

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 III

June 16, 1971 to June 24, 1971

Index

1st Special Session

January 24, 1972 to March 10, 1972

Index

**KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE**

HOUSE

Tuesday, June 22, 1971

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Jack E. Shankel of Augusta.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

Orders Out of Order

Mr. Kelley of Machias presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that Kirby Davis of Cherryfield be appointed to serve as Honorary Page for today.

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

Mr. Bartlett of South Berwick presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that Christi-Le Shankel of Augusta be appointed to serve as Honorary Page for today.

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

On request of Mr. Susi of Pittsfield, by unanimous consent, unless previous notice is given to the Clerk of the House by some member of his or her intention to move reconsideration, the Clerk be authorized today to send to the Senate, thirty minutes after the House recesses for lunch and also thirty minutes after the House adjourns for the day, all matters passed to be engrossed in concurrence, and all matters that require Senate concurrence; and that after such matters have been so sent to the Senate by the Clerk, no motion to reconsider shall be in order.

Papers from the Senate

From the Senate: The following Order:

WHEREAS, the private and special laws of 1941, chapter 69 created the Maine Turnpike Authority for purposes of providing an expressway from a point at or near Kittery to a point at or near Fort Kent, Aroostook County; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Government and the State of Maine have set up a system of interstate highways; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to said Act an expressway was built between Kittery and Augusta; and

WHEREAS, a portion of the Maine Turnpike has been designated for inclusion in said interstate highway system; and

WHEREAS, payment of tolls on said highway places a burden on users of that section of designated highway; and

WHEREAS, existing tolls create congestion on Route No. 1 and other alternate routes; now therefore, be it

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee be directed to study, review and analyze the operations of the Maine Turnpike Authority, its financial structure and the feasibility of reverting the Maine Turnpike to the State of Maine; and be it further

ORDERED, that the committee report its findings and recommendations at the next special or regular session of the Legislature; and be it further

ORDERED, that all departments and agencies of State Government shall cooperate with the committee and are directed to provide such technical and other assistance as the committee deems necessary or desirable to carry out the purposes of this Order, including but not limited to personnel and staff as a part of their regular employment; and be it further

ORDERED, that there is allocated to the committee from the Legislative Appropriation the sum of \$3,000 to carry out the purposes of this Order; and be it further

ORDERED, that the committee shall have the authority to employ professional and clerical assistance as they deem necessary within the limits of funds provided. (S. P. 291)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

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

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee be authorized and directed to study the subject matter of Bill: "AN ACT Providing for a Staggered System for Registration of Motor Vehicles", House Paper 1203, Legislative Document 1654, introduced at the regular session of the 105th Legislature to determine whether the best interests of the State would be served by adoption of such legislation; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Secretary of State be directed to provide such technical advice and other assistance as the Committee deems necessary or desirable to carry out the purposes of this Order; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Committee report the results of its study to the 106th Legislature; and be it further

ORDERED, upon joint passage, that a copy of this Order be transmitted immediately to the Secretary of State as notice of the pending study. (S. P. 576)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

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

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee be authorized and directed to study Maine Forestry District taxation practices among municipalities. Such study to include, but not be limited to, all forest lands of the State receiving forest fire protection, whether or not they are included in the Maine Forestry District; dedicated revenues and General Fund moneys as related to forest fire protection; and such other phases of Forestry District taxation and fire protection practices as related to the best interests of the State and as they affect organized municipalities therein; and be it further

ORDERED, that the State Bureau of Taxation and the Forestry Department be directed to provide the committee with technical advice and other assistance as the committee deems necessary or desirable; and be it further

ORDERED, that the committee report the results of its study at the next regular session of the Legislature; and be it further

ORDERED, upon joint passage, that copies of this Order be immediately transmitted to said agencies of the State as notice of the proposed undertaking. (S. P. 587)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

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

From the Senate: The following Order:

WHEREAS, the impact on both public and private ownership from the acquisition of land by the State Highway Commission is significant; and

WHEREAS, hardship is often the case when citizens lose their property for little or no compensation in the process of eminent domain; and

WHEREAS, landowners are subjected to extreme pressure to transfer certain title or interest at less than fair value under municipal contracts required by the commission; now, therefore, be it

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee be authorized and directed to study the methods and procedures employed by the State Highway Commission for acquisition of property and property rights for highway purposes; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Committee report its findings and recommendations at the next regular session of the Legislature; and be it further

ORDERED, upon final passage, that a copy of this Order be transmitted forthwith to the State Highway Commission as notice of the pending study. (S. P. 602)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

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

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee is directed to study the subject matter of the following bills: "AN ACT Extending Collect-

ive Bargaining Rights to Public Higher Education Personnel”, Senate Paper No. 447, Legislative Document No. 1337; “AN ACT Providing Collective Bargaining Rights for Employees of the State and the University of Maine”, House Paper No. 1119, Legislative Document No. 1590; and “AN ACT Granting State Employees and Employers the Right to Collective Bargaining”, House Paper No. 1160, Legislative Document No. 1610, in order to determine and develop, if possible, by consultation with experts in public labor relations law and such public hearings as it deems appropriate, necessary amendments to existing Municipal Public Employees Labor Relations Law as provided in chapter 424 of the public laws of 1969 and later amendments to bring all public employees in Maine currently under the jurisdiction of the State, under one comprehensive public labor relations law; and be it further

ORDERED, that the State Department of Labor and Industry be directed to provide the Committee with such technical advice and assistance as the Committee feels necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Order; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Committee be authorized to employ professional and clerical assistance within the limits of funds provided; and be it further

ORDERED, that there is appropriated to the Committee from Legislative Account the sum of \$2,000 to carry out the purposes of this Order; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Committee report its findings at the next special or regular session of the Legislature; and be it further

ORDERED, that upon joint passage a copy of this Order be transmitted forthwith to said department as notice of the pending study. (S. P. 611)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

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

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the Legislative Research

Committee be authorized and directed to study the subject matter of the Bill: “An Act Providing for Clinical Treatment and Rehabilitation of Alcoholics,” Senate Paper No. 3, Legislative Document No. 17, introduced at the regular session of the 105th Legislature, to determine whether the best interests of the State would be served by the enactment of such legislation; and be it further

ORDERED, that the State Departments of Health and Welfare, Mental Health and Corrections and the Office of the Attorney General be directed to provide such technical advice and other information as the Committee deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Order; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Committee report its findings and recommendations at the next regular or special session of the Legislature; and be it further

ORDERED, that said agencies of the State be notified accordingly upon final passage of this Order. (S. P. 624)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

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

From the Senate: The following Order:

WHEREAS, there is growing concern over the matter of educational leave being granted to some state employees and not to others; and

WHEREAS, employees on such leave remain on full salary and are provided expenses; and

WHEREAS, the practice of educational leave was initiated to help recruitment of specialized persons otherwise impossible to hire; and

