

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

and November. The report before us does divide it. The summary that we handed out this morning indicates which parts will go out in June and which parts will go out in November. Other reports, again, send it all out in November.

The other major difference for us is that the other reports are somewhat smaller, not significant in this case. This is the bill with the three that has the most agreement as far as the total at the bottom.

Finally, we had referred to the cost of this morning. We talked just briefly about how much money we spend every year to support this debt. Currently it is about \$170 million in the biennium. It is about \$85 million a year. We did not include this morning the government facilities authority debt. That adds about \$13 million a year or \$26 million for the biennium. We are roughly at a total debt service cost for tax afforded debt at \$200 million for biennium or \$100 million per year. I ask you just to think in terms of that of what else could we do with that money? That is what this is all about. If we didn't have this debt or we reduce the debt, there are other things that could be improved. This money could be spent elsewhere or our citizens would have a lesser burden for supporting state government.

Mr. Speaker, this has a cost. We can quantify it. We have told you about it. You need to know that before you vote on this. Thank you.

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

ROLL CALL NO. 623

YEA - Ash, Berry RL, Blanchette, Bliss, Bouffard, Brannigan, Brooks, Bryant, Bull, Bunker, Canavan, Chick, Chizmar, Clark, Colwell, Cote, Cowger, Cummings, Desmond, Dorr, Dudley, Dugay, Dunlap, Duplessie, Etnier, Fisher, Gagne, Gerzofsky, Green, Hall, Hatch, Hawes, Jacobs, Jones, LaVerdiere, Laverriere-Boucher, Lemoine, Lessard, Lundeen, Mailhot, Marley, Marrache, Matthews, McDonough, McGlocklin, McGowan, McLaughlin, Michaud, Mitchell, Norbert, Norton, O'Brien LL, O'Neil, Paradis, Patrick, Perry, Pineau, Povich, Quint, Richard, Richardson, Rines, Savage, Simpson, Skoglund, Stanley, Sullivan, Tarazewich, Tessier, Thomas, Tracy, Tuttle, Twomey, Usher, Volenik, Watson, Wheeler GJ, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Andrews, Annis, Belanger, Berry DP, Bowles, Bruno, Buck, Bumps, Carr, Chase, Clough, Collins, Crabtree, Cressey, Daigle, Davis, Duprey, Foster, Glynn, Gooley, Haskell, Heidrich, Honey, Hutton, Jodrey, Kasprzak, Labrecque, Ledwin, Lovett, MacDougall, Madore, Mayo, McKenney, McNeil, Mendros, Michael, Morrison, Murphy E, Murphy T, Muse C, Muse K, Nass, Nutting, O'Brien JA, Peavey, Perkins, Pinkham, Rosen, Schneider, Sherman, Shields, Snowe-Mello, Stedman, Tobin D, Tobin J, Trahan, Treadwell, Waterhouse, Weston, Wheeler EM, Winsor.

ABSENT - Bagley, Baker, Duncan, Estes, Fuller, Goodwin, Kane, Koffman, Landry, McKee, Smith, Young.

Yes, 78; No, 61; Absent, 12; Excused, 0.

78 having voted in the affirmative and 61 voted in the negative, with 12 being absent, and accordingly Report "A" **Ought to Pass as Amended was ACCEPTED.**

The Bill was **READ ONCE. Committee Amendment "A" (S-564) was READ** by the Clerk and **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-564) in NON-CONCURRENCE** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH.**

The Chair laid before the House the following item which was **TABLED** earlier in today's session:

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)
(S. "B" S-560 to C. "A" H-1035)

Which was **TABLED** by Representative COLWELL of Gardiner pending **FINAL PASSAGE.**

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

Representative **MURPHY:** Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. The first thing I need to do is reassure members of the House that there was no conspiracy. I received a note saying that there has to be a plan connected with this because I know if you have lunch, now that you are a senior you might be napping in the afternoon. There was another member who sent me a note that this casino proposal which started out in Kittery and this morning was in Wells and by the afternoon it could be in Kennebunk and I would be able to sit on my lawn in my chair and watch the traffic go by.

