

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

Volume II

May 5, 1971 to June 15, 1971

KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Monday, May 10, 1971

The House met according to adjournment and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Howard Washburn of Gardiner.

The members stood at attention during the playing of the National Anthem by the Fort Kent Community High School.

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

Order Out of Order

Mr. Faucher of Solon presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that Julie Rancourt and Darlene Russell of Solon be appointed to serve as Honorary Pages for today.

The Order was received out of order by unanimous consent, read and passed.

Papers from the Senate

From the Senate: The following Order: (S. P. 575)

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the following be recalled from the Governor's Office to the Senate: Bill, "An Act relating to Costs of Investigation Where Injunction Is Issued under Unfair Trade Practices Law" (S. P. 331) (L. D. 978)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

In the House, the Order was read and passed in concurrence.

Reports of Committees

Ought Not to Pass

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Providing Funds to Establish Exemplary Area - wide Multi-Service Programs for Older People" (S. P. 292) (L. D. 927)

In accordance with Joint Rule 17-A, was placed in the legislative files.

Leave to Withdraw

Covered by Other Legislation

Report of the Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act Providing for Full - time District Attorneys" (S. P. 456) (L. D. 1407)

reporting Leave to Withdraw, as covered by other legislation.

Report of the Committee on Transportation reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Real Property Acquisition for Highways" (S. P. 503) (L. D. 1486)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, the Reports were read and accepted in concurrence.

Ought to Pass

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought to pass" on Resolve Appropriating Moneys for the Acquisition of Property at Meddybemps by the Atlantic Sea Run Salmon Commission (S. P. 198) (L. D. 583)

Report of the Committee on Fisheries and Wildlife, acting in accordance with Joint Order (S. P. 563), reporting a Bill (S. P. 569) (L. D. 1710) under title of "An Act to Make Allocations from the Department of Inland Fisheries and Game Receipts for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1972 and June 30, 1973" and that it "Ought to pass"

Report of the Committee on Health and Institutional Services reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Board of Visitors for Each State Institution under the Department of Mental Health and Corrections" (S. P. 431) (L. D. 1245)

Came from the Senate with the Reports read and accepted and the Bills and Resolve passed to be engrossed.

In the House, the Reports were read and accepted in concurrence, the Bills read twice, Resolve read once, and tomorrow assigned.

Ought to Pass

Amended in Senate

Report of the Committee on State Government reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to the Laws of the Maine Industrial Building Authority" (S. P. 496) (L. D. 1372)

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A".

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence and the Bill read twice. Senate Amendment "A" (S-150) was read by the Clerk and adopted in concurrence, and tomorrow assigned for third reading of the Bill.

Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment

Report of the Committee on Health and Institutional Services on Bill "An Act Providing for Clinical Treatment and Rehabilitation of Alcoholics" (S. P. 3) (L. D. 17) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence and the Bill read twice. Committee Amendment "A" (S-142) was read by the Clerk and adopted in concurrence, and tomorrow assigned for third reading of the Bill.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Veterans and Retirement reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Disability Retirement and Retirement Allowances under State Retirement System" (S. P. 243) (L. D. 704)

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. ANDERSON of Hancock
Mrs. CARSWELL

of Cumberland
—of the Senate.

Messrs. DOW of West Gardiner
THERIAULT of Rumford
CURTIS of Bowdoinham
JUTRAS of Sanford
SIMPSON of Millinocket
PRATT of Parsonsfield
LEWIN of Augusta

—of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. BERNARD
of Androscoggin

—of the Senate.

Mrs. LINCOLN of Bethel
Messrs. HAYES of Windsor

VINCENT of Portland
—of the House.

Came from the Senate with the Bill substituted for the Reports and recommitted to the Committee on Veterans and Retirement.

In the House the Reports were read. On motion of Mrs. Lincoln of Bethel, the Reports and Bill were recommitted to the Committee on Veterans and Retirement in concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Amend the Laws Relating to Forcible Entry and Detainer" (S. P. 229) (L. D. 675) which was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence in the House on May 6.

Came from the Senate with that body voting to insist on its former action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Orrington, Mrs. Baker.

Mrs. BAKER: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur and would speak to my motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Orrington, Mrs. Baker, moves that the House recede and concur.

The gentlewoman may proceed.

Mrs. BAKER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: You have heard many debates on the merits of this bill. In fact, it appears to be the strategy of the opponents of the bill to talk L. D. 675 to death. I sincerely hope that this is not the case. I hope you will vote with your conscience and vote for the passage of this bill.

L. D. 675 will eliminate fraud upon our court system by doing away with the phoney lease. The phoney lease is a lawyer's gimmick to circumvent the 30-day notice requirements to the tenant. It should be outlawed. But if the tenant violates the law by damaging his landlord's property he can be evicted in seven days under this bill.

Do not vote against L. D. 675 simply because you are tired of landlord-tenant bills. L. D. 675 changes an archaic law which has

produced hardships on both tenants and landlords.

I hope you will vote in favor of the bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi.

Mr. SUSI: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The House chairman of Judiciary which heard this bill has had a death in his family and he will not be here until tomorrow, and he has asked that someone table this for one day so that he can participate in the debate.

Whereupon, on motion of Mr. Orestis of Lewiston, tabled pending the motion of Mrs. Baker of Orrington that the House recede and concur and tomorrow assigned.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Size Limit of Trout" (S. P. 548) (L. D. 1687) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" and House Amendment "A" in non-concurrence in the House on May 6.

Came from the Senate with that body voting to insist on its former action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mr. Finemore of Bridgton, the House voted to insist.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Majority Report of the Committee on Election Laws on Bill "An Act relating to Alternative Methods of Nominating Candidates" (H. P. 934) (L. D. 1288) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and Minority Report reporting "Ought not to pass" which Reports and Bill were indefinitely postponed in the House on May 5.

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede from our former

action and concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, moves that we recede and concur.

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

Mr. VINCENT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Last week we had an overwhelming vote against this proposal and it hasn't been amended in any way, shape or manner which would make it more acceptable to myself or, I should hope, to the vast number of people in this House that did vote against it.

This is the bill that we had last week where we debated on the merits of having a person purchase his way onto a primary ballot. This is completely contrary to the present systems that we do have.

Some of the arguments that we had last week were the fact that never again would we see uncontested primary battles or uncontested November elections due to the fact that either party chairman could purchase a spot on the ballot to make sure that the entire ticket was filled up.

It would also make it extremely difficult to defeat an incumbent candidate in a primary due to the fact that the incumbent could purchase a place on the ballot for several other people and divide up the vote that would be split, which would probably be going against them.

This is a type of bill that I hope would be defeated here in the House for once and for all today and I would hope that you would oppose the motion by the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Casco, Mr. Hancock.

Mr. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I don't propose to speak at the same length as I did the other day. I probably will repeat myself a couple of times.

It has been suggested here this afternoon that no amendments have been presented to make this bill more palatable. As yet the House has not had any opportunity to present amendments. I have one on your desks at the moment that

I think clarifies the situation somewhat. I am proposing another one if we get, hopefully, as I said the other day, to third reading.

So I think that in terms if amendments will help this or help any of you people, that this is not any problem. The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Vincent, just mentioned about the incumbent purchasing places for other candidates to ensure his own primary election. It would seem to me that he has little faith in our incumbents if he feels that they would do this.

I would like to repeat a couple of things that I said the other day. This does not, repeat it does not, replace the present method of getting a nomination, a position on the nomination in the primary. It does allow you to have a choice. I don't think that it would be used a great deal; but to the extent that it would be used it would be a helpful method of allowing candidates to gain a position on the nomination in the primary election.

The present method, as I said the other day, does allow for undemocratic procedures, and I won't reiterate those procedures, but they do exist and we all know that they exist. As far as the fees that are outlined in my bill, there is no magic in that system. I said this the other day. I like myself much better and this would be an amendment that I would offer, that the fee system would be changed from that that is outlined in the bill to be more like the Kansas system where one per cent of an annual salary would constitute the fee.