WHEREAS, there is a strong feeling among employees that there should be rules and regulations relating to the granting of such leave; and

WHEREAS, such rules and regulations may best be promulgated and enforced by the State Personnel Board rather than at the discretion of the various departments; now, therefore, be it

ORDERED, that the Legislative Research Committee be authorized and directed to study the practice

of granting such leave and to determine the feasibility of promulgating and enforcing rules and regulations by means of the State Personnel Board which will carry into practice a uniform policy for educational leave for all state employees; and be it further

ORDERED, that the State Personnel Board and Department be directed to provide the Committee with such technical advice and other assistance as the Committee deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Order; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Committee report the results of its findings to the next regular session; and be it further

ORDERED, that said agencies of the State receive copies of this Order upon joint passage as notice of the proposed study. (S. P. 628)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

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

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee is authorized and directed to study the various methods by which the Legislature may exercise its constitutional authority pursuant to Article IV, Part Third, Section 1 of the Constitution of Maine to convene upon the call of the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House, with the consent of a majority of the Members of the Legislature of each political party, all Members of the Legislature having first been polled; and be it further

ORDERED, that the office of Attorney General be directed to provide such technical advice and assistance as the Committee deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Order; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Committee report the results of its study together with any recommended legislation to the 106th Legislature; and be it further

ORDERED, that a copy of this Order be transmitted forthwith upon joint passage to the Attorney

General's Office as notice of this assignment. (S. P. 670)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

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

From the Senate: The following Order:

WHEREAS, State departments charge employees varying amounts for furnishing such maintenance services as meals, rental or housing; and

WHEREAS, employees are charged for such services in some instances, similar State services are furnished to others without charge; and

WHEREAS, employee maintenance was estimated to return \$213,298 during the current fiscal year but to date is \$72,472 in arrears; and

WHEREAS, the State needs to develop and utilize a single policy applying equally to all state employees; now, therefore, be it

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee be authorized and directed to study the general problem of employee maintenance and to make recommendations to the next special or regular session of the Legislature for a uniform policy regarding all maintenance charges which can be applied equally to all state employees entitled to receive such benefits. (S. P. 675)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

In the House, the Order was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Hewes.

Mr. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, could there be an explanation of this order?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Hewes, requests an explanation of this particular order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Gill.

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure just what one we are on. Would you tell me the number?

The SPEAKER: Item nine on Senate Papers, 675.

Mr. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe I know about this one, Mr. Hewes. What this says is that the departments are supposed to charge a certain amount to each one of the personnel that are on the premises. Some is for housing, some is for meals, and things of this nature. Well it seems that we have gone by the figures that they say they charged. However, as you can see they aren't coming up to the figure.

One of the greatest problems is perhaps at the Augusta State Hospital, there will be a certain policy, at some other institution the policy will not be the same. So we thought it was worthwhile to establish a policy for the entire state.

Thereupon, the Order received passage in concurrence.

From the Senate: The following Communication: (S. P. 672)

Maine Scenic Highway Board
Augusta, Maine

June 15, 1971

Honorable Kenneth M. Curtis
and Members 105th Maine Legislature

Transmitted herewith is the initial report of the Maine Scenic Highway Board.

This report is being submitted in accordance with the provisions of the Public Laws of 1969, Chapter 453, Subchapter VI, Section 234.

Respectfully submitted
MAINE SCENIC
HIGHWAY BOARD

(Signed)

William Zoidis, Chairman

Came from the Senate read and with accompanying report ordered placed on file.

In the House, the Communication was read and with accompanying report ordered placed on file in concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Joint Order relative to Legislative Research Committee study of tax relief for municipalities on State-owned and tax exempt property (H. P. 1207) which was passed in the House on March 17.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. SUSI: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede and concur and would speak to my motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi, moves that the House recede and concur.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. SUSI: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We are now entering into the final death throes of this regular session of the 105th Legislature and it seems to me that either we can meet this death with dignity or we can go yelling and screaming every inch of the way.

The process has been established over the years, and I know many of you who have been here as long as I or longer know this better than I, but to some of the newer members this may be informational to you. At this stage leadership of both parties becomes involved in one, the Legislative Research table which has to do with items 11 through 20 inclusive before us right now. And they separate those orders which will be dealt with by the Legislative Research Committee and those that won't.

Now 11 through 20 have, by the decision of the leadership of both parties, been killed. I sat in on this session and in some instances there were duplication of orders and in some instances there had been previously studies made in the same field, records of which we have available to us. In other instances the leadership felt that these were not reasonable fields for the Legislative Research Committee to become involved with. But for whatever reason, the leadership has taken these positions.

These orders were sponsored by you and members of the other body, and the leadership fully recognizes that you are thoroughly committed to the purpose of the orders and the need for them. And I am sure that on each of these orders that are going to be killed here this morning, you could stand and give an excellent case, in case you are the sponsor or supporter of the order and give reason for perhaps the tabling of it

or insisting and asking for a Committee of Conference.

Now basically the decision that has to be made by all of us as a body is, shall we support the leadership of both parties in these final hours, or shall we go off in all directions asking for Committees of Conference and all this which could delay the adjournment of this session by days or even weeks in case we want to re-argue each one of these issues. Now obviously what I am asking for is your support for the leadership of both parties, and in supporting the position of leadership and for recognition that the leadership is not any more than any of us as individuals immune to mistake; we have probably made some mistakes, but we are asking your support in order to get this session completed.

There are further things which I would ask of you now in order to expedite the completion of our business. Obviously one is that you keep at an absolute minimum the amount of tabling. Each time that you table you are pushing the end a little farther away. We are hoping that we can get everything sent for engrossment today. I don't know if this is possible or not, but if we can keep in mind every action that we take here today, if we could put it to that test, will it make it possible for this bill to be acted on by both bodies and get to engrossment today? Any instance where we fail that, we are delaying the adjournment by a day at least.

So if you will keep this in mind, that obviously there are going to be good, legitimate reasons why we should add amendments and reengross bills and all this, that and the other, the same as it has been all during the session, but all I am saying to you is, the choice is now, is it worth another day of the session to add this amendment? Because practically speaking, it can come right down to that. So again, I am asking for your support. So far as we are able to, in leadership, we will be pointing out to you the dangers of any action which you take which may delay the adjournment. And let's all try to keep on speak-

ing terms — it would be great, wouldn't it?

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have been through many sessions, and I have seen the closing up of many sessions. I pretty much concur with the remarks made by our Majority Floor Leader. However, I feel that personally, even in the closing hours of the session, if I as a legislator feel very strongly that leadership may not be following the right course, I shall not hesitate to make my views known. And I don't feel that any members of this House, who feels likewise should begrudge, we will say, staying here another day or two perhaps to do things up in the manner in which they feel is right. I am not advocating a lot of debate. I earlier made the prediction that we would be here until sometime in the small hours of Sunday morning anyway, and I am still sticking with that prediction. I have got a fund here that I am going to collect on if that time arrives.

