We needed to research the issue. When I took this down to the constituents in York County, they had concerns with how the bill was written. The people had no input in this public hearing. I do realize that a week ago last Friday that it was announced in this body at the end of the day that there would be a public hearing on it. I was not present for that, but neither was I absent for the day as was given out for the newspapers.

Having said that, I was concerned about notifying the individuals, the public, who had concerns as to how this study bill

was written and wish to have their concerns addressed. When I came in Monday morning I immediately went to my desk to look for the listing of public hearings and work sessions for that day. There were none. I learned about this at approximately 10:30 in the morning when the bill came across the desk.

I called individuals who wished to testify on this bill, but, of course, they could not get up here for the public hearing. I have done some research since then and I do know that it was not announced in the other body. There was no notice to that effect in the other body on Friday. Having said this, I went to the public hearing. Let me tell you who was at the public hearing, the individual who submitted the bill, as he should have been, representatives of the Native Americans, special interests and the lobbyists. There was not one member of the public there to speak on this bill. I have attempted to bring forward some of their concerns regarding this study bill, but I am not sure if I was able to bring those all forward on such short notice.

It is the feeling of the residents of York County that this is just another example of trying to put something over on them. They are not left with a very pleasant taste in their mouth. This is a very divisive issue, a very contentious issue. It will be impacted in the polls in November, I can guarantee you. Anything that is so divisive and contentious as this should have public input in the process.

York County is very concerned about this issue. There have been many things put forward that a casino would do. It is going to bring up 4,000 jobs. York County doesn't need any jobs. We can't fill the jobs that we have, whether you put it in Kittery or now as the paper is suggesting, Wells, it will deplete the job market for our existing tourism industry. It will be good paying jobs, \$25,000. In York County that is not adequate to live. We are the tenth highest place in the United States in which to live. The other tenth spot is in California. There are many other issues that the residents of York County are concerned about. My concern regarding this bill as it is now, the people that are going to be most affected, the residents of York County, have not had a say or anyone else who have had areas of concern regarding casinos. That is why I am now asking you to vote against the Majority Report. Thank you.

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

Representative **RICHARDSON**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I first want to stand to apologize to the good Representative from York, Representative Andrews. She was at the public hearing and we attempted to do our best as a committee to incorporate her concerns. I think we did so to some extent. I will say two things about the concerns which she has raised here.

Remember, this is just a study. The public input will occur over the next couple of months as this study gets underway because it is written into as a result of Representative Andrews request that we will, in fact, have public hearings around the state in order to take the concerns of the public into account. This study, however, is necessary, in my opinion, because it is going to provide the Legislature with the closest thing we can get to an objective analysis about how this casino concept will impact our economy, impact our social services, impact our transportation network, impact crime and things of that nature. I think looking at this information, gaining as much information as possible about the effect of the various considerations we put in the study is a good thing.

Two concerns arose at the hearing. One was that the opponents claim that the study should be done by the backers of the casino. I don't think that is a very good idea from a public policy standpoint. I think that the state should be funding this

casino study because we want objective and independent information to the greatest degree possible. We tried very much to balance the needs in this study. We put four public members on this study, two for and two against. We added law enforcement officers to this study and also someone from the neighborhood association about the impact that this will have.

Finally, it has been suggested that voter's views have already been made regarding gambling. They made it clear in the 2000 referendum when they rejected a proposal to allow slot machines at Scarborough Downs. I think that argument is flawed and here is why. I remember that the referendum was carefully worded to permit slot machines at only one racetrack while claiming, in fact, that this was going to help the harness racing industry. That couldn't be more apart from the truth. As a result, I don't think we got a very good idea from that referendum, as limited as the concept was, slot machines rather than casinos affecting only one race track as oppose to affecting the entire racing industry.

Finally, here is why I think it is so important to do this. This was a request, government to government. I think that should mean something to us. When the Tribal Nations come to this Legislature and ask for assistance and all they are asking for is a study, I think that we should be in a position to help them as much as possible. From a government-to-government standpoint, I think we are doing the right thing. We have been asked by the Tribal Nations to look at this and I think we are meeting our obligations. I would ask you to support the study. Thank you.