There is nothing new here. Maine is not taking an entirely new step. Thirty-three states have this nominating by fee in one form or another. In some states it is just a token system. In some states it is a very substantial amount. The State of New Mexico, for example, requires no signatures, but six per cent of the annual salary. That is quite a substantial fee if you are running for state-wide office or for United States Senator or for Congress.

We are not buying a place on the ballot; I am not suggesting that anyone should buy a place on the ballot. It was said the other day that this allows the candidate to go

around the people — he doesn't have to go out to them. Of course this is foolish. Any candidate in a contested primary must reach out to the people or he cannot possibly receive that nomination. We must always reach to the people, and I have no desire to avoid that.

I feel that this is a good bill. I feel that it deserves your support. I hope that you can give it to us. I hope that you can support the motion to recede and concur, and when the vote is taken, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. WHITSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The proposed amendments to this bill do not change it in any sense. This bill provides that a fee is an acceptable waiver to a nomination petition. I would ask this body to reflect upon the result of such a waiver of nomination petition.

In the first place this would enable many persons who have no serious intentions of running to become candidates. In Portland I knew of many persons who showed casual interest in running for the House. If it was simply a matter of paying a \$50 fee these people would have been candidates and invariably some would have won. Yet they were not candidates because their convictions were tested by a requirement to obtain a few signatures. I would question the sincerity of such candidates, and I would question whether we in this House would want colleagues who took the office so casually that they would not have won had they been required to obtain a few signatures on a petition.

I believe that the requirement of a nomination petition separates the casual and frivolous candidate from those who seek office with deeper conviction. I would ask that you vote against the motion to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In my opinion this bill would not affect any one of us because we get our own signatures and it is

a very good way for us to campaign. But when you are running for a higher office it is just an imposition on your friends. I have always felt that these petitions were just a nuisance.

Now if you are friendly with a Governor or a Congressman or a United States Senator and they send you a petition, you feel obligated, not just to get a few names, but to get the paper completed entirely. It is not buying your way on the ballot any more than campaign expenses are now. You still can have the alternate of using petitions. And I don't believe that anyone is going to be frivolous in doing this and doing it for a joke. To run for Congress would cost \$500 and Governor or Senator \$1,000. But this, although it sounds like quite a lot of money, is now an infinitesimal amount when compared with the total cost of a major campaign; and I certainly feel that these major office seekers should be allowed to do this if they so desire.

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

Mr. VINCENT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would remind the gentleman from Bath that this bill covers all offices, not just high offices. I would also remind the body that there are no provisions in this state for runoffs. Now if he received less than fifty percent of the vote, it is very possible with four or five or six candidates, or even three candidates, a person could be nominated with thirty-four, thirty-five percent of the vote.

I would hope that you would oppose this due to the fact that without some form of runoff here whereby a candidate would have to obtain at least fifty percent of the vote this type of an approach would just serve to divide the vote in the primary.

As the gentleman from Portland mentioned, there were quite a few candidates that entertain the idea and even went so far as to take out papers. Twenty-seven people in Portland took out papers for the nomination of the House; only seventeen filed. A lot of people entertain the idea of running

for office, but due to the fact that they can't get sufficient support in a community they drop by the wayside.

I would suggest that also at the last minute a lot of people make up their minds that it is too late to acquire signatures and it would be just a simple matter of placing \$50 with the Secretary of State's office to have your name placed upon the ballot. It still boils down to indecisiveness on the part of the candidate, and it still left the option of going to his wallet to obtain a place on the ballot instead of the effort.

Now one of the best systems we have is obtaining signatures due to the fact that it gives the people supporting you an opportunity to get around, to mention your name, to circulate your papers, and it gives you an opportunity to thank the people that are participating in your candidacy. It gives these people that are signing petitions and circulating them a sense of participation, and this is what it is all about in being nominated.

I would hope that you would oppose the bill and vote against the motion, so that we can put an end to this bill now.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Marstaller.

Mr. MARSTALLER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Now the other day we voted for indefinite postponement of this bill and all its reports by a vote of 74 to 37. I think at that time we saw the clear issue that this was adding another feature to our election laws which would allow people to use money instead of friends to get on the ballot. I hope you will recall how you voted the other day and vote against the motion of Mr. Ross to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Casco, Mr. Hancock.

Mr. HANCOCK: One more final try.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: A couple of things have been mentioned. One was that some of the speakers — the gentlemen from Portland, Mr. Vincent and Mr. Whitman appeared to be

quite concerned about the casual candidate. In my thinking the casual candidate, the frivolous candidate, the insincere candidate, stands no chance anyway, regardless of what system he uses to get his name on the ballot. And if he does stand a chance, then our entire system is in trouble.

I would suggest to them they have mentioned a number of problems that they feel that this bill has, that thirty-three states, have had no problems with this type of filing system. And also, this is an interesting point that has not been mentioned before. In going back through the sources that were given to me in the law library, they have quite complete files as of 1953 and quite complete files as of 1970, and the change between these two periods of time, some seventeen years, is that there has been an increase in the number of states who have adopted this system, either on an alternative basis or as a flat out basis, it has increased by about a third — gone up from twenty odd to the thirty-three, and that is an increase of about fifty percent, and apparently these states do not find that they have had any real problem with this.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, that the House recede from its former action and concur with the Senate on Bill "An Act relating to Alternative Methods of Nominating Candidates," House Paper 934, L. D. 1288. 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 Bath, Mr. Ross, that the House recede and concur. If you are in favor of receding and concurring you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Albert, Baker, Bernier, Birt, Boudreau, Bunker, Cottrell, Cummings, Dam, Doyle, Fine-more, Genest, Good, Hancock, Immonen, Jutras, Lawry, Lincoln, Littlefield, Lynch, MacLeod, Martin, McKinnon, Millett, Norris, O'Brien, Pontbriand, Porter, Rand, Ross, Shaw, Simpson, T. R.; Stillings, Trask, Webber, Wheeler, White, Wight, Williams, Wood, M. W.; Woodbury.

NAY — Ault, Bailey, Barnes, Bartlett, Bedard, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Berube, Bither, Bourgoin, Bragdon, Brawn, Brown, Bustin, Call, Carrier, Carter, Churchill, Clark, Clemente, Conley, Cooney, Cote, Crosby, Curran, Curtis, A. P.; Cyr, Donaghy, Dow, Drigotas, Dyar, Emery, D. F.; Emery, E. M.; Evans, Farrington, Faucher, Fecteau, Fraser, Gagnon, Goodwin, Hall, Haskell, Haw-kens, Hayes, Herrick, Kelleher, Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Kilroy, Lebel, Lee, Lessard, Lewin, Lewis, Lizotte, Lucas, Mahany, Marsh, Marstaller, McCormick, McNally, Mills, Morrell, Mosher, Murray, Orestis, Page, Parks, Payson, Pratt, Rocheleau, Rollins, Scott, Sheltra, Shute, Slane, Smith, D. M.; Susi, Tanguay, Theriault, Tyn-dale, Vincent, Whitson, Wood, M. E.

ABSENT—Binnette, Carey, Collins, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Dudley, Gauthier, Gill, Hanson, Hardy, Henley, Hewes, Hodgdon, Jalbert, Kelley K. F.; Kelley, P. S.; Lund, Maddox, Manchester, McCloskey, McTeague, Santoro, Silverman, Simpson, L. E.; Smith, E. H.; Starbird.

Yes, 41; No, 84; Absent, 25.

The SPEAKER: Forty-one having voted in the affirmative, eighty-four in the negative, with twenty-five being absent, the motion to recede and concur does not prevail.

Whereupon, on motion of Mrs. Goodwin of Bath, the House voted to adhere.