I know of some matters that I feel should be handled, and I hope they are handled in the way that I want them. And if I don't get them handled the way I want them, I am not going to begrudge another day for that purpose.

Thereupon, the House voted to recede and concur.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Joint Order relative to The State Planning Office under the supervision of the Legislative Research Committee, authorized to study the desirability of creating a state bureau under the Department of Finance and Administration (H. P. 1232) which was passed in the House on March 26.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Joint Order relative to Legislative Research Study reviewing State Laws relating to Health Manpower (H. P. 1262) which was passed in the House on April 8.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Payson.

Mrs. PAYSON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This order would allow for a study of licensure in the health care field which in other states has been found to cut down on the cost of health care. It would be financed and organized by such groups as hospitals and medical groups, and they would make the study themselves. This needs only the help of the Legislature as far as leadership goes in order to provide for information and cooperation from these licensed groups.

In those states which made the studies, they have found that these licensures has increased salaries only as they have been able to do away with it, and I think this would be an enormous help to the State of Maine, and I hope that you will allow this order to be passed — I therefore move that we insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Payson, moves that the House insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

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

Mr. SUSI: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi, moves that we recede and concur.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Gill.

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to support the motion of the gentle lady from Falmouth, and I shall be brief and tell you why. It was my privilege to serve on that committee that she does for three terms, and we were constantly besieged by bills to form official groups for all types of this. And at that time the only reason I could see that they wanted all these small groups of perhaps licensed persons and then another group for the assistants, and then another group for the assistants to the assistants, was so that they could bring pressure upon the employers and give them more money, and then in turn it would increase the

cost to the patient. However, I think that through this type of a study we could come up with an overall program in valuation so they could all be taken into a particular group rather than trying to form their own groups.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I move that a vote be taken on the motion to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi, that the House recede and concur. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

66 having voted in the affirmative and 49 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Joint Order relative to Legislative Research Committee study and review maritime laws of Maine (H. P. 1266) which was passed in the House on April 13.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur. (Later reconsidered)

Non-Concurrent Matters

Joint Order (H. P. 1281) relative to Legislative Research Committee study Bill, "An Act Creating the Maine Health Care Facilities Labor Relations Act" (H. P. 746) (L. D. 967) which was passed in the House on April 20.

Joint Order (H. P. 1297) relative to Legislative Research Committee be directed to study subject matter of Bill, "An Act relating to Licensure of Physical Therapy Assistants" (H. P. 530) (L. D. 692) which was passed in the House on April 29.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur on the preceding two Joint Orders.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Joint Order (H. P. 1303) relative to Legislative Research Committee study subject matter of bills:

An Act Prohibiting the Use of Certain Nonrefundable Beverage Containers (H. P. 940) (L. D. 1299), An Act relating to Sales of Beverages in Nonreturnable Bottles (H. P. 76) (L. D. 149), An Act Creating the Maine Litter Control Act (S. P. 262) (L. D. 768) which was passed in the House on May 5.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I thought I cleared this bill with the powers that be in the other body, also with my leader. I thought I had cleared it with the Majority Leader, and I, for that matter, am going to move that we insist.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Cote, moves that the House insist on its former action.

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

Mr. SUSI: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi, moves that the House recede and concur.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Cote.

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am very sorry that we are taking this action this morning, as this was a promise made by me and the members of the Legal Affairs Committee to one of the largest hearings we ever had. We know we have a problem with nonreturnable beverage containers, and I feel it is very very important to many many people in this state, and that is why I am going to ask you to vote against receding and concurring.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I don't know how we sometimes get involved in boxes such as this, but I think I am in one now. I agreed with the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Cote, to support his order and sending it back to the other body.

And then of course following that the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi and I had a conference. I feel, however, that I have to support the gentleman from Lewiston. I do feel that in view of the fact that a commitment had been made to both the bottling industry and also to the natural resources people, I am going to have to vote with him. And I would hope that the gentleman from Pittsfield is not going to throw me a brick across the hall.

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

Mr. SUSI: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think everybody understands that there is nothing personal so far as I am concerned or anyone else who is involved here, but I think we do have to have a workable program to get this session completed so that we can get home.

Now I am not at all talking about the merits of this order or any other order, but we have to establish a pattern, and this is the early stages of the closing of this session, and if we break this pattern I think that we are going to bust the whole ball game wide open. Because although these are just subjects for study by the Legislative Research Committee right on the tail of them are some of the money bills which have been knocked out of the box on the Appropriations table. Now these are sponsored by people here on this floor who believe in them completely. They are devoted; they have worked all session to try to get these bills as far along as they are, and they aren't going to sit still here and allow these to die without their putting up a fight, and they are going to have a good case for them.

After having killed all of these, we are still going to have to kill another half million dollars worth of bills, not add more on. Now if we start breaking down at this point by believing in these issues and supporting them and trying to keep them alive another day, you had better send a note home to mother because you are going to be late getting home for supper.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have been here and seen the closing of seven sessions. This is not our last day here by a long shot, and we all know that. There is a difference between Legislative Research bills and the Appropriations bills. The Appropriations bills you will not have much of a chance to keep alive. I will admit that. I have killed many of my own here on the Floor of the House. But on these Legislative Research bills, if you ask for a Committee of Conference on certain ones that you feel you definitely favor, I am sure it will not keep you here any more time.

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

Mr. DAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to go on record as going with Mr. Cote on insisting on this, because I think that if we don't have a Committee of Conference and if this doesn't go to the Legislative Research Committee for study this will be coming back in the next session in the form of another bill.

We are going to hold a hearing again, it is going to be debated, and debated at length, and it is going to cost more money to the State than if we have a Research Committee report on this; and if we had the Research Committee report at least there would be something for guidance in the next session.

Therefore, I would hope you people would go along with the motion of Mr. Cote.

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

Mr. AULT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to support Mr. Dam in what he just said. We know that this bill had considerable support. It was narrowly defeated in this body as well as in the other body, and the people that came to that hearing were strongly in favor of it. And I would say that if I come

back you are going to see another bill.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I believe there is a reasonable solution for this bottle program. Obviously we did not have it in the bill that was before us this time. However, I feel that it is a tremendous and a tremendously expensive program to the State of Maine. I believe that a reasonable solution can be found. I know of no better way perhaps than to attempt to make some interim study again on this matter.

I know you could probably all say that it has been studied and studied and studied, but it is a terrific problem, and it is a problem that we should somehow or other, not only state - wide but nation - wide, come up with the right solution. We can keep on tossing out bottles and cans the rest of our lives and the lives of our children and gathering them up and throwing them in a heap. Perhaps there is no solution but I am not ready to admit it yet. I will go along with the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Cote, in asking that we insist upon this bill.