We have before us an issue that provides for a study on casino gambling. It has within it three major issues, the economic benefits, the traffic and the social costs. As I said earlier, others have said, why don't you just roll over? Why don't you just let this thing happen? In your own county some people have. What is missing in this study is the intangibles. You cannot measure intangibles. They are the things that you experience every day where you live. York County is a pretty complex county. We have tourism, agriculture and manufacturing. If you get a catalog in the mail, it probably came from Spencer Press. If you have ridden in a jet, either military or commercial, that engine was made at Pratt and Whitney. If you have been to an arena or a stadium, those seats were made by Hussey Manufacturing. Those seats are even on their way to China. We have biomedical. We have high tech. We also have families that open up their homes to guests, B & Bs. We have small retail shops.

Last month, the leaders of the Indian Nations and Tribes spoke to this House and spoke to their love of the land. What I want to speak to today is the love of our land, the love of our county and how important that is to us. It is a place of great beauty. It is a place of harbors with an active fishing industry, beaches and wild places. One of the most beautiful places a short distance from the proposed casino is a place called Mt. Agamenticus. You can stand on the crest and look toward the ocean and see the blue of the water. You can walk 250 feet across and you can see the White Mountains. If you are there in the fall, you can see the hawks circling. It is an absolutely beautiful place.

York County is a county of small towns. Within those towns, small villages separated by hayfields, forests and other green spaces. We have great pressures in York County. You have heard about some of those in the previous debate. Most of our towns have increased their population in the last decade 25 to 45 percent. Thousands of our kids go to school every day in trailers. We have high property taxes, high housing costs and because of that, many of our people work in Boston, New Hampshire and Portland to be able to live in those communities. We have those

challenges. We have those problems and we are working to solve them. Tourism, which this has been pitched at, is very important to us. You learn during those seasons, as many of you that live in tourism areas, you drive the back roads and you have to go to the grocery store at 8:00 a.m. in the morning. You can't go out to dinner on weekends. You can't go north or south in York County on a Saturday or a Sunday from May to October. There are economic benefits. There are jobs for our young people. Thousands of our young people have been able to go to college because of those summer jobs. Because of those tourists, barns throughout York County host summer theatre, something that wouldn't be available. Some of those tourist snow birds come back and they support our civic organizations and our churches. Some of those tourists fall in love with that county as much as we do and they come back for good. Our home is our county and it is probably very much like your home and your county. You love it like we do ours.

For 14 years in this Legislature, I have listened to representatives from all regions of this state. I have heard about your problems and your fears. I didn't need a study to understand that you needed help, especially when it meant being able to stay in your home and have a quality of life. In the previous Legislature when a proposal for high-stakes bingo was brought forward from Albany Township, I didn't need a study. I didn't need to talk to the Department of Transportation. I listened to the citizens from that area. I listened to the Representatives and Senators and they told me that that proposal would alter their way of life forever. I didn't need a study. I listened and I voted in support of people in that area.

This is a little side issue. You have to understand my background. I am a history teacher. I will always be a history teacher even though I am retired. My specialty was frontier and western history. If you have an interest in frontier history, you understand how important Deadwood, South Dakota, is. You have to understand how important the things that happened there were, the history that was made. We went back to South Dakota to go to a wedding and the high point of that trip for me was to be able to go to Deadwood. I did some reading and I saw that they had gambling there. It was one of the most economically depressed areas in South Dakota. They were losing their young people. They were desperate and they went to casino gambling. A percentage of it was going to be dedicated to architectural preservation. I am an architectural preservationist. I write about it. I study it and I build houses along that line.

