

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 Fifth

Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1971

KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

Committee Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

**Finally Passed
Constitutional Amendment**

Resolution Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Reduce the Voting Age to Eighteen Years (H. P. 35) (L. D. 67)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Orono, Mr. Curtis.

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The resolution before us was debated extensively last week in this chamber. Final passage of this measure would be, I think, an example of the responsiveness of representative government. Young people do not need to feel alienated from their institutions and from the decision-making process. We have a chance now to enact landmark legislation and take a necessary step toward bringing into the electorate a segment of our population which has amply demonstrated its concern with public policies.

Passage of this measure, I think, would be a victory. Not a victory for those of us in both political parties and of all ages who have worked for the 18-year-old vote. But passage will be the best possible example of the confidence that we, as elected representatives, have in the abilities of our young people. Passage will be a victory for the youth of Maine and the future of our State.

Mr. Speaker, I move the enactment of L. D. number 67.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Ault.

Mr. AULT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I again speak in opposition to this resolution because I want to remind certain of you here today of the very seriousness of the actions you are going to take.

A crime is committed and, because of a technicality, the offender is allowed to go free — And the voice of Youth asks — What is truth?

Parents use pills to make them sleep, pills to pep them up, pills to prevent babies, and are horrified to find their youngsters experimenting with pills of their own. Parents are appalled for drunken driving or over-indulge at home and are appalled when their youngsters try marijuana. And the voice of Youth asks — What is truth?

Parents who for years have pampered their children, who have pushed them and tried to make them older than they are, who have neglected to instill a sense of responsibility, who have never said no, who were afraid to discipline them because it was easier not to, who aren't home evenings to answer questions of young people who want answers, ask now in astonishment: What's wrong with the young people of today who are rebelling and lack respect for their elders? And the voice of youth asks—What is truth?

The 18-year-old wants the vote because he believes he can do better and he expects to get it because he is used to getting what he asks for. The gentleman from Orono says we will alienate this group if we don't give them the vote. It should be obvious to everyone that respect is not gained by giving without earning.

These youngsters of today are probably the best informed and best educated group this State and Country has ever seen. Except for the usual minority, they are as morally straight and fine as we could hope them to be. They are compassionate, dedicated, idealistic citizens interested in correcting every wrong they see. A war is being fought that they don't comprehend and they say, we must end it today. Minority groups suffer injustices and these must end today. People suffer from hunger and want, and this must end today.

They might be justified in what they say, but they don't yet realize that there are many more sides to each problem than the obvious one. They have not yet acquired insight to see the problem as a whole and they have not yet come to realize that life, because many

different people are involved, is really Compromise.

Can each of you remember when you were 18? How easy it appeared to solve the world's problems of that time. But haven't you now come to realize that all is not black and white? Let these youngsters work for a living and they will realize one has to compromise in order to earn his way in this world. Let him pay taxes and he will realize that there is a limit to the money available to solve all the problems that he thought could be solved overnight. Let him marry and realize compromise.

Should these young, idealistic people, who have been under the wing of their parents or teachers for these 18 years, suddenly be allowed to say who should spend the taxpayers' money, how much of it should be spent and on what it should be spent? No — they have not yet experienced life nor have they started to pay their own way.

The two political parties have endorsed the 18-year-old vote. One has done so, because it believes the 18-year-old will vote its way. The other has done so because this may be so. And the voice of youth asks — What is truth?

I have contributed to my party. I have worked for its candidates. I am a Republican, but I assure you I am an American and State of Mainer first, who believes that good responsible government is more important than political expediency.

Contrary to what some say, the Supreme Court did not give the 18-year-old the right to vote in Federal Elections. It only determined if the Congress had the right to do so. Interestingly enough, the Court said Congress didn't have the right in State elections. I do not argue with the Court decision, but I do disagree with the irresponsibility of Congress.

Today you have an opportunity to gain respect without fear of alienation. You can make an independent decision based on fact and you can assume the responsibility with which you have been appointed. You can do something

to change the direction of the Permissive Society. You can do something to help erase what our Governor has called the peoples' distrust of their government. You can do so by voting a responsible nay on this resolution.