Non-concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Eliminating Certain Organizations as Participating Local Districts under State Retirement System" (H. P. 979) (L. D. 1341) on which the House accepted

the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee on Veterans and Retirement on April 29.

Came from the Senate with the Minority "Ought to pass" Report accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mr. Hayes of Windsor, the House voted to adhere.

Non-Concurrent Matter Tabled and Assigned

Report "A" of the Committee on State Government on Resolution Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Provide for an Environmental Bill of Rights (H. P. 751) (L. D. 1020) reporting same in a new draft (H. P. 1300) (L. D. 1705) under same title and that it "Ought to pass" and Report "B" reporting a Bill (H. P. 1301) (L. D. 1706) under title of "An Act Providing for a Declaration of Policy Concerning the State's Environment" and that it "Ought to pass" which Reports and Resolution were indefinitely postponed in the House on May 5.

Came from the Senate with Report "B" accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mr. Martin of Eagle Lake, tabled pending further consideration and specially assigned for Wednesday, May 12.

Messages and Documents

The following Communication:

The Senate of Maine
Augusta, Maine

May 7, 1971

Hon. Bertha W. Johnson
Clerk of the House
105th Legislature
Dear Madam Clerk:

The Senate voted to Adhere to its action whereby it Indefinitely Postponed Bill, "An Act Relating to Payment of Expenses of Supreme Judicial Court and the Superior Court by the State" (S. P. 524) (L. D. 1519).

The Senate also voted to Adhere to its action whereby it accepted the Majority Ought Not to Pass report in non-concurrence on Bill, "An Act to Grant Adult Rights to

Persons Eighteen Years of Age" (H. P. 435) (L. D. 600)

Respectfully,

(Signed)

HARRY N. STARBRANCH
Secretary of the Senate

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

Orders

(Off Record Remarks)

Mr. Cyr of Madawaska was grant unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. CYR: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am not a poet, and I haven't prepared any poem. However, there is something that happened last week that disturbed me very much. In a democracy the legislature is supposed to be the last citadel of freedom of speech; and I was very disturbed when somebody shut off the debate in the legislation that I was preparing.

I accused, in privacy, my good friend Rodney Ross about it, and he assured me that it wasn't him, and I apologized for the thought that had crossed my mind at that time. However, I must say that whoever did this did a disservice to the State of Maine. Whether we are debating the deer or the moose or the trout, I think that everyone should have a chance to express himself in the debate that goes on.

There are quite a few other legislators that had intended to speak on my legislation, and were not allowed to do so because of this shutting off of debate.

I was in the process at the time of trying to explain to you the clever strategy that had been pulled on us by the Republican party in trying to make that a party issue without having to take the responsibility. I say it was clever because it was very clever, and had to be the hand of a very experienced former legislator.

When the subject was brought up in the executive meeting, and they started to poll on the legislation as to how the committee wanted to vote, the chairman started out on the Democratic side. And as you know in these committees you had Democrats on one side and you

have Republicans on the other side. So the chairman started polling the members on the Democratic side, knowing very well the feelings of most Democratic legislators in regard to that legislation, and also knowing very well the feelings of the Republican legislators. So he polled the Democratic legislators, and everyone polled in favor of it. When it came to the chairman, the chairman made the comment, "Well, you fellows, you Democrats now want to make it a party issue, well, we can also." Knowing very well that they had the majority, they had seven members.

So that is what happened, gentlemen; that is why this legislation came out seven to six "ought not to pass," and why it came out a party issue.

During the debate I did have a chance to rebut most of the argument — I should say most, there was only one argument that deserved rebutting. The arguments of my good friend Mr. Tyndale were so trivial that they do not deserve an answer.

But one argument from the House chairman, Mr. Williams, I think that I should rebut. He mentioned that in previous attempts on trying to pass the Power Authority, he mentioned that the proponents had stated that unless the State of Maine went in and took an Authority that we would have blackouts by 1972. Instead of that, he kept on, instead of that Maine has been exporting power since last summer.

I would like to remind the gentleman that the power that was exported since last July has been Canadian power generated at the Maetaquac Dam in New Brunswick, and not from Maine.

I also stated in my presentation that last year 18.9% of the power in the State of Maine was purchased from outside. In my own utility of Maine Public Service, 220 million kilowatt-hours came from New Brunswick. Their own generation is only 158 million kilowatt-hours. So in other words, they are buying more than they are generating. And I say to you, when the utilities tell you that they have control of the action, I say that

they are not telling you the whole truth.

What disturbs me very much is this. The study made in 1966 shows that 33.1% of the generation, the total generation in Maine is in the hand — owned and operated by industry. To further compound the problem, or to understand the problem, from 1960 to 1966, according to this study, our growth was 4.3% in the State of Maine, while the national average was 8%. And the growth from 1960 to 1970 in New Brunswick, I was told a month and a half ago when I was in Fredericton, averaged 12% during this period.

Now this has a significance to me. It means two things. It means that our utilities cannot meet the demand of industries; and also that the industries have decided to create their own, to build their own generation so that they won't have to pay the price asked by the utilities. In a state that has to import its fuel, its oil, its coal for power generation; in a state such as ours, where we are at the end of the road on transportation, and we have to pay the high cost, we have a natural resource — hydro-electric potential on the St. John River — and what are we doing about it? Nothing.

We are exporting the waters of the St. John, the Big Black and the Little Black, and the Allagash to Canada for nothing. By building a hydro-electric project on the St. John River this would increase the generation of the plants down river which are in Canada, without additional cost to them.

But they are not breathing about it. I have a letter right here which I would have read in my presentation from the New Brunswick Power Commission, in which they state that they would be very willing to share with us on these down river benefits. Now what they mean by down river benefits, it means the increased generation in the plants down river due to the controlled flow of the river. And how do you control that? By damming the waters.

New Brunswick has done extensive study in these down river benefits, and they told me, in my visit to them, that we can expect

at least 350 million kilowatt-hours of down river benefits if they share with us. That means at least 175 million kilowatt-hours, which would come to our system for just the transmission cost. Gentlemen, I ask you, wouldn't this lower the cost of electricity in the State of Maine?

The other facts that I mentioned in my presentation was that by creating a state agency that you could save yourself at least 2% on the financing. If we take the example of Yankee Wiscasset, Yankee Wiscasset is being built by a syndicate of eleven private utilities in New England. And they will share the generation, the power generated from that plant on the basis of the money, the contribution they put into it. Which means that the State of Maine will get about 50% of that generation. 38% for Central Maine, 7% for Bangor Hydro, and 5% for Maine Public Service. The rest of it will go outside the State of Maine according to the arrangements, the contract that they have.

Now in this study—and I am referring back again to the 1966 study—this report shows or suggested three plans. I like Plan C better than any others, in which it suggested that Maine would need, by 1972, one plant of the million kilowatt generation. This is being replaced by Wiscasset. It is a good move.

The second proposal that they had in there was the Dickey-Lincoln School to come on the line by 1975. Now it takes at least five years to build one of those plants, and one or two years for preparation before. So you are seven or eight years away already. And the third plant would be needed of about 700,000 kilowatts by 1980. Well, we have Wiscasset, which is being built by private utilities, which is all right. But only half of this will come to Maine, or 400,000 kilowatts.

Not only that, but I showed you that by financing this through tax exempt bonds you can save yourself 2%, which means that if Wiscasset had been built through an authority you would save 2% of \$200 million; that is \$4 million a year that the consumers of the State of Maine would have saved

themselves during the life of that bond. And I challenge my opposition to prove otherwise; that by creating a Power Authority that Maine could not save itself some power, some electricity.

If at some time you are worried about your bill, your electric bill, next month's bill, look at it, study it. If you don't understand it, send it back to PUC here, and have an explanation. I have my own bill here of last month, and this is what it says.