We did a 7 a.m. windshield tour of Deadwood, South Dakota. It was absolutely beautiful, the facades, the exteriors. It was everything that I hoped it would be. We went to park the car for the day and it was \$12. That should have told me something. Because it was still so early in the morning, we went to a historic hotel with the star on it saying that it is a must-see. If you see only one thing in Deadwood, South Dakota, you need to go to that two or three story atrium lobby and see that 100-year-old atrium. We walked in at 8:00 in the morning. You couldn't see the atrium because there was Las Vegas inside that lobby. At 8:00 a.m. in the morning there must have been 250 people playing the games and that was their slack hour. That was an eye opener and we walked around town. We looked inside the barbershop. There were two chairs, 12 slots. We went into a hole in the wall breakfast place, you would call it in most of your towns, a counter, six tables and 40 slot machines. We looked into an auto parts store and there was the counter where you pick up your auto part and to the left were the slots. By about 10 or 11 o'clock we realized there was a beautiful façade and they had preserved Deadwood, but the most important thing about that town was the people and their way of life and it was gone. By 10

o'clock the buses started rolling in. Within 5 or 10 minutes there were ladies with 30 or 40 ounce cups with their quarters running from building to building. That was the reality of what casino gambling will do. Most of these casinos on the exterior have beautiful facades, a lot of glitz, but when you get inside and you see where they are located, the people and their way of life have been dramatically altered.

You had passed out here the other day a copy of the *York Weekly*. That was a real nice photo of Foxwood, wasn't it? A real nice sophisticated couple sitting there. Our newspaper in York County wanted to be able to go to Foxwood and take a picture of the people who are gambling. They told the newspaper no, we don't allow those photos to be shot. We will give you a nice glossy of what is happening at Foxwood. I have a feeling an awful lot of those photographs would show the same kind of ladies with their 48-ounce cup running down the street looking for another machine to drop their quarters in.

Many of us are asking you from York County, we do not want that county to become a place where you go to lose your paycheck. We don't want it to become a county where with your ATM card on a weekend, you can wipe out your life savings in your checking and savings account. What I need to ask you, I think there was a hint of it in the *Sunday Telegram* that Mainers who lived elsewhere in the state were asked, would you like to have casino gambling? They said yes. The reporter said, how about here in your town? No, I don't want it in my town. They had made the comment, why not stick it down in York County because that area is ruined already. They are expendable. Let me tell you that as a person from York County, it isn't ruined. It isn't expendable. It is our home. This proposal, while it may bring us glitz, it may bring us a fancy façade, what it is going to do to our towns, our people, our way of life will be unbelievable.

I would ask you on this vote, even though this study says no specific place, I would think about home. Would you put that casino and all the problems connected with it, would you put that in your home, your town or your village and expect the quality of life or what makes your home so unique to continue or would you move out within a year or two? That is what it is all about. Mr. Speaker, when the vote is taken, I ask for a roll call.

Representative MURPHY of Kennebunk **REQUESTED** a roll call on **FINAL PASSAGE**.

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

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

Representative **TUTTLE**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I love York County. I am a York County native. I was born and brought up there. I plan to spend the rest of my life there. I care very much for York County, my home town and I do understand the concerns of the good Representative from Kennebunk. I think that as a York County native there are differing opinions. I passed out an article from the *Portland Press Herald* in my area and it says if Kittery says no to the casino, then Sanford and others say maybe. In that article it explains that the Town of Sanford and business leaders favor the idea and they want to hear more. In Biddeford, the mayor believes the casino deserves consideration. In Old Orchard Beach at least one town official favors the idea. In Bangor, the mayor believes a casino has merit and should be looked at. Lewiston/Auburn, the economic development director says that a casino is something that should be viewed for the state. Scarborough Downs in Scarborough says it is open to the idea initially.

As I said yesterday in my discussion, having been chairman of the Committee on Legal and Veterans Affairs that deals with these issues year after year, I have always said that regulation

works and prohibition does not. We have a long history of applying that principle. I think that it can work for the State of Maine. As I mentioned before, I think that historically we do review important issues of this nature. I do understand the concerns of my good friend, Representative Murphy. As a fellow member of the York County Delegation, his concerns are well met and well intended, but I think that if this study is conducted correctly as has been the amendment added to it in the other body and with the input of this Legislature, that these questions can be answered and if it can be done in the right way, this is something that we should do. Let's study it. Let's find out. Our minds have not been made up, but by having a study, I think a lot of the questions that have been asked will be answered and I hope that you would support the pending motion.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Biddeford, Representative Laverriere-Boucher.