And then you and they will know. . . What is truth.

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

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I know that many of my legislative associates were surprised to see my vote against this amendment last week. I think we discussed it for an hour. I cannot vote for this amendment at this time.

I would not like to repeat my biography, but my biography has been associated with the youth of the State of Maine for 36 years, three at Stephens High School in Rumford, 33 at Deering High School in Portland. I have just recently retired from the field of education. 17 of those years were spent as the head football and basketball coach in those schools.

I think my legislative record has shown that I have great concern for the interests and desires of the young people. In 1963 I introduced a bill, a qualified bill on the 18-year-old voting proposition. I qualified it in this way: that those who had passed examinations in history, government, and economics could qualify for the vote at 18 instead of waiting until 21. At that time it was constitutional, because the Supreme Court had not eliminated literacy qualifications as something to be considered in voting.

And then I was influenced by Boys' State. Boys' State is our state legislature composed of representatives from our high schools, held at the University of Maine every year. And Boys' State had never themselves passed the 18-year-old vote. And today I see no clamor, great clamor among youth for the 18-year-old vote. They are disturbed by many things. They have been greatly disturbed by this war which they themselves, the 18, the 19, the 20, the 21-year

olds have sadly had to bear such a great burden in our national defense.

To go on, in 1969, the last session, I introduced the amendment with the encouragement of Representative William Dennett, the Chairman of the House State Government Committee — the amendment to give the 20-year olds the right to vote, and all rights of citizenship. We debated that during the session.

It was discovered that we ourselves, here in the legislature, could give the 20-year olds the right to vote. And we did — not the right to vote — all of their rights as citizens, full rights. In fact they had all their rights as citizens before they had the right to vote. So when it went out in amendment it would have been a very peculiar situation if the electorate hadn't supported the amendment for them to have the additional right to vote.

My whole thinking has been that rights entail responsibilities. And we did a wonderful job, it seems to me, in that State Legislature last year, because we became the fifth state to lower the voting age in our country, and the third state to give them full rights.

The 18-year-old vote now is the low of our land, and it seems to me that the platforms of parties have been fulfilled by the Supreme Court. I am not disturbed because the 18-year olds have the right to vote in national elections. It means that each one of them now will have the right to vote for five people that operate in our national government.

But I am disturbed by the opinions of some of the Justices of the Supreme Court in reaching the method by which the 18-year-old vote should be settled. I had to shovel some snow this weekend, but I tried to read 185 pages of the opinions of the Justices, the full opinions of the Justices concerning the 18-year-old vote. This was not released until December 21, 1970, just before Christmas. It is the only copy of it in Augusta. I am the second one to have taken it out.

I have asked quite a few lawyers —and I have seen them around the halls—if they have read it. And they haven't had a chance to read it yet, the one I have seen. I am disturbed about the opinions of four Justices whose interpretation of history and our Constitution is a great departure. To me this is going to be a great landmark as an opinion.

Basically it was four against four. Four said that the granting of the voting right to large groups of our citizens should take place by the constitutional amendment. Every granting of the voting franchise in large numbers has taken place that way. The 15th Amendment to the Negroes; the 17th Amendment permitted the people to vote and elect in senatorial elections. They took the election of the senators away from the legislatures. The 19th Amendment gave the right to women; the 23rd gave the right to a vote to people in Washington, D.C. in national elections.

The other four based their judgment on an interpretation of the Equal Rights Clause in the 14th Amendment. And Justice Black went from one side to the other. He said Congress can establish the voting franchise. And then he switched over to the other side and said the states can determine their own future in that respect.

It seems to me it was an increasing erosion of our states rights. And the implications of this decision have not been yet fully determined. If we give the right to vote to our 18-year olds, it seems to me by a further application of the opinions expressed in this close vote, can be extended to force us to give full rights of citizenship to the 18-year old.