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

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am sure that no time will be lost with this bill. I have cleared with the other body and my motion is to insist, and I believe it is going to be taken care of at that time.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will order a vote. The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi, that the House recede and concur on Joint Order relative to Legislative Research Committee study. If you are in favor of receding and concurring you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

29 having voted in the affirmative and 86 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the House voted to insist.

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

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take up a matter out of order, please.

The SPEAKER: Will the gentleman state his matter that he wants to take up.

Mr. DONAGHY: I was sort of stupid, I guess, to go along with the leadership. I had the same thing on a bill that I have in here and I think it is very important to the future of the State of Maine. It is the one on the maritime laws. It has had a very good hearing.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman want to reconsider something that has just been acted upon?

Mr. DONAGHY: That is right, sir. It is item 13A.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Donaghy moves that the House reconsider its action whereby it receded and concurred with the Senate in indefinitely postponing House Paper 1266.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I don't want to prolong this any longer, but as Mr. Ross has pointed out this shouldn't take a great deal of time, and here is the story very briefly.

The maritime laws are based primarily on the laws of Portland Harbor that were set up in 1918 before the days of radio, super tankers, radar, or any of these other modern things that we have today. It is completely outmoded. There is one other bill up in the Penobscot Bay that is quite different from Casco Bay — actually it isn't even Casco Bay, it is Portland Harbor. Maine is a maritime state and I feel sure will grow as a maritime state, and we should be prepared for it.

This is simply an order for the Research Committee to come back next time and tell us what they feel should be done to bring us in line with modern day transportation by the sea. I hope that you will go along with reconsideration. I know that this takes a two-thirds vote, but I still wish you would go

along with it for your own good and the good of this state.

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

Mr. SUSI: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would support Mr. Donaghy of Lubec in his reaction to this matter, and furthermore I would like to apologize to those who are sponsors or supporters of the earlier ones that were killed. Basically, in the name of fairness, if you are going to go against it on one you might as well go against it on the others, so I would suggest that when we handle this one, we reconsider all the others, and we could keep this ball game going all the way into fall, and it could be a lot of fun.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have already seen two of my orders go down and I have not said anything at all. Now I am certainly mindful of the fact that the leadership of both parties have a job to do. I am also remembering back in January when I made a few remarks and I stated that we were talking too long on several matters that we might be sorry for later on when we were in a hurry to get out.

I am not in so much of a hurry to get out to kill off good proposals that should be studied. Now the leadership of the House I respect; but the leadership of the House by their own admission must agree that they also are human. Now because I didn't think that two of my orders that have gone by the boards, that I have let by, were earthshaking, I let them go by. But that doesn't mean to say that I am going to give carte blanche just for the sake of giving carte blanche, I assure you of that.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Donaghy, that the House reconsider its action whereby it receded and concurred. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

44 having voted in the affirmative and 70 having voted in the negative, the motion to reconsider did not prevail.

Non-Concurrent Matters

Joint Order (H. P. 1325) relative to Legislative Research Committee study subject matter of Bill, "An Act relating to Property Taxation" (H. P. 1037) (L. D. 1428) which was passed in the House on May 14.

Joint Order relative to Legislative Research Committee be directed to study feasibility for acquisition or sale of State-owned lands (H. P. 1381) which was passed in the House on June 1.

Joint Order (H. P. 1382) relative to Legislative Research Committee study subject matter of Bill, "An Act relating to Cost of School Construction Aid" (H. P. 1340) (L. D. 1759) which was passed in the House on June 1.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur on the preceding three Joint Orders.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Joint Order relative to Legislative Research Committee study policies and programs at University of Maine complex (H. P. 1429) which was passed in the House on June 18.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This is one of the three orders that I put in; I will put in another one later on. But this is one of the three orders; the other two were killed and I said nothing. I spoke to the leadership of both parties on this thing; the leadership of my party very briefly, the leadership of the Republican party very briefly, as well as to the Speaker. I know fully well that if you have a friend on the Research Committee you might have these things revived anyway; but I don't want to go through that route.

I spoke to one of the leaders in the other branch, who mentioned

to me that he wanted no part of a witch hunt. I have an article here dated Monday in which it says in headlines that I am not looking for a witch hunt. I say very briefly that this order was put in with no other thought in mind than to attempt to bring in some rapport between the college administration, its board of trustees, the Legislature and the people. I don't think that there is an organization in the entire State of Maine, and I would go even further, where there is so much discord and dissension. There is a great deal of dissension, I happen to know, between the board of trustees and the University of Maine. They are divided into three areas. Those that would spend the kitchen sink dry; those that would be moderate; and those that want to just spend nothing.

Now here we passed a few years ago, one at the regular session I voted against, the complex, the big compound that we have now. At the special session I was literally conned into voting for something that I didn't want to vote. I am not going to stand here, but I will if I have to. And if I happen to be late for supper it won't be the last or first time. But I will reach in here and I will start reading letters from the University of Maine professorship, the parents, the students and everybody else, that will literally, those that don't have curly hair, will make your hair curl and those that have curly hair will make it stand up on its ends. Now my only interest—and I don't know what it will do to those who have no hair.

I literally intend to try to make an honest, sincere and serious attempt to bring some rapport or rapprochement between the University of Maine, the students, the professorships, the programs, the policies, the people, and the Legislature. There has been so much talk about the fact—in particular higher education programs, that the Legislature is against education. The Legislature is not and never was against education. I stated before, the University of Maine Chancellor made the statement at an Appropriations hearing that where years ago anything concerning the word education would go by without one word,

now anything that goes by without one word concerns itself with ecology.

I reminded him that that was not so. I reminded him that on two separate occasions bond issues were proposed before the people concerning the University of Maine. On the same bond issues were bond issues concerning themselves with vocational education and the Maine Maritime Academy. The University of Maine bond issues went down with a thud. The proposals for Central Maine passed resoundingly, as well as the Maine Maritime Academy. I reminded him that certainly we were not against education; we are just plain in a quandary.

We have got a \$53 million investment here and I think somewhere along the line the programs have gone down the drain. I well recall the remarks of the gentleman from Eagle Lake where he said we are a melting pot in Orono for all sorts of types of programs and studies. We inherited programs even in V-twelve back in 1942 that carried on until '45 that were dispensed with by other colleges; but it still hung on. And paid for not out of federal funds, paid for because — paid for by us and the University of Maine.

It is not my intention at all to go on a witch hunt; it is not my intention to have put in this thing because of malice. I was one of three members of the Appropriations Committee that voted for a high bond issue for the University of Maine. The Chancellor himself called me and said, "Forget the \$8,300,000 bond issue, I would rather have \$1,300,000 for maintenance work out the surplus." The reason he was telling me that, he knew he was insecure, he knew that a bond issue before the people would not pass.