Representative **LAVERRIERE-BOUCHER**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I live in York County. In fact, I am a native. I have been living in Biddeford for 45 years. A study is a study. I am not afraid of a study. This study I understand will be looking at various Maine locations. I want a study to decide next year if it is in the best interest of everyone concerned. In the resolve it says that there will be three public hearings held in different regions of the state on the subject of a Maine-based casino. Again, a study is a way to gather information. Why are people afraid of gathering information? We are not voting on a casino today, only a study. Thank you.

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

Representative **CARR**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. First of all, I would ask that you vote for the position of the person who speaks least, not the longest. I also would like to remind you that this bill has been debated several times now. The same issues have been discussed. I think what we have done is turn this into a debate of whether or not we should have a casino, not whether or not we should have a study. Each time that we voted on this previously, there have been several roll call votes on this, it has been approved overwhelmingly. I would just ask that you stick to your previous vote and let's move on. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Frenchville, Representative Paradis.

Representative **PARADIS**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. The good Representative from Kennebec might very well be right about the incompatibility of casino gambling in his district. A study might very well reflect that. However, a comprehensive study like the one proposed in LD 2200 could also very clearly conclude that a casino would be a natural for the north country, Van Buren or Limestone, where there is no sprawl, no traffic congestion and plenty of room to build as big a casino as my good friends the Penobscot or the Passamaquoddy want to build. We need LD 2200 to give us direction northward. Thank you.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Poland, Representative Snowe-Mello.

Representative **SNOWE-MELLO**: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I cannot support this study in any way, shape or how. I think what we are doing here is we are taking the cart before the horse. We haven't even decided whether we want gambling in this state. To set a study up to see where we want to put a casino is absolutely ridiculous. We haven't made a decision whether we even want to have a casino or not. I think a study at this time is inappropriate. If you wish to have a casino next year, then put in a bill proposing that. All that information

and all that data will come to you quickly and you will have it all before your little fingers. You will be able to make that decision. I think this is absolutely absurd. I haven't said anything before because I have been holding tight and seeing how people are going. I have to say something. I lived in New Jersey when we built a casino, Atlantic City. New Jersey has hated the day that they put that casino up. They made all kinds of promises to Atlantic City, saying that they are going to help the economic base and they were going to turn Atlantic City into a beautiful city. They turned a charming, quaint, old fashioned town into a city that I am very ashamed of.

In other areas of the country they have done the exact same sort of thing and it has proved to be disastrous. I do not want to support a study that will put our foot into it. I do not want a study that would put a foot into the door. I love Maine. Maine is such a beautiful state. I want Maine to be able to remain a pure and beautiful state. People from all over the world and all over the United States come to our state because of the way it is. If we turn it into a gambling state, we are going to lose those people. Thank you.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Scarborough, Representative Clough.

Representative **CLOUGH**: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. One of the things that you learn usually quite early in life is not to believe everything you read in the papers. They don't always tell all of the story. It was mentioned by the good Representative from Sanford, Representative Tuttle, that it was in the paper this morning that the management at Scarborough Downs would be willing to talk about a casino in Scarborough. What they didn't say was that last night the people of Scarborough, through the Scarborough Town Council, voted to ban video gambling in Scarborough, at Scarborough Downs and at other areas of Scarborough. I think it is important that we know how the people think on this issue. I would urge you to go on and defeat this motion for passage.

The SPEAKER PRO TEM: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Final Passage. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 624

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

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

ABSENT - Annis, Bagley, Baker, Duncan, Estes, Koffman, Landry, McKee, Smith, Young, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, 94; No, 46; Absent, 11; Excused, 0.

94 having voted in the affirmative and 46 voted in the negative, with 11 being absent, and accordingly the Resolve was **FINALLY PASSED**, signed by the Speaker Pro Tem and sent to the Senate.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

BILLS RECALLED FROM ENGROSSING DEPARTMENT

(Pursuant to Joint Order – House Paper 1732)

Bill "An Act to Create the Maine Rural Development Authority"
(H.P. 1724) (L.D. 2212)

- In House, **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY SENATE AMENDMENT "A" (S-559)**.