Now I feel most inadequate to handle the great problems which are going to arise, it seems to me, as a result of these opinions. I think at this point, if we turn this amendment out, after we have considered it only for a month, and discussed it perhaps for an hour or an hour and a half, and turn it out to the people with our stamp of approval on it, it will come to them in this form. The Supreme

Court has given the right to vote to the 18-year olds; your Legislature has done the same thing. What are you going to do?

I think we are representatives, and I think we should be very deliberative in moving on this question. We come up here and we are supposed to know more about issues than they are. That is why we are a representative republic. The people choose us to do their business for them, and trust in us, and hope we will do it adequately.

Now there are many things I could say. I could hope that everyone would familiarize himself with the opinions reached, and the reasoning behind the opinions. I am not saying at this time that I shall not vote to send this amendment out to the people. But I cannot vote for this amendment this morning. And I would hope that it might be placed on the table unassigned, or if not that, I could hope that it could be indefinitely postponed, because we have another bill coming before us which will give the 18-year old the right to vote, and also full adult rights.

I have done all I can. I had to express my opinion. I am sorry if I have disappointed any of my legislative associates in the stand I am taking in this matter.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As an offtime sponsor of the 18-year-old bill, first I would like to say that certainly the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cottrell, has not disappointed me. I enjoyed his remarks very much. I know his extreme dedication to youth, and I know we all know him for the gentleman that he is.

I might make reference to the remarks as made by the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Ault, concerning married life and compromise. I can only give you a very recent indication of how I consider compromise in married life by just saying that as I left my house this morning I was informed quietly that my trip to

Orono tonight was canceled, and I was expected to be back in the confines of Elm Street in Lewiston immediately after the executive session of the Research Committee. The spirit of compromise with me is this. After 33 years of married life, I have agreed to the compromise, I am going home.

Inssofar as this measure here is concerned, I think it is a matter for us to reflect in our own minds what has happened, and this wouldn't affect the good gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Ault, it would affect me, and possibly others like me. What has happened since the time, for instance, 41 years ago, when I was 18 years old until now?

Can any of you remember back when you were 12, 13, 14, 16 or even 18 visiting the State House, talking to the President of the Senate, talking to the good Speaker of the House, having them greet you? Can you remember your television sets, or even your radio sets? I am one of those who will claim now that the youngster of today at the age of 18 is far superior than I was at the age of 18, because times have gone on.

I appreciate the remarks of the young man from Orono, Mr. Curtis. I would suggest that there were three other sponsors of the 18-year-old bill; namely, the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Bustin, Democrat; the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Smith, Democrat; and the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Lucas, Democrat. And I gave up or yielded my position, which has been long and loud in favor of this measure. And not with any thought of chiding, but with the thought of commending the majority party, I must remind them in that they are to be commended for their stand. Let's just remember the long history of pro 18-year-old voting by the Democratic party. And I certainly hope this measure is enacted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Lizotte.

Mr. LIZOTTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to express my views pertaining to the 18-year-old vote. There

is nothing personal, in fact I am very proud of our 18-year olds. I would be willing to say that they have more at 18 than most of us at 50, and that is education.

I am being very honest when I say this. It goes to prove what a great country we are living in. It also proves that we are a mature nation. We want better things for our young people. This is exactly why I am speaking.

I truthfully believe that as good as education is, it still needs one thing which to me is even more important, and that is experience, which is what everyone needs and must have. There is definitely no substitute for experience.

I believe that our teenagers are deserving of their teenage life, as we were to ours. Let us not impose premature responsibilities on our youth. In a recent survey that I personally made, it was pointed out that it was not the majority of the people who favored the lowering of the voting age to 18, but it was being politically motivated. We are not in a position for a teenage government. We have and must maintain a mature form of government. Thank you.

Mr. Bustin of Augusta requested a roll call vote.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I agree with most of what has been said this morning. I think youth is much more intelligent than it was a few years ago. I agree to that. And as a father that has raised children that have now exceeded that age, I feel as though I have some qualifications to say a few words in relation to this subject.

Now if I lived in any city that had a council form of government, I probably would have some different views. At least it would tend to change my views to some degree. However, I represent a group of towns where they are all represented by three selectmen, of which I served for many years, and helped to write a warrant.