The first 16 kilowatts at flat \$2; that is approximately 120 mills per kilowatt. The next 144 were six cents, or 60 mills. The next 440 were 2.7 cents, or 27 mills. And the last 260 were two cents, or 20 mills. I tried to find out or have a breakdown to find out from PUC just what is the average cost of power for Maine Public Service, because I knew that 220 million kilowatts came from New Brunswick at 5.6 mills. I also knew that 138 million kilowatt-hours came from their Tinker Dam, which should be their own operation—it is a hydro—should be even lower than 5.6 mills.

So that leaves only 21 million kilowatts out of the steam generation. And I was trying to do that, because of this clause which was included in my letter with my bill, which was the clause for the fuel surcharge, where they are charging me 14 cents for each 100 kilowatt-hours.

Now I questioned that, because only 21 million kilowatt-hours came from steam generation. As yet I don't have the answer, because if you can make anything out of these two pages here you are better than I am in trying to decipher doubletalk. But I say this to you. The bill ran all the way from 120 mills down to 20 mills, and their cost for at least 220 million kilowatt-hours is 5.6 mills. Where does the rest go? Where does the rest go? All you get when you try to get an answer on this is again some more doubletalk.

And I say to my Republican friends, if you are not satisfied with your bill here next month, ask yourselves when you had a chance to do something about it, to vote for a program that would have brought cheaper power to Maine,

ask yourself what you did. And I lay the blame for higher power, higher electricity bills in the State of Maine, right at the knees of the Republican party.

If I go back here to the front page of today, somebody else among the Republicans had the same thought. They said that "the Republicans are not issue oriented, and there are times when we are completely out of touch with what the people want." I say that last week through their votes the Republican party was not in touch with the people back home. And I also say to my Democratic superiors, that at times might have questioned my loyalty to my new party, that they have nothing to worry about.

House Reports of Committees Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Lessard from the Committee on Health and Institutional Services reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Appropriating Funds to Advance the Level of Dental Health in Maine" (H. P. 935) (L. D. 1289)

Mr. Fecteau from the Committee on Legal Affairs reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Distribution of Part of Snowmobile Registration Fees to Sheriffs' Departments" (H. P. 997) (L. D. 1359)

Mr. Cooney from the Committee on State Government reported same on Bill "An Act Amending the Municipal Industrial and Recreational Obligations Act" (H. P. 1180) (L. D. 1634)

Mr. Donaghy from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Appointment of an Indian Justice of the Peace for the Passamaquoddy Reservations (H. P. 307) (L. D. 407)

In accordance with Joint Rule 17-A, were placed in the legislative files and sent to the Senate.

Leave to Withdraw

Mr. Hall from the Committee on Agriculture on Bill "An Act relating to Sale of Kosher Meats and Foods" (H. P. 1135) (L. D. 1596) reported Leave to Withdraw.

Mr. Norris from the Committee on Legal Affairs reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Assess-

ments on Interment Space of Cemeteries" (H. P. 654) (L. D. 885)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse Norwood Beveridge of Camden for Damage by Highway Construction (H. P. 816) (L. D. 1089)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Referred to the 106th Legislature

Mr. Crosby from the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act Providing for a Staggered System for Registration of Motor Vehicles" (H. P. 1203) (L. D. 1654) reported that it be referred to the 106th Legislature.

Report was read and accepted, the Bill referred to the 106th Legislature, and sent up for concurrence.

Ought to Pass in New Draft New Drafts Printed

Mr. Clemente from the Committee on Health and Institutional Services on Bill "An Act to Improve the Procedure for Correcting Vital Statistics" (H. P. 808) (L. D. 1081) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1311) (L. D. 1719) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Dyar from same Committee on Bill "An Act to Improve the Enforcement of the Marriage Blood Test Requirement" (H. P. 807) (L. D. 1080) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1312) (L. D. 1720) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Farrington from the Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act relating to Acceptance of Gifts and Purchases of State Lands" (H. P. 787) (L. D. 1063) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1313) (L. D. 1721) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Reports were read and accepted, the New Drafts read twice and tomorrow assigned.

Ought to Pass Printed Bills

Mrs. Berry from the Committee on Health and Institutional Services reported "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Definition of Resident Trainee, Licensing and

Compensation of Board under Laws Relating to Funeral Directors and Embalmers" (H. P. 528) (L. D. 690)

Mrs. Doyle from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Salary and Duties of Executive Director and Assistant Director to the State Board of Nursing" (H. P. 594) (L. D. 789)

Mr. Lessard from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Revising Licensing of Hearing Aid Dealers and Fitters" (H. P. 593) (L. D. 788)

Mrs. McCormick from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Appropriating Funds to Continue Housing Services for Older People" (H. P. 675) (L. D. 912)

Mr. Crosby from the Committee on Legal Affairs reported same on Bill "An Act to Validate Certain Proceedings Authorizing Ambulance Service for Town of Skowhegan" (H. P. 998) (L. D. 1360)

Mr. Emery from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Election of Officers of Hospital Administrative District No. 3 in Aroostook and Penobscot Counties" (H. P. 970) (L. D. 1330)

Reports were read and accepted, the Bills read twice and tomorrow assigned.

Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment

Mr. Lewis from the Committee on Health and Institutional Services on Bill "An Act relating to Transportation of Seriously Injured People Directly to a Hospital" (H. P. 1051) (L.D. 1443) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-237) submitted therewith.

Mr. Donaghy from the Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act to Provide an Automatic Pay Increase to Classified State Employees Who Pass the Certified Professional Secretary Examination" (H. P. 973) (L. D. 1334) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-238) submitted therewith.

Mr. Wood from the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act relating to Weight Tolerances of Vehicles Loaded with Refrigerated Products" (H. P. 976) (L. D. 1338) reported "Ought to pass" as

amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-239) submitted therewith.

Reports were read and accepted and the Bills read twice, Committee Amendment "A" to each was read by the Clerk and adopted, and tomorrow assigned for third reading of the Bills.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on County Government reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Creating a County Civil Service Commission for Deputy Sheriffs" (H. P. 1141) (L. D. 1597)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. DANTON of York
MARTIN of Piscataquis
PEABODY of Aroostook
— of the Senate.
Messrs. BERNIER of Westbrook
WIGHT of Presque Isle
IMMONEN of West Paris
PONTBRIAND of Auburn
CHURCHILL of Orland
HAWKENS of Farmington
DYAR of Strong
MILLS of Eastport
KELLEY of Southport
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. KELLEHER of Bangor
— of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Wight of Presque Isle, the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Labor reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Applicability of Workmen's Compensation Law to Employers of One or More Employees" (H. P. 601) (L. D. 803)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. TANOUS of Penobscot
MARCOTTE of York
— of the Senate.
Messrs. McTEAGUE of Brunswick
SIMPSON of Millinocket

GENEST of Waterville
BUSTIN of Augusta
BEDARD of Saco

— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought not to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. KELLEY of Machias
LEE of Albion

ROLLINS of Dixfield

Mrs. LINCOLN of Bethel

Mr. GOOD of Westfield

— of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Good of Westfield, tabled pending acceptance of either Report and tomorrow assigned.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Transportation reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Steel Guardrails on the Maine Turnpike" (H. P. 619) (L. D. 830)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. GREELEY of Waldo
KELLAM of Cumberland

— of the Senate

Messrs. WOOD of Brooks
CROSBY of Kennebunk

HALL of Windham

LEE of Albion

BARNES of Alton

McNALLY of Ellsworth

DUDLEY of Enfield

KEYTE of Dexter

FRASER of Mexico

— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. JOHNSON of Somerset

— of the Senate.

Mr. LEBEL of Van Buren

— of the House.

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Wood.

Mr. WOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that we accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Wood, moves that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report.

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

Mr. LIZOTTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Believe me, the reason I ran for this office was that I might be able to do something to make our state a better and safer place to live in, and I am sure that this bill falls in that category. I have made a survey through our Highway Commission, and I must admit that the people I spoke to in that department were very helpful and more than willing to go out of their way to give me all the information I needed.