On motion of Representative RICHARDSON of Brunswick, the rules were **SUSPENDED** for the purpose of **RECONSIDERATION**.

On further motion of the same Representative, the House **RECONSIDERED** its action whereby the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED**.

The same Representative **PRESENTED House Amendment "B" (H-1086)** which was **READ** by the Clerk.

The **SPEAKER PRO TEM**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Bridgton, Representative Waterhouse.

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

The **SPEAKER PRO TEM**: The Representative may pose his question.

Representative **WATERHOUSE**: Thank you Mr. Speaker, to anybody who could answer, the amendment that this went on, it was my understanding of the reading of it that if a municipality is lacking some kind of private investment in something, which means the private investor doesn't think it is a good idea, that we are going to go ahead and give funding for that.

The other question is on the Senate Amendment it says that expenses are subject to other funding. Could somebody explain to me what they mean by other funding?

The **SPEAKER PRO TEM**: The Representative from Bridgton, Representative Waterhouse has posed a question through the Chair to anyone who may care to respond. The Chair recognizes the Representative from Brunswick, Representative Richardson.

Representative **RICHARDSON**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. In order to answer that question about the private enterprise and whether or not private concerns will come in and essentially bail out a town, we can think of a number of instances in the State of Maine where a single largest employer leaves town. The private investment certainly isn't there because the infrastructure no longer exists. Perhaps the tax base now has been reduced by about 50 percent. In those very rare circumstances, this is something the good Representative from Kennebunk and the good Representative from Scarborough insisted upon when we put this bill together, in rare circumstances we would have the opportunity to go in when private investment, because of a chronically ill, if you will, town or municipality, we would have the opportunity to go in and take some course of action when private investment would not step in. That was to keep the social fabric, if you will, of a community together. That was the reason for that.

The second question you have was with respect to expenses. That was the Senate Amendment. What that did was that was a technical amendment, which OPLA had asked us to place on the

bill. The reason for that is because there were some very small costs, which the Department of Economic and Community Development was going to incur, start-up costs for this authority to get started. You needed that enabling language to allow the Department of Economic and Community Development to get this program started if, in fact, we were to pass this on final enactment.

I hope that answers your questions.

House Amendment "B" (H-1086) was **ADOPTED**.

The Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by House Amendment "B" (H-1086) and Senate Amendment "A" (S-559) in NON-CONCURRENCE** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

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

ENACTORS

Acts

An Act to Update the Department of Defense, Veterans and Emergency Management Laws

(H.P. 1288) (L.D. 1752)

(C. "A" H-837; H. "C" H-946; S. "B" S-557)

An Act to Implement the Recommendations of the Committee to Review the Child Protective System

(H.P. 1644) (L.D. 2149)

(C. "A" H-1078)

Reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed, **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**, signed by the Speaker Pro Tem and sent to the Senate.

An Act to Amend the Motor Vehicle Laws

(H.P. 1406) (L.D. 1844)

(S. "A" S-524 to C. "A" H-941)

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

On motion of Representative KASPRZAK of Newport, was **SET ASIDE**.

The same Representative **REQUESTED** a roll call on **PASSAGE TO BE ENACTED**.

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

The **SPEAKER PRO TEM**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Newport, Representative Kasprzak.

Representative **KASPRZAK**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. You will recall that we heard the merits of this very wonderful bill last night from the Representative from Brewer. I would just remind you that there is a fee increase in here for truckers. If you believe that a fee is a type of tax, then I would encourage you to vote against this. Thank you.

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

Representative **BOUFFARD**: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I want to remind you that this has nothing to do with the truck weights. This simply has to do with the fee of oversized vehicles that are usually escorted. People that are bringing in modular homes. These are oversized. That is the permit fee that is being increased. It is still going to be \$10 on the low scale, the lowest fee in the United States of America. Just a faint reminder of that. It has nothing to do with the weights or anything, just the size of the vehicles.