And I might point out to you that each one of these towns, the

real estate taxpayer is being very hard pressed. As a matter of fact, in some cases to the limit. I would say actually to the limit of what he can stand.

Now I have found that with children this age, although they are intelligent, that they do seem to have a tendency to think that every ill can be cured with dollars and cents. And I am old enough at this age to know that it cannot be cured with dollars and cents. A lot of times some things have to be cured with common sense.

Now I think there is no great cry from these young people to vote. Because most of them realize that they don't have the qualifications so far as dollars and cents. I would be the first one to stand here and tell you that they have qualifications, of course there are 18-year olds, there are things they can do that I can't do. I would be the first one to admit that. But not in the field of dollars and cents.

Now you see what happens. Now you people that live in the cities, I just want to point out to you that you are forcing these towns, these small towns, in most cases to a new form of government. This bill will actually force them in a matter of a short time to a new form of government.

Now we have in these small towns a lot of poll taxpayers that pay a \$3 tax. He doesn't hesitate to go to town meeting and try to up every bill that he can until the taxpayer can almost run out of town. All he needs is a few 18-year olds that do not pay a tax to put the community or referring to the town, or this particular form of government in the small towns, on the rocks.

Now you see in the case of Old Town or Caribou, or any of these towns that have a council form of government, then this is not the case. Now as far as the voting on a candidate, I think they are fully as qualified as I am. And I still maintain they have other very good qualifications. I cannot vote for this bill this morning, and I hope that this bill will not receive two - thirds.

And I also will point out to you that I think that the reason that

I am here is because the people that I represent thought I was qualified, and they have thought that for some time, that I was qualified to answer these questions, and that I would not send all these little bills that are sort of minor in nature back to them to decide. When they go to the polls, they are getting a bit disgusted — a lot of them are getting really a bit disgusted to think that we do such a sloppy job here that we will send back ten or fifteen bills for them to decide on.

I think we are sent here to decide on these bills, and I am willing to assume responsibilities and do the job that I was sent here to do. And for this reason I am going to try and exercise my rights, and that is what I think I was sent here for, not to send these things back for them to decide. They elected me to do this decision, and as long as I am here I will try to be expedient in this matter.

I do hope that this vote this morning does not receive two-thirds passage.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. McCloskey.

Mr. McCLOSKEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would be remiss in my duties, being fairly near the age of 18, if I didn't stand up before you to voice my opinion. There is a great deal of talk today about the generation gap and the alienation between our youth. Perhaps this gap, this alienation, will never be completely bridged, but it must be spanned. For this bridge is essential to the nation, and it is essential to the State of Maine. And more important, it is not only essential for the present, it is essential for the future.

Whatever their differences with us, and with their elders, whatever the depth of their dissent, it is vital for us as it is for them that the young feel that change is possible, that they feel that they can be heard. They ask for an opportunity to contribute to their nation, and shape their own fate, and to share in the responsibilities of governing.

And I ask for them that you give them this opportunity.

An Italian philosopher once said, "There is nothing more difficult to take a hand in, there is nothing more perilous to conduct or more uncertain in its success than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things." And this is what we are doing today. And I ask you to have the courage, the moral courage to take this lead and vote to enact this bill. Thank you.

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

Mr. VINCENT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: If Mr. Dudley of Enfield is afraid that 18, 19 or 20-year old voters in his area would alter the tax structure in his particular area, I would suggest that the older voters in that area were remiss in their duties of exercising their voting franchise.

Mr. Cottrell of Portland and I enjoyed a relationship back a few years ago in which I was a student and he the teacher. Quite often we disagreed on quite a few things, and it was expressed in class and out of class, and quite often we have disagreed on items here on the Floor. Mr. Cottrell is opposed to this bill for a variety of reasons. And I support it for a variety of reasons.

There was one point he brought up about a bill coming up later on, incorporating adult rights and the 18-year-old vote. The 18-year-old vote is a constitutional item that has to be sent out to referendum. The adult rights are a non-constitutional item, and cannot or should not be sent out to a referendum.