Now we have got to continue with this program at the University of Maine, and until such time that the parties involved have an opportunity to get together and straighten out the situation by discussing it properly and at length, we will continue to be distrustful and the people will continue to say no to any pro-

posals that we put before them. This is one, in my opinion—not just because it is mine, I have lobbied nobody outside of talking to the leadership about it, I have lobbied nobody on this thing; I don't go into that operation—not because it is my program, because I see the very serious sincere need of it. I beseech you not to recede and concur, I beseech you to vote against receding and concurring, so that I can make a motion to insist. I would beseech you to do that, and when the vote is taken I move it be taken by the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It may appear strange to some of you that I, at the beginning of this closing day or days or weeks of the session, that I would be going along with two members of the opposite party in their plea before this House. However, I will say that both of them, in my opinion, they are very good Democrats.

You will recall that in debating the University of Maine problem, that I repeatedly stated that I did not wish as a legislator to attempt to dictate to the trustees of the University of Maine how the University should be run. And I certainly, at that time, I certainly felt that this should be a problem of the trustees more than a problem of the legislature. However, in the light of the very varied problems with regard to our University system that we face at the present time, and I saw in the paper just the other day, I believe the day before yesterday, where the president of the University of Maine at Presque Isle spoke before the Presque Isle Rotary Club regarding the problems of the branch of the University up there versus the total picture. I don't know what position he took, but he did speak. And there are many problems within the University that apparently in my own opinion the trustees have not begun to make the kind of corrections that I had visualized in the remarks that I made earlier

with regard to the University of Maine budget.

I am afraid that perhaps I am buying the idea that possibly a research study along this line, and there are many things I think of regarding what percentage of our youth can we logically plan to send to such institutions as the University or what percentage go to vocational-technical schools; there are all such things. There are many many problems that I, in the light we will say of what Mr. Jalbert refers to as perhaps a division amongst the trustees — I don't know that that exists, but I think there is maybe a very logical problem that the Legislative Research Committee might study which would result in good to all concerned. And for that reason I am going along with the gentleman from Lewiston in this matter.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, first of all I will pose a question. Has a motion been made on this?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that no motion has been made.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I now move that we insist and would speak briefly to that motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, moves that the House insist.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I was against the Super University from the beginning. But I also was sold a bill of goods, that this would be a great saving to our state through consolidated purchasing, elimination of duplication, and so forth. That has worked just the other way. It is more expensive. In my opinion, the great University of Maine would take the whole of the state if we would give it to them.

Now I am not jealous just because I went to Bowdoin College, which of course gets nothing from the State, but if there is any complex which needs study it is the Super University of Maine. And I will guarantee that this motion will not keep you here one extra hour.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Mills.

Mr. MILLS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: You may recall that on a previous bond issue I spoke and stated that I would be in favor of a bill to restructure the University of Maine if and when they didn't go through with what the cost of classified employees raises were. I believe that this could be the vehicle to do that certain problem for us and report it back to the 106th Legislature. I think that the action here today should be to insist and to really insist.

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

Mr. BINNETTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to add on a few words to what the Representative from Lewiston has just stated in regards to the operation of that University. I live within a mile as the crow flies from it. There are almost 400 people from my town who work down there. They are conveying information to me that I know is a fact, that a lot of corrections could be made down there that would save a lot of money.

I have been in contact with the trustees, and I can truthfully say they are not all in harmony with some of the things going on. I have had many of the alumni come to me and ask, "What in the name of heavens are you fellows doing down there at the Legislature?" And I ask them, "What seems to be the problem?" Well, we are not in accord with what is going on, all the monies you are giving them." So I tell them, "Well look, if you want to talk to the Appropriations Committee, I have a lot of confidence in those people, but I think that sometimes the job is done and it is put in lump sum figures, not broken down, they don't know exactly where it is all going to; and then, they are not on a line budget. They can transfer one fund from another; they can do just as they see fit." And I really think that this order is not a witch hunt, but it is going to be a correction and it is going to stop some of this unnecessary doings that are going on up there.

They do a lot of things up there that I can stand here all afternoon and tell you some of the irregularities that I know are going on, but I am not going to do it. I am going to support the motion that we continue with this order and see if we cannot get some results and get the people of the state to more thoroughly understand the needs of that University. It has been shown by two bond issues that have failed of passage. So therefore I think there is something lacking somewhere, and we might as well start in and try to clean house.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westfield, Mr. Good.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I agree with the last four speakers on this University of Maine question. The U of M has not brought the classified workers up to the state level. It has not indicated they have anything like that in mind. Consider the fact that the University of Maine can get together any complicated set of figures within 24 hours when they want money but can't come up with their own payroll in two months. I feel that some study should be made of this whole system.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Jutras.

Mr. JUTRAS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am in support of Representative Ross's motion for Mr. Jalbert. I have a very up-to-date communication from the University of Maine from the Business and Financial Affairs office, in fact from the Chancellor's office, and I shall read part of it to show that some work needs to be done. "It seems that criticism of the University of Maine is in vogue this year and everyone is jumping on the band wagon." It is not my purpose to jump on the band wagon. What Mr. Good has just said a moment ago, I was not going to talk about this morning. He said it for me and I thank him.

"I am sure" — I quote again from this letter that I received yesterday. "I am sure that some of the criticism is well-founded but your's was not." That is okay.

"We are completely dependent upon the good will of the Legislature in understanding and our every effort is made toward complying with the public policy it espouses. We do make mistakes and we do have areas that need improvement." This is from the University of Maine. "We are working on them constantly. The help and understanding of our lawmakers is vitally necessary to accomplish our goals." Sincerely, Herbert L. Fowle, Jr., Vice Chancellor for Business and Financial Affairs."

Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston 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 Bath, Mr. Ross, that the House insist on its action on Joint Order relative to Legislative Research Committee study policies and programs at University of Maine complex, House Paper 1429. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Albert, Ault, Bailey, Baker, Barnes, Bedard, Bernier, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Berube, Binnette, Birt, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Bragdon, Brawn, Bunker, Bustin, Call, Carey, Carrier, Carter, Clark, Clemente, Collins, Conley, Cote, Cottrell, Crosby, ummings, Curtis, A. P.; Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Cyr, Dam, Donaghy, Dow, Doyle, Drigotas, Dudley, Dyar, Emery, D. F.; Emery, E. M.; Evans, Farrington, Fecteau, Finemore, Fraser, Gauthier, Genest, Gill, Good, Goodwin, Hall, Hancock, Hanson, Hardy, Haskell, Hawkins, Hayes, Herrick, Hewes, Hodgdon, Jalbert, Jutras, Kelleher, Kelley, P. S.; Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Kilroy, Lawry, Lebel, Lee,

Lessard, Lewin, Lewis, Littlefield, Lizotte, Lucas, Lynch, MacLeod, Maddox, Mahany, Manchester, Marsh, Marsteller, Martin, McCormick, McKinnon, McNally, McTeague, Millett, Mills, Morrell, Mosher, Murray, Norris, Page, Parks, Payson, Rand, Rocheleau, Rollins, Ross, Santoro, Shaw, Sheltra, Shute, Silverman, Simpson, L. E.; Simpson, T. R.; Slane, Smith, D. M.; Smith, E. H.; Starbird, Theriault, Tyndale, Webber, Wheeler, White, Wight, Wood, M. W.; Woodbury.