First of all, I would like to inform you that in the last four years we have had 14 cars that have crossed the median strip without hitting another car in the opposite lane, which have resulted in 19 fatalities. We have had eight cars crossing and hitting another vehicle which have caused 13 fatalities; these are all on the Maine Turnpike.

Now gentlemen, here is a bit of interesting information. In the Town of Freeport they have had one such accident in the last four years that has caused four people to lose their lives. In item 180 in the highway construction agenda for 1971, the Maine highway has appropriated the sum of \$180,000 to erect a guardrail for a distance of 5.2 miles in that very town so this will not happen again.

I have received some literature from Mr. Hancock, who is the attorney for the Maine Turnpike Authority, and in these papers they have had guardrails appraised; but at no place does it say that they have decided to have it done. And another thing, they only want it from Scarborough to Augusta because they plan on renovating from York to Scarborough. The letter reads that they plan to widen that section, but at no place does it specify that they plan for guardrails in that section, and all this is in the plans within the next ten years. Ladies and gentlemen, we need to protect our people, our tourists and, believe me, this is one way to do it. It might be a costly way, but we are not here to measure dollars against human lives, and we don't want to wait ten years

for this to be taken care of. If you were to ask me how long would you recommend for this to be done, I honestly would have to say, I would like it done yesterday—that is how soon we need it. This is a much needed piece of safety legislation, and I would hope that you would give this a great deal of consideration.

Before closing, I would like to ask any of you here if you have seen or read about any big accidents occurring during this past winter on the turnpike—by this I mean crossing the median strip. I am sure you would say none. The reason—a five-foot drift of snow making it impossible to get across.

I would hope that you would reject the motion to accept the Majority Report and I would ask that you would please accept the Minority Report, and I would ask for a division, please.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Wood.

Mr. WOOD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: During the hearing on this bill we had people from the Turnpike Authority and many other people that understand this program and the progress that is being made. They informed us, to my satisfaction anyway, that they were putting up guardrails, that their plans for the future were to put up guardrails as fast as they feel that they can afford to do it.

Of course this is a program that will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to put these up. We felt that this was a project that probably would help a great deal to stop accidents, but there was no time limit set in the bill that it would have to be done. And after informing us and proving to our satisfaction that their plans were to do this as fast as they possibly could do it, we decided that the bill wouldn't make any difference and make any faster progress than what they are doing now. I hope you will accept the "Ought not to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Albion, Mr. Lee.

Mr. LEE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Nobody on the Transportation Committee is against the safety of all our people. It was brought up, as Mr. Wood said, about the progress they are making. They spent last year in the neighborhood of \$350,000 in the worst places which are at the bridges, approaches to the bridge abutments—they got those all fixed. They let a contract this spring, for \$330,000 for twelve miles of the turnpike. They are doing about the best they could do we felt.

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

Mr. SHELTRA: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I attended the hearing and spoke in favor of the guard railing along with many other legislators from my area, and the only comment I really had to make was that the State of New Hampshire, for instance, in its wisdom saw fit to build a guardrailing all the way. And I also felt that even though this portion, let's say, from Kittery to Scarborough, even though a four-lane highway might be proposed, this certainly would not delete or take away from the problem of anyone crossing this median trip.

It is also my understanding, in speaking with other legislators, that the Maine Turnpike Authority can well afford the project at this time from the funds it has and is quite for us to speak. So I strongly feel that this definitely would be good for human safety. I think our fellow legislators deserve it above all. I think all our constituents deserve this safety measure. So I hope that you will go along with Mr. Lizotte's motion that the Majority Report "Ought not to pass" be defeated and let's go along with the Minority Report.

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

Mr. McNALLY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to pose a question through the Chair to Mr. Sheltra. Have they really got a guardrail on that 17 mile strip from Portsmouth to the Massachusetts line? It was kind

of snowy when I went down on the fourth day of March.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. McNally, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Sheltra, who may answer if he chooses.

The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. SHELTRA: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Yes they have, because I paid special notice. And of course I travel to Massachusetts very frequently and I deliberately took time out to observe the situation. They certainly have. And I feel that if our turnpike was state owned, it would already have been done.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Wood, that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report. The Chair will order a vote. All in favor of accepting the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

60 voted in the affirmative and 52 voted in the negative.

Whereupon, Mr. Vincent of Portland 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 Brooks, Mr. Wood, that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report on Bill "An Act relating to Steel Guardrails on the Maine Turnpike," House Paper 619, L. D. 830. If you are in favor of accepting the Majority Report you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Ault, Baker, Barnes, Bartlett, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Birt, Bither, Bragdon, Brawn, Brown, Bunker, Cottrell, Crosby, Curran, Dyar, Evans, Finemore, Fraser, Hall, Haskell, Hawkens, Hayes, Herrick, Immonen, Jutras, Kelley, K. F.; Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Lee, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, MacLeod, Maddox, Mahany, Marsh, Marsteller, McCormick, McNally, Millett, Morrell, Mosher, Murray, Norris, Page, Parks, Payson, Porter, Pratt, Rand, Rollins, Scott, Shaw, Shute, Susi, Tanguay, Trask, White, Wight, Williams, Wood, M. W.; Wood, M. E.

NAY — Albert, Bailey, Bedard, Bernier, Berube, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Bustin, Call, Carrier, Carter, Churchill, Clemente, Conley, Cooney, Cote, Cummings, Curtis, A. P.; Curtis, T. S. Jr.; Cyr, Dam, Dow, Doyle, Drigotas, Emery, D. F.; Emery, E. M.; Farrington, Faucher, Fecteau, Gagnon, Genest, Good, Goodwin, Hancock, Kelleher, Kilroy, Lawry, Lebel, Lessard, Littlefield, Lizotte, Lucas, Lynch, Martin, McKinnon, Mills, O'Brien, Orestis, Pontbriand, Rocheleau, Ross, Sheltra, Simpson, T. R.; Slane, Smith, D. M.; Stillings, Theriault, Tyndale, Vincent, Webber, Wheeler, Whitson, Woodbury, the Speaker.

ABSENT — Binnette, Carey, Clark, Collins, Donaghy, Dudley, Gauthier, Gill, Hanson, Hardy, Henley, Hewes, Hodgdon, Jalbert, Kelley, P. S.; Lund, Manchester, McCloskey, McTeague, Santoro, Silverman, Simpson, L. E.; Smith, E. H.; Starbird.

Yes, 63; No, 64; Absent, 24.

The SPEAKER: Sixty-three having voted in the affirmative and sixty-four in the negative, with twenty-four being absent, the motion does not prevail.

Thereupon, the Minority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted. The Bill was given its two several readings and tomorrow assigned.

Divided Report

Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Transportation reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Operating a Motor Vehicle Without a Current Certifi-

cate of Inspection" (H. P. 790)
(L. D. 1066)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. GREELEY of Waldo
JOHNSON of Somerset
— of the Senate.

Messrs. WOOD of Brooks
CROSBY of Kennebunk
HALL of Windham
BARNES of Alton
LEE of Albion
McNALLY of Ellsworth
KEYTE of Dexter
DUDLEY of Enfield
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. KELLAM of Cumberland
— of the Senate.

Messrs. LEBEL of Van Buren
FRASER of Mexico
— of the House.

Reports were read.

(On motion of Mr. Lewin of Augusta, tabled pending acceptance of either Report and tomorrow assigned.)

Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Transportation reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act to Eliminate the Use of Motor Vehicle Dealer Registration Plates for Wrecker Service" (H. P. 899) (L. D. 1219)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. GREELEY of Waldo
JOHNSON of Somerset
KELLAM of Cumberland
— of the Senate.

Messrs. HALL of Windham
LEE of Albion
BARNES of Alton
McNALLY of Ellsworth
LEBEL of Van Buren
FRASER of Mexico
DUDLEY of Enfield
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought not to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WOOD of Brooks
CROSBY of Kennebunk

KEYTE of Dexter
— of the House.