If it was so done, and voted in, we would incorporate all adult rights for all ages into the Constitution, and it would clutter up the State Constitution to the point we would never be able to amend it properly. It would create a great deal of confusion. So any future bill in this area would have to be separated, that of the vote and that of adult rights.

There has been some discussion also of a generation gap. I have never held to the theory of a generation gap, never believed in

it, and I think it is something that Life Magazine and some other magazines have perpetrated and fostered on the American public in an effort to sell magazines or news stories. There is a gap between various groups, but it is always, and always will be, an ideology gap, and not an age gap. This country has never had, and never will have a generation gap agewise. It is and always will be an ideology gap.

For this reason, and many other reasons, I would support the enactment of the 18-year-old vote at this time, to send this out to the public and let them decide. We sent one out, the 20-year-old vote, and the vote was overwhelmingly convincing that they wanted the lowering of the voting age. I see no reason why we can't send this one out. If it was possible to pass this, and leave it here and not send it out to the people, I would so vote, but due to the fact that the law requires us to send it out, I would hope that we vote now to pass this, and to have it sent out as soon as possible to the people, and let them decide it finally. Thank you.

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

Mr. DAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Again, as in the last session, in the 104th Legislature, I rise to support this. As the good gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, said, he is concerned with what this will do in the communities where the 18-year olds will turn out in numbers at their town meetings.

My Town of Skowhegan I don't feel is any different, or the people are any different than the other small towns in the State of Maine. For 25 years, 26 years to be exact, I have been going to town meetings. During that time, because of sickness, I have missed one. But during this 26 years, I have seen the attendance at the town meetings dwindle. Only when there is a special bill pertaining to some special group does that group show up in numbers. I feel if this bill were passed it would generate more interest in government from the older people because they would know that they do have a

little competition. They would not leave government in the hands of a few people in the small towns.

Now the younger people, it is true that they may feel that they have the all-time cure for every ill that pertains to the community, to the state, the nation or the world. But they are willing to work to try for something better. They are willing to get out and work. I say that the older people, myself included, many times take too much for granted. Many times we accept the wish or the will of the Federal government, because we don't have the guts to fight something. I think the younger people do have the guts.

And as far as my good friend, Mr. Dudley, speaking about the poll taxpayers, again at every town meeting for 26 years I have heard this same thing. Personally I feel the poll taxpayer pays just as much in a sense as the real estate owner, and I own a little real estate. I have a few houses I rent. When the taxes go up, if they are forced up by the poll taxpayer or the \$3-a-year man, as the people refer to them as, I go up on my rent. And I am sure everybody else does. So when the man that doesn't own property rents property, he is paying a tax, because as the taxes go up, as the cost of the services go up, so too does his rent go up.

And as I said in the 104th, and I will say again, both parties, the Republican and the Democrats, have always gone to the younger people in their elections, and the candidates have in their campaigns. They have enlisted the aid of the younger people, because the younger people are willing to get out and work. And today, I am not going to sit here and deny the right for this to go to the people. I believe they would be remiss in their duty, and it shows irresponsible legislatorship on their part. I don't think we are getting into any chaos by doing this. I don't think it will cause all these problems that we have been told about, because I know what the 18-year olds in my town are. And I am sure we are no different, as I said, than anyone else.

It is true you are going to have this handful involved that is a min-

ority, that maybe wants to disrupt—you have it in all your school systems, you have it in all your town governments, you have it in your state government, you even have it in your federal government. Everyone does not agree; but only by disagreement can you make a better state, a better community, a better country, or a better world. And to get this disagreement, and to get this talk, to get these things going and moving, you must turn down to a younger age. And the younger age is the 18-year-old vote, and I hope you support this.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Kelleher.

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I again arise this morning to support the gentleman from Wayne's motion to indefinitely postpone. Inasfar as what Representative Dam talked about, about common sense, I think we ought to use a little common sense in the House here this morning.

When the 20-year-old bill was before this House in the last session, I was amazed at how brilliant, how smart the young people are at 20 years old. Now this morning we have got the 18-year-old bill here. And they seem to have improved considerably with intelligence over the past two years. And I wouldn't be a bit surprised that in the next session that someone will be introducing a bill for maybe 16-year olds.