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

Representative **MUSE**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I will be very brief. We have heard that this is very divisive. It probably is. For that very reason, I believe we need to do this study. The impact that gambling and casinos have on Las Vegas and the impact that gambling and casinos have in Atlantic City and the impact that gambling and the casinos have at Foxwoods are different in every region. Clearly the impact that a casino would have in the State of Maine is very different. For that reason, we need to study this. We need to study the impact that it will have on everything from traffic to trafficking. As a member of the only chartered group of Gamblers Anonymous in the State of Maine and as a member of the board of directors for that organization, I highly support this study. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

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

Representative **MURPHY**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. Last month, I think, when most of us were more optimistic about being able to finish up our work and leave, we started something that for a week or two looked much like a two minute drill in a football game as you get to the end when we were hustled about the need to do a casino in this session before we went home. We were told that we needed to do it. We needed to do it right away because New Hampshire was going to beat us to it. It turned out the lobbyists who were making that pitch didn't bother to tell us that that had been turned down in New Hampshire already and that every gubernatorial candidate in New Hampshire has taken a written pledge that if by chance a casino was passed in New Hampshire, they would veto it. For that we have got to rush before New Hampshire beats us, they have looked at it and decided that they really don't want any part of casino gambling.

It has been interesting to watch the effect of waving some money, supposedly \$100 million and how people respond. I would bet that between now and next January whatever your pet project is or whatever your focused interest is, you will probably see promises made for the monies to go there. We will probably

see a situation where never so much has been promised to so many by so few.

We are told that we need to study this. We are told that we are going to look at an economic activity that is going to separate the overwhelming majority of the people that come through the doors, we are going to separate them from their money. That is being pitched as entertainment. We are going to separate them from their money, but we are going to call it entertainment. If I could draw an analogy, that would be like Jesse James and his brother Frank and their activity of robbing banks and trains, calling that an afternoon tea party. We have been told this is economic development. If you studied casino gambling and riverboat gambling all throughout the Midwest, they pick out the area of the state that is beyond redemption. It doesn't even qualify as being economically deprived. I won't use the phrase that I used in our caucus. It is beyond hope and then you throw the Hail Mary and hope that casino gambling will allow them to survive. When you go to those areas and you look at the impact and you walk two blocks away from the riverboat or from the casino nothing changes. I guess we need to study to see what level of increased bankruptcy is acceptable to us. We need to study to see what increased rate of embezzlement is acceptable to us. We need to study to see what percentage of increased addiction is acceptable to us. We need to look to see, in terms of this offset, the money versus the social cost, what the increased crime rate will be. We call this economic development, but when you look at the proposal where they are looking for it to go, as you have heard earlier, the most expensive housing in Maine with the greatest shortage, unemployment that is almost nonexistent. I read in the paper the other day that Old Orchard Beach has contracted with 100 eastern European college students to come in and work this summer, because there is no one to work in that resort community. It is that way in Kittery and York and all the way through in terms of the unemployment rate. As I have reminded you constantly, whether it is the turnpike or Route 1, for a good part of the year, our traffic is at gridlock. We are talking about another 30,000, 40,000 or 50,000 cars a day. This is a bad bill and it is being put into the worst possible location.

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

Representative SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. When I first heard about the casino, I was less than pleased. However, this bill is a study and for all the reasons that have been given, what is the impact on crime rate? I have also asked. I would like to see what pay level. We have been talking about a living wage. Are we going to be paying a living wage? It is a Maine-based casino. I would hope that we might find out that southern Maine is not the place for a Maine-based casino. I think the study needs to happen or we are going to be back here next year, again, without the information. Part of our job as legislators is to gather information, to have a source on which to base our decisions. Without this study, we do not have this information. I hear, he says, she says or who can put up the best lobbyists. Let's do the study. Let's be prepared and hear what is happening and in the 121<sup>st</sup> session come back, take a serious look, find out what we have learned and maybe we will decide that southern Maine is not the place. We are not willing to turn in Maine, the way life should be for this. We don't know until we have this study. It is the only time we will have real, honest information. I am not opposed to honest truths and can make our decision from there. Please support this study for a Maine-based casino. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from the Penobscot Nation, Representative Loring.