Reports were read.

(On motion of Mr. Crosby of Kennebunk, tabled pending acceptance of either Report and specially assigned for Wednesday, May 12).

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Transportation reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Use of Motor Vehicle Dealer Registration Plates" (H. P. 900) (L. D. 1220)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. GREELEY of Waldo
KELLAM of Cumberland
— of the Senate.

Messrs. WOOD of Brooks
CROSBY of Kennebunk
HALL of Windham
LEE of Albion
BARNES of Alton
McNALLY of Ellsworth
KEYTE of Dexter
FRASER of Mexico
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. JOHNSON of Somerset
— of the Senate.
Messrs. DUDLEY of Enfield
LEBEL of Van Buren
— of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Lebel of Van Buren, the Minority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted.

The Bill was given its two several readings and tomorrow assigned.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act relating to Electrical Inspection" (S. P. 567) (L. D. 1708)

Bill "An Act Increasing Compensation of Full-time Deputies in all Counties" (H. P. 328) (L. D. 437)

Bill "An Act relating to Injury or Incapacity of Wardens of the Departments of Inland Fisheries and Game and Sea and Shore Fisheries" (H. P. 444) (L. D. 578)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading,

read the third time, passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

Third Reader

Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act relating to Committees on Status of Women, Children and Youth, and the Aged" (H. P. 477) (L. D. 618)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading and read the third time.

Mr. Birt of East Millinocket offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" (H-242) was read by the Clerk.

(On motion of Mrs. Kilroy of Portland, tabled pending adoption of House Amendment "A" and tomorrow assigned.)

Third Reader

Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act to Increase Compensation for Members of the Legislature" (H. P. 1302) (L. D. 1709)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading and read the third time.

(On motion of Ross of Bath, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Wednesday, May 12).

Bill "An Act relating to Raising Fees and Expenses of Jurors" (H. P. 1307) (L. D. 1713)

Bill "An Act relating to Specific Periods of Total Incapacity for Certain Injuries under Workmen's Compensation Law" (H. P. 1308) (L. D. 1714)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, read the third time, passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

Amended Bills

Bill "An Act relating to Testimony and Proceedings before the Industrial Accident Commission" (H. P. 464) (L. D. 592)

Bill "An Act relating to Total Incapacity Resulting from Second Injuries under Workmen's Compensation Law" (H. P. 679) (L. D. 916)

Bill "An Act Amending Fees Charged by Registers of Deeds" (H. P. 762) (L. D. 1028)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, read

the third time, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

Third Reader

Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act Creating the Maine Litter Control Act" (S. P. 262) (L. D. 768)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading and read the third time.

(On motion of Mr. Curtis of Bowdoinham, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Wednesday, May 12.)

Passed to Be Enacted

Emergency Measure

An Act Providing Moneys for Eastern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments to be Held in Maine in 1971 (S. P. 161) (L. D. 483)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 109 voted in favor of same and 5 against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Emergency Measure

An Act Creating the Cobbossee-Annabessacook Authority (H. P. 786) (L. D. 1062)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 116 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act to Reconstitute School Administrative Districts Numbers 12, 22, 59, 73, 74, 75, 76, and 77 (H. P. 646) (L. D. 876)

An Act relating to Acquisition of Land by Conservation Commissions (H. P. 714) (L. D. 959)

An Act Appropriating Funds to Establish Kidney Disease Treat-

ment Services (H. P. 731) (L. D. 993)

Were reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed, passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Enactor

Tabled and Assigned

An Act to Clarify the Law Regulating the Alteration of Coastal Wetlands (H. P. 944) (L. D. 1303)

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

(On motion of Mr. Donaghy of Lubec, tabled pending passage to be enacted and tomorrow assigned.)

An Act to Increase the Compensation of Members of the Legislative Research Committee (H. P. 1099) (L. D. 1505)

An Act relating to Hunting from Vehicles, Aircraft, Boats and Snowmobiles (H. P. 1147) (L. D. 1588)

Were reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed, passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Enactor

Tabled and Assigned

An Act relating to Suspension of Motor Vehicles Operator's License for Speeding Violation (H. P. 1151) (L. D. 1692)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Van Buren, Mr. Lebel.

Mr. LEBEL: Mr. Speaker, could I have this tabled for one legislative day please?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Van Buren, Mr. Lebel, moves that this matter be tabled until tomorrow pending passage to be enacted.

Whereupon, Mr. Gagnon of Scarborough requested a division on the tabling motion.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested on the tabling motion. All in favor of this matter being tabled until tomorrow pending passage to be enacted will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

66 having voted in the affirmative and 48 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

Mr. Farrington of Old Orchard Beach requested a roll call vote.

The SPEAKER: The yeas and nays have been requested on the tabling motion. 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 an insufficient number having voted for a roll call, a roll call was not ordered.

An Act relating to Search by Coastal Wardens (H. P. 1291) (L. D. 1690)

Finally Passed

Resolve Appropriating Funds for the Perambulation of the Maine-New Hampshire Boundary Line (S. P. 71) (L. D. 150)

Were reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed, Bill passed to be enacted, Resolve finally passed, both signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Orders of the Day

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

HOUSE REPORT — "Ought to pass" in new draft—Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Permitting Trials for Petty Offenses Without a Jury" (H. P. 227) (L. D. 309)—New Draft (H. P. 1305) (L. D. 1711) under same title.

Tabled—May 6, by Mr. Susi of Pittsfield.

Pending—Acceptance.

Thereupon, the "Ought to pass" Report was accepted, the New Draft read twice and tomorrow assigned.

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

HOUSE DIVIDED REPORT — Majority (12) "Ought not to pass"—Minority (1) "Ought to pass"—Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Appointments to Housing Authorities" (H. P. 782) (L. D. 1048)

Tabled—May 6, by Mr. Lucas of Portland.

Pending—Acceptance of either Report.

On motion of Mr. Norris of Brewer, the Reports and Bill were recommitted to the Committee on Legal Affairs and sent up for concurrence.

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

Bill "An Act Providing for the Protection of Coastal Wetlands" (H. P. 1299) (L. D. 1704)

Tabled—May 6 by Mrs. Brown of York.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Donaghy.

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There is an amendment that has been prepared but it hasn't been distributed yet. I would ask that someone table this for one legislative day.

Whereupon, on motion of Mrs. Brown of York, retabled pending passage to be engrossed and tomorrow assigned.

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

Bill "An Act relating to Disposition of Portion of Fees Collected by Maine State Park and Recreation Commission" (S. P. 20) (L. D. 48)—In House, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-26) and Senate Amendment "A" (S-55) as amended by House Amendment "A" (H-125) thereto. In Senate, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and Senate Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto and Senate Amendment "B" (S-122) in non-concurrence.

Tabled—May 6, by Mr. Hewes of Cape Elizabeth.

Pending—Further consideration.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Marstaller.

Mr. MARSTALLER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House:

There is an amendment being prepared for this bill, and the amendment, in effect, is a redraft of this bill with the amendments in it, plus some other material. It is not ready yet, and I hope somebody would table this for one legislative day.

Whereupon, on motion of Mr. Hancock of Casco, retabled pending further consideration and tomorrow assigned.

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

An Act Creating Piscataquis County Commissioner Districts (H. P. 1279) (L. D. 1679)

Tabled—May 6, by Mr. Trask of Milo.

Pending—Passage to be enacted.

On motion of Mr. Trask of Milo, retabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for Wednesday, May 12.

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

An Act relating to School Construction Aid (S. P. 152) (L. D. 421)

Tabled — May 6, by Mr. Farrington of Old Orchard Beach.

Pending — Passage to be enacted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dixmont, Mr. Millett.