Well, I am of the conclusion that when the Constitution of the United States was written up by some very intelligent people—and they weren't 90 years old, their average age was right around 34, I believe. And the reason that level was so high was that Benjamin Franklin was 86 at the time, and he brought it up considerably. But these people thought the use of reason, common sense, was at an age right around 21 years old.

I suppose if you get up and vote against this motion this morning that you are anti - youngsters. Like voting against an education bill, you might be anti - education. Well, I am not. But I feel as far as common sense is concerned —

and I know these people are very intelligent that they are all talking about; they seem to be either college graduates or potential college graduates. But you can't get common sense through a text book. You get it from experience. And I believe as far as being elected to this House, I am down here serving the people. It is high time that we voted the issues in here, and not continually be sending them back to the people.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Norway, Mr. Henley.

Mr. HENLEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I too would like to approve and second Mr. Ault's very fine speech. I also would recognize a very fine speech of my young friend Mr. Curtis of Orono. I have really enjoyed both sides of the question as it has been discussed.

And strange to say, because in spite of my stand that I have taken for four years, I still enjoy a very good association with the youngsters back home. Isn't that strange? I have openly done so. I have opposed this bill. I have appeared on television. I have appeared before committee. I have been lambasted here and there. But who was I lambasted by? One or two cranks, and the rest of them were politicians and people with special interests.

Who is driving for the 18 - year - old vote? Where are all the letters and petitions signed by 18 - year olds? They have got every right if they want to. They could try to persuade us with petitions by the thousands. Where are they? We say the 18 - year old is crying for the vote. I haven't heard it.

Four years ago, after I had opposed the 18 - year - old vote, I had a group of 18-year-olds in the senior class at high school at home who happened to be Key Clubbers — and as perhaps some of you know, the Key Clubbers in most high schools are some of the cream of the crop of the boys, they have to really qualify. I had a very nice discussion with them on the subject. And I saw two of them the other day. I asked them if they felt the same way as they

did four years ago. They said no, they said, "Good Lord, then I didn't know enough to do anything." I wonder how much we can change in that four years. I know I changed tremendously from the time I was 18 until I was 20 or 22.

Now again, I talked to a group about last fall — not the same group, but a group of boys, Key Clubbers, and I mentioned it the other day. I asked them what they had in high school for training and education on government. I told you what they said, that they had none in high school, that they only recall getting some in the eighth grade, or rather junior high, on history and federal government. I offered at that time, I said the 18 - year - old vote in session will be coming up. I would like to come before your entire group or your whole class, or any group that you want to get together, and discuss this thing as your representative and get some views, I am perfectly willing to discuss it. They said, "Well that's fine, and we will get in touch with you." They never got in touch with me, so apparently that SAD 17, of 1,200 students, are not too interested in getting me to talk to them about the 18 - year - old vote, or to talk to me.

Now I would like to mention a couple of cases which may come up and hit us in the face on this thing, not just the 18 - year - old vote. But I know a lot of us feel that if the 18 - year - old youngsters have the vote they should also have the entire responsibilities and rights of citizenship. I have stated that and I stated it four years ago; I state it again now.

But supposing we do give them votes? For example, last October an elderly gentleman, he and his wife are living on Social Security and have a State boy who suddenly turned twenty. They were getting \$100 a month from the State for his keep. He hadn't gone through school; he was in no position to take care of himself. All of a sudden the hundred dollars was wiped out because he had become an adult. How many problems are we

going to run into if all 18 - year olds become adults?

Now Mr. McCloskey of Bangor insists that all the 18-year-olds are asking for the vote. Again I say I haven't heard any of them or any group of them asking me. I realize that the few of us that are opposing this passage possibly are few. But nevertheless, as I stated the other day, I have not committed myself as a Republican to support this and I will only be consistent by hoping that this bill will be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I know you have made up your minds, but I think I am speaking for the record at this point, because what we say goes in the record. I would like to just make this comment. I agree with many things that have been said about the 18-year old. The average junior in high school, taking Physics and Biology today, knows more about electronic impulses, genes and chromosomes, than Ben Franklin did, our great scientist. Our knowledge is doubling every ten years. Ninety-five percent of the scientists who ever lived on the face of this planet are still alive. Certainly our youth are better informed, and their children are going to be much better informed than they are.