Representative LORING: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. The Penobscot Nation is in favor of this study. On March 11, the Chiefs of the Penobscot Nation and Passamaquoddy Tribe addressed a joint session of this Legislature for the first time in Maine history. They spoke of the historic relationship between the state and the Tribal Governments. They spoke of our sacred relationship with the land and our obligation to Earth Mother. They spoke of our struggle for survival. They spoke of our present economic struggles. They spoke to this Legislature and the people of Maine as representatives of sovereign Tribal Governments.

The Penobscot Nation and the Passamaquoddy Tribe have put forth a proposal from our Tribal Governments to the government of the State of Maine. This is a government-to-government proposal. This legislative body is a policy making body. I would ask that you give the Tribal Governments proposal due diligence and respect. I would ask that you consider this study carefully. Thousands of jobs have been lost in the past year and perhaps many more will be lost in the coming weeks and months. There is a projected infrastructure gap of \$500 million. The tribes are suffering economically as well. The economic opportunity they have proposed has the potential of bringing thousands of jobs to Maine and millions of dollars to the state coffers. As policy makers you have an obligation to thoroughly study this proposal. There has been much media attention paid to the possible negative effects of a casino. There is worry about crime, increased traffic, sprawl and loss of control. A study would answer these concerns and throw some light on these issues.

The Penobscot Nation and Passamaquoddy Tribe proposed a casino as a viable and sustainable economic venture. It is working well for other tribes and states across the country. The State of Maine cannot afford to reject this proposal out of hand. I ask you to give the Tribal Governments the respect they deserve and vote for the Majority Report. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Augusta, Representative O'Brien.

Representative O'BRIEN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There are few issues that I am closed minded about. This is one of them. Casinos in Maine is certainly an issue that I don't really have an open mind about. However, for that reason, I support the Majority Ought to Pass Report on this study. I know full well that in the future, this issue will come before us again. I am convinced that because of the composition of the study committee, the issues that they are going to be studying and the impartiality and objectivity with which they are intending to proceed, will give us findings that will be very valuable in the future. I intend to use those findings to argue against a casino in the future. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from York, Representative Andrews.

Representative ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I am not against the study. As I originally stated, I was going to speak neither for nor against because I felt there were some issues that needed to be addressed in the study. What I am attempting to do here is to represent my constituents who feel that they were not given due process in this procedure.

We had another bill a week or so ago, another rather contentious bill, and the word was certainly gotten out on that issue. It was very well attended. That is my concern. My constituents, everyone else was represented here, but the public, my constituents, were not represented. I do not know if all their areas of concern are addressed in this study. That is my concern. Thank you.

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

Representative **TUTTLE**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I would hope that you would support the Majority Report. I have said on the floor many times that I believe that regulation works and prohibition does not. I think in this area, from reviewing, I would refer you to (H-1035), which is what the report does. As far as representation, there will be two members from the Senate, five members from the House, two members from the public in support of Maine-based casinos, two members from the public opposed to Maine-based casinos, a representative from the Maine State Police, a designee from the Attorney General's Office, a member from the independent neighborhoods, a member from the Chief of Police Association, a representative from the Chamber of Commerce, a representative from the Maine Tourism Association, a representative from the Office of Substance Abuse and there will also be a member of the Maine Harness Racing Commission. I think there has been enough input and study where the issues and the concerns can be addressed.

I am from York County. I do have my concerns, but from talking to many of my constituents from my area, they think that the study commission is a good idea because we don't know what we are going to get from the study. I think with the number of individuals that we have on this study commission, I think those answers can be reached.

As most of us know, the review of various types of issues that will affect the people of Maine and study commissions are instruments that the Legislature use every year. A casino, in my opinion, is a very important issue. It needs to be studied in a non-partisan manner. I am sure it will be done that way. I think that this review will allow the people of Maine to have the true facts and figures on any potential endeavor. I think that these facts will prevail from the study committee or task force.

We did have testimony at the public hearing from the Maine State Police. The Chief of the Maine State Police testified neither for nor against the bill. They said that the Maine State Police would be glad to assist the study committee task force in any way. As you see in the amendment, they are included. They said that a representative of the Maine Chief of Police Association should be added to the task force, which it is. It said, a casino, located in any city or town with an organized police department. I think that impacts that department and the Maine Chiefs would bring valuable information to the study. I think that input is there. I think that if we don't do this, we are putting our heads in the sand and not really addressing the issue. I am asking that we would support the study. Mr. Speaker, I would request a roll call.