Mr. MILLETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would hope this afternoon we might be able to dispose of item six. As you may recall, the bill has been in this body now for going on two weeks, and it has not yet been debated for one reason or another, some reasons being that individuals had questions, others that we were waiting for an explanation on the cost of the bill. I would like, in view of the hour this afternoon, and it seeming to me to be timely to do so, to explain what the bill contains and hope that we might take action one way or another on the bill.

Going back to an earlier appearance of L. D. 421 in this body, prior to its recommitment, you might recall that this bill, along

with L. D. 999, were discussed almost simultaneously one day and a decision to recommit the two of them in order to recombine the two bills and present a compromise package took place in this body, and here today is the bill with its compromise provisions.

It is an extremely important bill, a bill that relates to the use of the \$50 million bond issue and affects each and every one of you here this afternoon. And I say this in such a way that you all ought to know that this bill, in a way, is a property tax relief bill for every member of this body as well as the other body. In order that you clearly understand it and that you can vote intelligently upon it, I would like to just quickly summarize the original school construction method of paying back on projects which were approved in the past.

Going back to 1957 when school construction first became a state function, a set of valuations per pupil were determined for all communities who were eligible either as districts or as cities. They were bracketed in 21 classifications, with percentages going from a high of 66 to a low of 18 percent. This, at that time, produced a median state effort of approximately 49 percent. In other words, the town in the middle of that distribution was receiving a 49 percent state aid. This seemed to be a sensible plan at the time. And until recently, with the last two revisions in state valuation, these percentages have held relatively stable. However, in the last two biennial revisions in state valuation, many communities have seen their state share drop considerably — in many cases from 15 to 20 percent and even more.

So the idea involved in this bill is to update each biennium the percentages of state share by the use of a simple fraction. That fraction would contain as the denominator the local valuation per pupil on a given biennial determination. The numerator of that fraction would be the state median. This would be multiplied by originally a 49 percent factor, but in the compromise, a 40 percent figure, with the

idea that the state would maintain now a reduced 40 percent level of state share. And I might point out that this would be done each biennium, and approximately the same level of state share would be maintained.

This is the feature of L. D. 421 in its original form, now reduced to 40 percent at a state median. The other factor that has been changed with respect to the original L. D. 421 is that the upper and lower limits have been modified from a low of 15 to a high of 85 from the original 18 to 66.

Now I have told the members in this body, who actually will see their percentages drop slightly, who they are. They are very few. In fact, there are five units that would go from a previous rock bottom of 18 percent to slightly lower, but no lower than 15 percent.

The second feature of the new bill is that it does incorporate the features of L. D. 999. Now this is the extension of school construction aid from the state to all units, regardless of their previous eligibility. But it does maintain an area need statement. In other words, decisions may be made, and I might point out quite unpopular decisions sometimes, on the basis of whether or not a project met the needs of the area in which that locality existed. These decisions would be made by the Commissioner of Education. L. D. 999 then is now incorporated in L. D. 421.

The final change that has been made in the compromise package is that there is going to be, according to this bill, a freezing of rates on projects approved since 1957 up through 1966 at the rate that they were when the project was approved. So it maintains three very basic and very important changes from present law. The effective dates are quite confusing. And so that nobody might feel that this bill does something that you don't understand it to do, I would spell out what the effective dates are for each part of the bill.

The change relative to the updating on a biennial basis of all percentages would not take effect until the 106th biennium or until

January when the 106th Legislature convenes.

The inclusion of those units who presently do not receive any school construction aid would take place in January of 1972. In other words, their projects would be subsidized starting in January of 1972.

The freezing rate that I have just mentioned, and the last change that is involved in this bill would take effect when the bill takes effect, in other words presumably three months after the Legislature adjourns. Now the committee did not take a position on the use of the \$50 million bond issue for past projects. I pointed out on an earlier occasion, quite some time ago now, that the Governor's recommendation was that the \$50 million which was approved by the voters last November be used to pay back biennial needs.

Now I am sure that this was not the intent of the bill. I am sure that it was not the intent of the bond issue, and I do not believe that the voters actually realized that this was what they might see happen to the large bond issue. However, this is a decision which I think the Appropriations Committee is probably more in line to make, and I would suggest that as some others have suggested, that they might give consideration to smaller bond issues for past projects.

Now those are the features of the bill as it now stands before you. It does have a price tag, and that price tag is in the vicinity of \$200,000. In view of the fact that the Part I Budget has been cut to the bare bones in the area of interest this bill, if enacted, would have to remain on the Senate Appropriations table.

I think my only purpose in speaking on the bill today was to explain it. I doubt very seriously if many people have understood it. I am not sure you do now. But I would hope that you could make an intelligent decision on whether or not you feel the bill is satisfactory to you. I have reservations about certain parts of it, and I have spoken on those reservations in the past. However, it is a compromise and it is a compromise which involves each and every one of you.

I would hope that if there is further debate that this bill might be moved along knowing full well that it will lie on the Senate Appropriations table if it gets that far.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As you are well aware, I have tabled this item and retabled it so many times that I have lost count. And I did so with one thing in mind, hoping that at some point we would try to understand the confusion that exists in the construction of school buildings in the State. I think the gentleman from Dixmont, Mr. Millett, has done an excellent job in explaining a very detailed and very complex problem that faces us every time we come to Augusta.

I am not at all 100 percent happy with the compromise that is arrived at. But at this point I am willing to let it go to the Appropriations table where it will have to accept the fate, whatever that fate might be, in the last night of the session, since this particular item is going to cost the State of Maine \$200,000.

The one problem I think, from my viewpoint, that I see, is the freezing level. And it is the freezing in the sense of, for example, let us take the community of Wiscasset. Of course this no longer would apply, but if in some other community in the future another large development would go into a community such as what has happened in Wiscasset and the law had not been changed, it would be possible for that community to receive the level that they were receiving previous to the large property tax benefits that they were now incurring.

Probably, as someone pointed out to me, we are not going to build another atomic plant in Maine so we don't have to worry too much about it. That may be true, but I think at some point we will have to think about it, and so today if for no other reason but to move us along, I am going to agree to let it go and have it sit on the Appropriations table. When we try to find money for all of the other

projects this one will have to reach the same fate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi.

Mr. SUSI: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Listening to this discussion on this topic it occurs to me that there is one element that has not been covered and I think should be brought out.

This \$50 million bond issue was sold to the people in the State of Maine, we claiming that it would be a saving to the State to have this money available, inasmuch as there would not be as much interest cost generated between the municipality and the State if this money were available for this purpose.

Also in connection with the selling of the bond issue, I believe that a time was mentioned, several years, I am not sure, something like eight or ten years. The way we are handling this bond issue in this session, and particularly in consideration of this item here, the bond issue, as I understand it, is not going to last anywhere near as long as we claimed to the people of Maine that it would last; nor is it being used for just the purposes that we indicated to the people when we sold them on the idea of passing this bond issue.

Now, this raises questions in my mind. We were having difficulty in selling bond issues to the people in the State of Maine and in my opinion — and I am not trying to scuttle this bill, I just want that we all be sure to understand, and there are people here who can tell us and I hope they will, just how long this bond issue will last in comparison to how long it was supposed to have lasted, an admission, if it is true, we are using it for purposes other than those purposes for which we indicated it would be used for when we sold it. I think we should level it, I hope that this information does go out to the public. If we should agree to the uses for which this bill would put the bond issue, we should do it openly and aboveboard so that the people won't continue to react in a negative way on bond issues when we do need them.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I concur with the remarks made by the gentleman from Pittsfield. One of the problems that we had originally with this bill was that we in the House had moved that it be committed to the Education Committee.

For some very strange reason by the time it got to the other body, that agreement disappeared and it was kept on the table and finally the bills were combined. I personally would have preferred that the bills had gone in the Education Committee and stayed there for a while until we knew exactly where we are going. I don't think I would particularly object to that motion being made now, for that matter.