And this is the last. Polls, and recent polls, have shown that the greatest thing that disturbs our high school students today, the cause of their restlessness, is because they want more things to say about their own concerns in school, their curriculum and their administrations. And the same goes on the college level. I think some of these points should be emphasized.

And another thing, this question is going to be debated all over our land in all the legislatures that are meeting this year, and I am sure that lawyers and other legislators, that many minds will engage themselves on this matter. I am only preaching caution and a deliberateness. I don't think that

we have to act in the first month of this long legislature on such an important thing as this. I am sorry to have bored you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Ault.

Mr. AULT: Mr. Speaker, did Mr. Henley make the motion for indefinite postponement?

The SPEAKER: A motion to indefinitely postpone is not before the House, final passage is the pending question.

Mr. AULT: I now make the motion for indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Ault, now moves the indefinite postponement of L. D. 67.

Whereupon, Mr. Bustin of Augusta requested a roll call vote.

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

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

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Ault, that Resolution Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Reduce the Voting Age to Eighteen Years, House Paper 35, L. D. 67, be indefinitely postponed. All in favor of indefinite postponement will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA—Ault, Baker, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P.P.; Birt, Bragdon, Carey, Carrier, Clark, Conley, Cottrell, Crosby, Dudley, Emery, E.M.; Hardy, Henley, Kelleher, Kelley, K.F.; Lee, Lincoln, Lizotte, Mosher, Page, Payson, Rocheleau, Trask, Wight.

NAY—Albert, Bailey, Barnes, Bartlett, Bernier, Berube, Binnette, Bither, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Brawn, Brown, Bunker, Bustin, Call, Carter, Churchill, Clemente, Collins, Cooney, Cote, Cummings,

Curran, Curtis, A.P.; Curtis, T.S. Jr.; Cyr, Dam, Donaghy, Dow, Doyle, Drigotas, Dyar, Emery, D. F.; Evans, Farrington, Fecteau, Finemore, Fraser, Gagnon, Genest, Gill, Good, Goodwin, Hall, Hancock, Haskell, H a w k e n s, Hayes, Herrick, Hewes, Hodgdon, Immonen, Jalbert, Jutras, Kelley, P. S.; Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Kilroy, Lawry, Lebel, Lessard, Lewin, Lewis, Littlefield, Lund, Lynch, MacLeod, Maddox, Mahany, Manchester, M a r s h, Marstaller, Martin, McCloskey, McCormick, McKinnon, McNally, McTeague, Millett, Mills, Morrell, Murray, Norris, O'Brien, Orestis, Parks, Pontbriand, Porter, Pratt, Rand, Rollins, Ross, Santoro, Scott, Shaw, Sheltra, Shute, Silverman, Simpson, L.E.; Simpson, T.R.; Slane, Smith, D.M.; Smith, E.H.; Starbird, Stillings, Susi, Tanguay, Theriault, Tyndale, V i n c e n t, Webber, Wheeler, White, Whitson, Wood, M.W.; Wood, M.E.; Woodbury.

ABSENT—Bedard, F a u c h e r, Gauthier, Hanson, Lucas, Williams.

Yes, 27; No, 117; Absent, 6.

The SPEAKER: Twenty-seven having voted in the affirmative and one hundred seventeen in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

Thereupon, this being a Constitutional Amendment and a two-thirds vote of the House being necessary, a total was taken. 119 voted in favor of same and 25 against, and accordingly the Resolve was finally passed, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Norris.

Mr. NORRIS: Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I now move that we reconsider our action whereby we voted to enact this legislation and I hope that you will all vote against me.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Norris, moves that the House reconsider its action whereby this Resolution received final passage. All in favor say aye; those opposed say no.