Representative **TUTTLE** of Sanford **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended Report**.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Lebanon, Representative Chick.

Representative **CHICK**: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This subject this afternoon is something that contains the same things in my district, as a legislator, that many other items have over the time that I have been here. When I am questioned about some item that is of great controversy, I try to explain, if I have the information, as best I can without taking sides and privately out here, I would discuss this with anyone. I believe that the only way to have the electorate knowledgeable, and I am sure with all respect to you people here in the House,

that this afternoon if we had a little questionnaire here that there are some items that would go unmarked because you don't have the information. Only as a result of this study committee will we have this information. I don't know how many here this afternoon have had inquiries by people in your district that wish to have their name put in nomination for this group that the Representative from Sanford just mentioned. I have. I have taken time to go and have the names placed with the people that will be gathering information about those interested to serve on this commission. I would highly recommend that this study take place and that the State of Maine, as a whole, that I am interested in, will benefit from it. I would ask that you would support the pending motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Lincoln, Representative Carr.

Representative **CARR**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I do want to touch upon a couple of things. I am not going to ask for your vote for this, because I know we all come from different areas of the state. Some people come from areas that are not interested in having a study and there are other areas that are interested. That is going to be entirely up to you on how you vote on this issue. Because of some of the previous testimony, I think it is necessary for me to stand and straighten out a few things that have been implied.

Number one, I did not discuss with any of the Tribal members about this study before I put this in. That has been implied in different areas. I put this in for one purpose and one purpose only. That was to generate information that could be used in future legislation, if it comes forward. The idea was to study the impact of traffic, the labor force to see if there was labor that would be sufficient if it came forth, study crime to see how that would be affected upon the state and also the social affects. We heard one side of the story and I thought it necessary to hear both sides of the story. For that reason and for that reason only, that is why I put this study in. I don't think that anyone here or anyplace else has heard me say that I am in favor of a casino in the State of Maine. I am in favor of studying the effects if we did have a casino. I believe that is exactly what this study would do. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

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

Representative **MICHAEL**: Mr. Speaker, May I pose a question through the Chair?

The SPEAKER: The Representative may pose his question.

Representative **MICHAEL**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. Could someone please clarify the relationship between the Indian Tribes and this study? I had heard that the Tribe had requested the study, but there is nothing in the language that I can see that would prevent the study from being a statewide study on gambling and not necessarily owned by Indians. Could someone please clarify that?

The SPEAKER: The Representative from Auburn, Representative Michael has posed a question through the Chair to anyone who may care to respond. The Chair recognizes the Representative from the Passamaquoddy Tribe, Representative Soctomah.

Representative **SOCTOMAH**: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This bill is about a fact-finding study, which has a lot of various issues attached with it. There is a lot of misinformation and damaging accusations being circulated by the opponents of this proposal. The vote today isn't about supporting or not supporting a casino. It is about presenting to the next Legislature accurate information, to make wise decisions on and coming up with remedies in areas of those concerns. Maine is

entitled to the true facts from this task force. I ask you to support the Majority Report on this bill. Thank you.

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

Representative MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. To respond to the question that was asked, because I think the question needs to be answered, it is my understanding from the hearing and the work session that it does not make reference to a Native American casino. It could be a state owned or state run or private enterprise. I think, if I remember correctly, it makes no reference to York County, Kittery or York, but could be anywhere in the state.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Orono, Representative Thomas.

Representative THOMAS: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. Just to add onto what the Representative from Kennebunk, Representative Murphy just said, I think we actually added on, also, included in the study, to find where the most feasible sight, if any, was for the casino. I think that that is also an important issue to be addressed.