NAY — Bartlett, Bither, Henley, Immonen, Kelley, K. F.; Lund, Porter, Scott, Susi, Trask.

ABSENT — Brown, Churchill, Cooney, Curran, Faucher, Gagnon, Lincoln, McCloskey, O'Brien, Orestis, Pontbriand, Pratt, Stillings, Tanguay, Vincent, Whitson, Williams, Wood, M. E.

Yes, 122; No, 10; Absent, 18.

The SPEAKER: One hundred twenty-two having voted in the affirmative and ten in the negative, with eighteen being absent, the motion does prevail.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act Providing Funds for the Maine Police Academy (S. P. 170) (L. D. 522) which was passed to be enacted in the House on June 3 and passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" on June 1.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: To acquaint the members of the House with what the procedure is, and the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi, has already done that on previous matters, but just for your information, those items that are coming now are those from the Appropriations table for which there is no funding.

It ought to be noted that we have available for the Appropriations table from the General Fund \$1,012,230. On the Appropriations table from the General Fund we have a total of \$10 million in items. On surplus we have available \$3,-

545,111, and in surplus we have \$4.9 million on the Appropriations table. Now this is just to give you some idea of really the number of worthwhile bills that have to be killed because of the lack of money.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would now move that we recede and concur.

Whereupon, the House voted to recede and concur.

Non-Concurrent Matters

An Act Increasing Salaries of Official Court Reporters (S. P. 171) (L. D. 523) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 14 and passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" on May 12.

An Act Creating a Second Assistant County Attorney for Kennebec County (H. P. 241) (L. D. 322) which was passed to be enacted in the House on February 23 and passed to be engrossed on February 16.

An Act to Pay for One Hundred Percent of Health Insurance Plans for State Employees (H. P. 364) (L. D. 471) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 7 and passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendments "A" and "B" on May 5.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur on the preceding three enactors.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve Providing a Minimum Service Retirement Allowance Under the State Retirement Law for Ernest F. Miller (H. P. 373) (L. D. 479) which was finally passed in the House on March 17 and passed to be engrossed on March 10.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Bethel, Mrs. Lincoln.

Mrs. LINCOLN: Mr. Speaker, I move that we insist and ask for a Committee of Conference. I would like to say that the sponsor of this bill and the next bill on the calendar has talked with the other body and they are in accord

with what we are doing now, by insisting and asking for a Committee of Conference, so I hope you will go along.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would caution members not to use the influence of the other body to influence this one.

The gentlewoman from Bethel, Mrs. Lincoln moves that we insist and ask for a Committee of Conference. Is this the pleasure of the House?

(Cries of "No")

The Chair will order a vote. All in favor of the motion to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

80 having voted in the affirmative and 10 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve Providing a Minimum Service Retirement Allowance Under the State Retirement Law for Grace V. Pullen (H. P. 374) (L. D. 480) which was finally passed in the House on March 17 and passed to be engrossed on March 10.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mrs. Lincoln of Bethel, the House voted to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act Appropriating Funds for Educational Costs for Maine Students in Private Schools of Higher Education (H. P. 475) (L. D. 836) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 11 and passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" on May 6.

An Act Providing for a Low Income Allowance (H. P. 575) (L. D. 751) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 28 and passed to be engrossed on May 24.

An Act Requiring Childhood Education Programs for Five-Year-Olds (H. P. 643) (L. D. 873) which was passed to be enacted in the House on March 31 and passed to be engrossed on March 24.

An Act to Create a Crime Laboratory (H. P. 919) (L. D. 1271) which was passed to be enacted in the House on April 28 and passed to be engrossed on April 21.

An Act relating to Staffing Committees of the Legislature (H. P. 1250) (L. D. 1571) which was passed to be enacted in the House on April 16 and passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" on April 14.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur on the preceding five enactors.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act to Appropriate the Amount of \$1,440,000 for Parking Garage Facility for the Capitol Complex at Augusta (H. P. 1341) (L. D. 1760) which was passed to be enacted in the House on June 9 and passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" on June 7.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mrs. Lincoln of Bethel, the House voted to recede and concur.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Provide for Full-time County Attorneys in Certain Counties and Four-year Terms for all County Attorneys (S. P. 657) (L. D. 1845) which was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence in the House on June 18.

Came from the Senate with that body voting to insist on its former action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed, and asking for a Committee of Conference with the following Conferees appointed on its part:

Messrs. TANOUS of Penobscot
QUINN of Penobscot
HARDING of Aroostook

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lund.

Mr. LUND: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: You will recall that yesterday in suggesting the tabling of the full-time county attorney for Cumberland County I made reference to the strong possibility we might

have an opportunity to reconsider the question of a state-wide system. You will recall that last Friday I took an active part in the debate which resulted in indefinitely postponing the bill providing for a full-time county attorney in certain counties.

This bill in its original form was L. D. 701 which provided for a different state-wide system of prosecutors, and this is a vehicle which I hope you may consider at this time. I would therefore move that we insist and join in a Committee of Conference.

Thereupon, the House voted to insist on its former action and join in a Committee of Conference.

Orders

Mr. Jutras of Sanford presented the following Joint Order and moved its passage:

WHEREAS, the Legislature has learned that Gerard T. Morin of Sanford was elected and installed as Commander of the Department of Maine, Veterans of Foreign Wars; and

WHEREAS, he has served with distinction in most of the Veterans of Foreign Wars offices and moved to his new post from that of Senior Vice Commander in Maine; and

WHEREAS, his recent elevation to this high office of Commander of the Department is a fitting recognition of his persistent efforts and devotion to duty; and

WHEREAS, among many honors he holds the bronze star and 17 battle stars as a veteran of World War II; and

WHEREAS, it is fitting and appropriate to recognize and pay tribute to such outstanding achievement and leadership ability; now, therefore, be it

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Members of the 105th Legislature now assembled in regular session extend to Commander Morin their heartiest congratulations and join his proud community and county in expressing good luck and Godspeed in his new office; and be it further

ORDERED, that a suitable copy of this Order, appropriate to the occasion, be prepared and presented to Commander Morin as a token of our esteem. (H. P. 1432)

The Joint Order received passage and was sent up for concurrence.

On motion of Mr. Porter of Lincoln, it was

ORDERED, that Mr. Stillings of Berwick be excused from attendance this week because of business.

Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Lucas of Portland presented the following Joint Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that Joint Rule 17-A be amended by adding after the first sentence the following new sentence: **The committee clerk shall endorse the bill or resolve to the effect that he or she polled each member of the committee as to his position on said report before the report is filed.**

(Tabled pending passage under the rules and tomorrow assigned.)

Mr. Lucas of Portland presented the following Joint Resolution and moved its adoption:

WHEREAS, in a move unprecedented in any State, Governor Kenneth M. Curtis established a Youth Task Force, composed entirely of young people from ages 15 to 24, representing all segments of Maine society; and

WHEREAS, the Youth Task Force was charged with studying the situation of young people in the State and with presenting recommendations to the 105th Legislature for programs and legislation affecting young people; and

WHEREAS, these recommendations have been presented in the form of a Task Force Report and are now being considered for comment by various concerned state agencies; and

WHEREAS, Governor Curtis has established by Executive Order a Youth Commission to be composed of young persons and State officials for the purpose of aiding in the implementation of programs to aid Maine youth; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That we, the Members of the 105th Legislature recognize the time, effort and sincerity of the work done by the Youth Task and the good faith in which

it was presented to us as a significant contribution to developing a dialogue between the present leaders of the State and the future leaders; and be it further

RESOLVED: That we hereby accept our obligation to pass upon the merits of the said Report and pledge to give a full and fair examination to the recommendations made within this Report and to work reward the implementation of these goals through legislation wherever practicable and desirable for the well-being of our state; and be it further

RESOLVED: That copies of this Resolution, duly attested by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Senate to the State Youth Coordinator and Task Force Chairman. (H. P. 1433)

The Joint Resolution was adopted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston presented the following Joint Order and moved its passage:

WHEREAS, the demands of American society require that each high school graduate or otherwise qualified person have open access to post high school education; and

WHEREAS, essential to such access are systems of comprehensive community colleges offering academic, occupational and general education to give students the widest possible range of options; and

WHEREAS, the function of the community college is to develop human potential with emphasis on meeting the diverse needs of individuals; and

WHEREAS, the community college seeks to serve the needs of individual students emphasizing service rather than facilities; and

WHEREAS, full recognition is given under the community college program to that one objective of all education, which is preparation for an occupation; now, therefore, be it.

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee be authorized and directed to study the feasibility of developing the community college concept with adequate provision

for state coordination and planning of community colleges as they relate to all forms and types of post high school education and as an integral part of the higher education system; and be it further

ORDERED, that the State Department of Education be directed to provide such technical advice and other assistance as the Committee deems necessary or desirable; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Committee report the results of such study at the next regular session of the Legislature; and be it further

ORDERED, upon joint passage, that a copy of this Order be transmitted forthwith to said Department of Education as notice of the pending study. (H. P. 1434)

The Joint Order was read.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In the Appropriations act was money for community colleges in different areas of the state, and the measure went by the board for two reasons: number one, no money; number two, there hadn't been too much study made.

The concepts of community college has vast differences of opinion, arriving itself to the possibility of combining the vocational schools with the University of Maine program, which I would object to in any event. Also the idea of the community college program such as we have here in Augusta and in Bangor, another concept which would prove very inexpensive but very effective, that should be studied, which would be based like a post graduate program in our high schools, which would not cost us monies for buildings, which would not cost us any money for food, for facilities, other than just the teaching programs, the teachers themselves, and the arrangements of the courses.

I think that this program merits a great deal of consideration. It certainly does in my area and it certainly does in the area of York County, and it does in the area of Washington County, and other areas that I can think of where

they do not have the facilities; and if we are going to have these youngsters say that they cannot afford the schooling and we are not going to give too much money for private colleges, then somewhere along the line at least for the first two years we ought to discuss and study the problem as to how we should handle it.

And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, even at this late date, I regret and I present this order proudly and I hope for its passage.

Thereupon, the Joint Order received passage and was sent up for concurrence.

Passed to Be Enacted Emergency Measure

An Act Providing Minimum Retirement Benefits for Certain Teachers (H. P. 1361) (L. D. 1776)

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

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I did not question this measure because I was afraid that the lady from Bethel was getting all of the funds that were being handed out today. However, I had seen it in its original form and I had not seen an amendment. If anybody would wish to answer the question, I would like to know what the present size of the appropriation is.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, poses a question through the Chair to anyone who may answer if they choose. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Bethel, Mrs. Lincoln.

Mrs. LINCOLN: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: In reference to the amendment, it is under filing S-289. It has been changed from a resolve to an act, and the money is \$53,870.

Therefore, this being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 127 voted in favor of same and 2 against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Emergency Measure

An Act to Create the Winterport Sewerage District (H. P. 1409) (L. D. 1851)

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. 122 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 Provide Mandatory Penalties for Commission of a Crime with a Firearm (S. P. 332) (L. D. 983)

An Act to Create the Department of Manpower Affairs (S. P. 659) (L. D. 1854)

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.

An Act to Amend the Employment Security Law to Conform to Federal Requirements (S. P. 663) (L. D. 1858)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. McTeague.

Mr. McTEAGUE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: L. D. 1858 is the bill to amend our Employment Security Law to conform with federal requirements. What we have before us is a redraft that was worked out between representatives of industry, labor, and the Employment Security Commission.

I thought originally to offer an amendment to this bill, but after consultation again with these various interests, I decided not to. I rise merely to offer an explanation of some of the language of the bill which possibly might be considered ambiguous and capable of different construction.

In Section 38 at page 13 of the bill, under A, there is a provision about two thirds of the way down in that paragraph to the effect that

“each contributing employer newly subject to the chapter shall pay contributions at the rate of two percent,” and it goes on. What is meant by that language, “each contributing employer newly subject to the chapter” is charitable organizations, for example hospitals which had not been subject to the Employment Security Law before but now are required by federal law to be subject to it; and also our small employers of three or fewer employees who are in the same position. They had not been under the law before, we are now required by federal law to put them under it, and we want to make clear that those two groups shall have the benefit initially of the special rate of two percent.

We also want to make it clear that new employers — however, they are not small employers, they are not charitable organizations, are not subject to this special break of a two percent rate. There is one other small matter in the bill in Section 37. We refer there to, at the top of page 13, the word employees appears. It should be employers. But with those two corrections and one explanation, Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill be enacted.

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

An Act to Amend Biennial Elections of Penobscot Tribe of Indians (H. P. 1399) (L. D. 1816)

An Act to Reorganize the Department of Finance and Administration (H. P. 1410) (L. D. 1827)

An Act to Create the Department of Transportation (H. P. 1411) (L. D. 1828)

An Act relating to the Parks and Recreation Department (H. P. 1415) (L. D. 1838)

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.