But one of the problems that we have had is trying to get information on this bill. I have attempted for the past week to get information, some of which I have got, and other information which I think I have got and I don't particularly believe. We were originally told that the original bond issue of 50 million was going to last us about 15 years before we had to go back out to the people. I understand, and this is merely an understanding, because no one seems to be willing to go out on a limb to tell you with any certainty what is going to happen, but I understand from rumor from the department over there that at the rate we are going this session the bond issue could be depleted in five years. Now I don't know to what level this is true. I have no way of proving it either way. But it is important that we ought to consider these things that you know so that you can tell the people, and frankly I don't know the answers.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon.

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am glad that someone else here in the House does not understand the effects of this, either present or lasting. It seems

to me that we are talking only about \$200,000 as a cost for this bill, but it seems to me that there is another question that has not been answered, namely what is going to be the cost during the next biennium when some of these things we are talking about are taking effect. Has there been something kept from us? In other words, not intentionally, but have we not been properly enlightened with regard to how this would speed up, or what the overall expense to the State would be in a matter of four years or something like that?

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dixmont, Mr. Millett.

Mr. MILLETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think I have determined three questions which have been raised here in the last couple of speakers and I would attempt to answer them as closely as I can, and I don't believe anyone could answer them exactly.

The questions were, first of all, what was the initial expected life of the bond issue as it was determined when it was sent out to the voters last fall. I think I reminded this body earlier that a memo from Legislative Finance came out to all of the returning members from the 104th projecting the life I believe to some time beyond 1977. Now that was or would have been approximately a seven year, nearly eight year, period of time. It was not the initial intent to fund current obligations through the \$50 million project.

In other words we were thinking, I believe the sponsors of the bill, or as I indicated Representative Jalbert was responsible for the bond issue in the 104th. The idea was to cut back on the double payment of interest which exists now, and it was the intention of the bond issue to apply only to new projects. Now this is a practical impossibility to determine what new projects will be built in view of the available money.

But the projections that I see if we were to accept this bill here this afternoon and it becomes law with the effective dates that I have mentioned, the bond issue would be

depleted sometime in 1975. Now this again is assuming that the method of using this bond issue to pay back current obligations is carried out as indicated by the Governor's message.

Now other questions, I believe, the question the gentleman from Eagle Lake raised relative to recommitment. This is just a procedural question but I think it deserves an answer. This body did vote to recommit both bills. When the bills reached the other body the next day we already had a committee executive session scheduled for that day. And rather than recommit, we discussed the entire concept of the two bills at length, and came to a compromise, and I suspect the only compromise which the committee ever would reach, and you see it here before you.

I might indicate, too, for some who are not quite sure of what the amendment is, or how the bill stands, the entire bill is in Senate Amendment "A" which is under filing number S-113; so that is the entire bill in terms of actual language that is contained within the L. D.

The other L. D. 999 is being held on the table in the other body pending disposition of this bill. So there is nothing underhanded about it. It was a simpler procedure at the time to discuss the issue and to hook on the Senate Amendment to see how much support it would generate in the two bodies.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Webster, Mr. Cooney.

Mr. COONEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to rise in support of this measure, and read to you a short letter I have received from some of my constituents. Now I don't know how your mail runs, but I get a very modest amount. But this particular item and L. D. 999, which is a similar item, have generated three or four letters in my district.

And this one comes from the three selectmen and the three members of the school board in the little Town of Wales. And they write:

“Dear Mr. Cooney, We, the selectmen and school committee of the Town of Wales, encourage you to help pass the following bills:

“L. D. 999, submitted by Mr. Marstaller of Freeport, which would give school construction aid for all administrative units.

“L. D. 421, presented by Mr. Minkowsky, which would authorize construction aid to Wales up to 90 percent of the total bill.

“Since Wales is a small rural community with no industry except a few farms, it becomes increasingly difficult to provide our students with an education even equal to that found in surrounding towns.” As I said, it is signed individually by the members of the school board and the selectmen.

It is a bill which is extremely important to the people in my district, and I think to the people in all of our districts. In the little Town of Wales the use is going to be for three rooms on the elementary school which they have deferred putting on for some time now because of the cost. I don't think this measure will raid the coffers of the State on the part of the Town of Wales, but it will certainly help them, and I hope we will all help my district, all our districts, and pass this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Houlton. Mr. Haskell.

Mr. HASKELL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The Education Committee, during the winter, heard a great deal of testimony very similar to the material that was presented in this letter. Now it seems to me the factor that is going to act to accelerate the demands upon the issue are basically the fact that we are extending construction aid to the nondistrict schools.

Now it becomes extremely difficult to predict the effect of this because in many cases a new school or an addition is planned and worked out in detail with the department and then it is turned down at the local level. So, in effect, it does become extremely difficult to predict the volume of school construction and when you are unable to make this prediction

it becomes almost impossible to estimate with any certainty the rate at which a \$50 million bond issue will be used up. But the addition of nondistrict towns, making them eligible for construction subsidies, certainly will accelerate the use of the bond issue. The extent and the timing, I think the fact is it can't be predicted with any certainty.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Marstaller.

Mr. MARSTALLER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Several questions have been raised about the effect on the bond issue in terms of the time involved. The latest estimate that I was able to get from the Legislative Finance Office indicated that this amended bill, 421, which includes L. D. 999, would be the one year shortening of the bond issue. As has been stated, it is hard to get accurate estimates on what will happen with this combination bill. But I think that this is a very reasonable compromise of the two bills, and I hope you will vote for it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Livermore Falls, Mr. Lynch.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think there are two things that ought to be mentioned. First, it recognizes that over a period of years the percentage expressed in dollars and cents that the cities and towns understood they were to be reimbursed for their school construction has been lowered, and L. D. 421 takes this into account. And there is a freezing. The freezing means that the cities and towns will get no more than they were expected to get when the construction was planned, which I think is fair to all concerned. If the state recognized at one time that they were entitled to so many dollars, then the state should stand back of that, regardless of what takes place in the field of valuation.

The other is a recognition that when the bond issue was approved by the people, most of them, I am sure, understood that they were to be assisted in all school con-

struction, whether it was SAD's or School Districts outside of SAD's.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will order a vote. All in favor of passage to be enacted of An Act relating to School Construction Aid, Senate Paper 152, L. D. 421, will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

109 having voted in the affirmative and 5 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail. It was signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

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

Bill "An Act relating to Public Utility Transmission Lines" (H. P. 918) (L. D. 1264)

Tabled — May 7, by Mr. Martin of Eagle Lake.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It seems like it is one of those days. This particular bill, L.D. 1264, would give the power of determining whether or not there is a problem with environmental — any environmental problem would lie with the Public Utilities Commission, when applying to public utilities transmission lines.

It is my understanding that there is a bill before the Natural Resources Committee now which would, in effect, put this particular power under the EIC.

Now this particular bill came out of the Public Utilities Committee and not from the Natural Resources Committee. In speaking with members of the committee

and also with members of the EIC, it would be my feeling that perhaps what ought to be done is that this item ought to be tabled until the Natural Resources Committee has reported out the other bill, so we will know what direction they are going, and at that point we could probably act on this item.

My problem is that I don't know when they are going to come out with the other bill. And so I would ask perhaps that the House Chairman or any other member of the committee to give us some time estimate and if it is not too long, then perhaps we could table this particular item.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from York, Mrs. Brown.

Mrs. BROWN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We have made certain changes in this bill in the Natural Resources Committee. It is now a new draft. As far as I know, the general consensus on Friday was that because the site committee would have a right to go to hearings on transmission lines under 1264, that at this time it will probably not come under control of the site control in 710. But I think it would be wise to table this until we are absolutely certain that it is going to come out that way.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Williams of Hodgdon, retabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Wednesday, May 12.

(Off Record Remarks)

On motion of Mr. Curtis of Bowdoinham,

Adjourned until nine o'clock tomorrow morning.