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

Representative TUTTLE: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. The good Representative from Auburn did bring up a good question. I would assume having been a member of this institution as many years as he has, I would pretty much be assured that the input as we have heard from the tribes will be heard at the study committee once it is evaluated. That is why I think that these questions are good questions. That is why as the process goes on the more input we get, hopefully, all of this can be included in that ramification and I would thank the good Representative for his question.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is acceptance of the Majority Ought to Pass as Amended Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 596**

YEA - Annis, Ash, Belanger, Blanchette, Bliss, Bouffard, Bowles, Brooks, Bruno, Bryant, Bull, Bumps, Bunker, Canavan, Carr, Chick, Chizmar, Clark, Collins, Colwell, Cote, Cowger, Cummings, Desmond, Dorr, Dugay, Duncan, Dunlap, Duplessie, Duprey, Estes, Fisher, Fuller, Goodwin, Green, Haskell, Hatch, Hawes, Heidrich, Honey, Hutton, Jacobs, Jodrey, Jones, Kane, Labrecque, LaVerdiere, Ledwin, Lessard, Lovett, Lundeen, Mailhot, Marley, Marrache, Matthews, McDonough, McGlocklin, McGowan, McKee, McLaughlin, Michaud, Mitchell, Morrison, Muse C, Muse K, Norbert, Norton, Nutting, O'Brien JA, O'Brien LL, O'Neil, Paradis, Patrick, Perry, Pineau, Povich, Quint, Richard, Richardson, Rines, Rosen, Savage, Schneider, Shields, Simpson, Smith, Stanley, Sullivan, Tarazewich, Tessier, Thomas, Tracy, Treadwell, Tuttle, Twomey, Usher, Volenik, Watson, Weston, Young, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Andrews, Berry DP, Berry RL, Buck, Chase, Clough, Crabtree, Cressy, Daigle, Davis, Dudley, Etnier, Foster, Gagne, Glynn, Gooley, Hall, Kasprzak, Koffman, Lemoine, MacDougall, Madore, Mayo, McKenney, McNeil, Mendros, Michael, Murphy T, Nass, Peavey, Perkins, Pinkham, Sherman, Skoglund, Snowe-Mello, Stedman, Tobin D, Trahan, Waterhouse, Wheeler EM, Wheeler GJ, Winsor.

ABSENT - Bagley, Baker, Brannigan, Gerzofsky, Landry, Laverriere-Boucher, Murphy E, Tobin J.

Yes, 101; No, 42; Absent, 8; Excused, 0.

101 having voted in the affirmative and 42 voted in the negative, with 8 being absent, and accordingly the Majority Ought to Pass as Amended Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Resolve was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (H-1035)** was **READ** by the Clerk.

Representative CARR of Lincoln **PRESENTED House Amendment "B" (H-1059) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-1035)**, which was **READ** by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Lincoln, Representative Carr.

Representative CARR: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. This would add one member to the committee. It would be a member of the Maine Civil Liberties. That would just add that one position.

Representative RICHARDSON of Brunswick moved that **House Amendment "B" (H-1059) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-1035)** be **INDEFINITELY POSTPONED**.

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

Representative RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I appreciate the thought that the good Representative from Lincoln, Representative Carr, had. We had considered all of the various people that should sit on this particular casino study bill. We have two people currently that can be for this piece of legislation and two that are against the legislation. I would encourage Representative Carr or any other Representative for that matter who has someone that might want to sit on this committee to go ahead and apply for those positions. I think it is inappropriate, whether it is a casino study or some other study that the State Legislature does, to impose, essentially, religion into what we do here. How are we to choose whether it is the Maine Christian Civic League or any other organization? I think it is dangerous that we would go down this road. For that reason, respectfully, because I do respect that organization, I am moving to Indefinitely Postpone. I think the religious and social or moral aspects can be dealt with as someone coming before the casino study group and making their views known. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Lincoln, Representative Carr.

Representative CARR: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I need to correct my previous statement. It should be the Maine Christian Civic League. It was a senior moment.

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

Representative MICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It doesn't matter, they are both religions anyway.

The Chair ordered a division on the motion to **INDEFINITELY POSTPONE House Amendment "B" (H-1059) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-1035)**.

A vote of the House was taken. 81 voted in favor of the same and 38 against, and accordingly **House Amendment "B" (H-1059) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-1035)** was **INDEFINITELY POSTPONED**.

Representative MENDROS of Lewiston **PRESENTED House Amendment "A" (H-1056) to Committee Amendment "A" (H-1035)**, which was **READ** by the Clerk.

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

Representative MENDROS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This amendment simply adds a new paragraph and the things that are going to be specifically looked at in the study. How a casino will be impacted by the potential for the referendum question that is most likely going to be on the ballot in 2003. There is a petition drive out now to allow video gambling at harness racing and how it is going to affect harness racing and video gambling. Both of these groups are telling us