An Act to Create the Department of Public Safety (H. P. 1426) (L. D. 1852)

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

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

Mr. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: Last week the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lewin, prepared an amendment to this bill, and he was unable to present the amendment. In the interest of fair play I thoroughly believe that any legislator should be allowed to present any amendment to any bill. And then the legislature should decide the merits of that amendment. Mr. Lewin was unable to present his amendment, and I resent it greatly.

Now we have another option. We may kill this bill, and that is exactly what I propose to do. I oppose this bill because it smashes the Department of Inland Fisheries and Game all to smithereens. It takes the ears and eyes of the Department and places them under the State Police, and I am deadly opposed to this. Furthermore, I am not alone in my opposition. I think every sportsman, every fish and game club in the state would be opposed to it if they knew what was happening here.

I would remind you that this Department is not supported by general revenue. This Department is supported by the sportsmen of our state and out-of-staters. Last winter this Legislature enacted, and the Governor signed the bill, which I sponsored, giving the authority to the Commissioner of Fish and Game, the authority to manage the game birds and the fur bearers. And only a few weeks ago this Legislature enacted, and the Governor signed the bill, authorizing the Commissioner to manage the deer herd. The Commissioner needs a great deal of information to manage these resources. In the case of beavers, the Commissioner must know where the population of beavers are too plentiful. He also must need to know where they are scarce so that he can set up a trapping schedule for the beaver trappers.

Last winter there were hundreds of fishers trapped in our state. Not one came from Washington County. The Commissioner needs to know about the migration of

the fisher from the western part of this state to the east so that he can manage this fur bearer. Also over in the western part of the state sables are becoming very plentiful and are almost a nuisance. Yet there are very very few, if any, east of the Penobscot River.

Each spring the game wardens visit the singing grounds of the woodcock to check the population of this valuable bird. This information is directed to the Commissioner who in turn sends it to the federal people, and from that a woodcock season is devised. It is only by the hard work of our wardens that Maine was able to have an early teal season last fall. The Commissioner needs a great deal of information, and it must come from the men in the field, the wardens.

Let us consider the deer herd. The Commissioner must know where the deer are plentiful. He must know where they are scarce. He must know those areas where the woodcutters have cleared the land so severely that a grasshopper would starve to death trying to cross it. He must know about the deer yards. He must know the depths of snow in those deer yards, and the water content of that snow. He must know the minimum temperatures in the deer yards, and the wind velocities.

All of this information has been gathered by the game wardens, and supplied to the Commissioner. There is a constant flow; every week these wardens report to the Commissioner of the conditions in the field. And yet this bill takes the ears and the eyes of the Department away from that Department.

I am utterly opposed to it. Mr. Speaker, I move this bill be indefinitely postponed and furthermore, for the second time in five years that I have been here, I am going to ask for a roll call. And if this bill passes, I am going to see that the fish and game clubs of our state are supplied with this roll call.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lincoln, Mr. Porter, now moves the indefinite postponement of L. D. 1852.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oakland, Mr. Brawn.

Mr. BRAUN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I go along with the previous speaker 100%. As I read in my paper this morning, this is what this law will really do. Under the reorganization plans the warden would come under a new Department of Public Safety, under a Commissioner who would be manager of the law enforcement responsibilities.

The Department would include the State Police, the enforcement division of the State Liquor Commission, the wardens service, the Fish and Game, the Sea and Shore Department, the vehicle equipment, the safety division, the Division of State Fire Prevention, and the Department of Insurance, and the Maine Police Academy.

Now, gentlemen, these are so far apart it is pitiful, and I shall go along with indefinite postponement.

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

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: You have gone a great way with the State Government Committee on these reorganization plans, and of course it isn't just the State Government Committee. It has been the Research Committee from last time, and the State Planning Office, and the Governor's plans.

It seems as though the only department that can't take equal treatment, but must have more than equal treatment, is the Fish and Game Department. Now everyone else has been willing to go along and wait and see what happens at the special session, or even before the special session.

I would ask you to not be threatened with the roll call that will be passed out to fish and game clubs. We have been threatened with most everything from the size length of trout, and where we are going to hunt moose, and the color of our clothing. Roughly probably one fourth of our debate this year has been on this nature of things.

Now I think that — I just hope that you will hold your own and ask these people to wait and see what happens in the final draft of these bills.

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I had some reservations about these bills a few days ago, as you all know, and I am probably not happy with the way some of the departments are thrown in here; but I must object to my good friend, Mr. Porter's, motion. I am afraid that some of us are going to have to buy some of these bills with a little skepticism, but if we pass them out as Mr. Donaghy said right now we can perhaps correct the problems with them when we come in here for the special session.

I think that we would be making a mistake right now if we pick out one of these particular L. D.'s and try to put the wood to it. I am quite sure that there are a number of these bills that we are not happy with. I know the education experts in this House weren't too happy with what they did with the Department of Education, but it seems to me that they sat still and they were willing to gamble or willing to feel that these were a little more responsible and perhaps that they should give them pleasure too, and I feel that we should oppose my good friend's motion this morning and enact these bills.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Parks.

Mr. PARKS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise to support the motion of Mr. Porter of Lincoln to indefinitely postpone.

Having had a little experience in law enforcement myself, I can assure you that it is almost impossible for any law enforcement officer, whether they be state troopers, deputy sheriffs, game wardens, seashore wardens or whoever, he cannot effectively serve two masters. Now if we allow the game wardens and the Sea and Shore Fisheries to be placed under the direct supervision of any other department other than the Fish and Game Department or the Sea and Shore Fisheries Department, these wardens will lose their identity with their respective departments.

In the Fish and Game Division, as you all know, all the revenues are dedicated revenues. Not one cent comes from the General Fund. The wardens' cars, their radios and all of their equipment that they use, such as their boats, snow sleds, uniforms and aircraft have been bought from these dedicated revenues that comes from the sportsmen of this state. And I remind you there are some 240,000 of them, plus the 70,000 or 80,000 from out-of-state.

These are the people who are paying for the wardens of the Fish and Game Department and not the general public. The Department does get some federal funds from the federal government. Now these funds come from the excise tax on fishing equipment and so forth. If it is found that one cent of these funds has been diverted to other projects, other than what they were intended for, the Fish and Game Department would lose these federal funds.

Now combining all of these departments mentioned here in L. D. 1852 will not accomplish anything. It will only create untold damage to the morale of the Fish and Game Department and the Sea and Shore Fisheries Department and also the State Police Department.

The State of Maine is noted throughout the United States for its excellent Fish and Game Department. We are the envy of all other Fish and Game Departments in the country. And believe it or not, ladies and gentlemen, the Maine Fish and Game Department is the number one Fish and Game Department in the country.

If we allow this bill to become law, we will lose our position as the number one Fish and Game Department because the morale of our wardens, as I stated before, the morale of our warden force will drop, as they know they will be unable to effectively serve two masters.

I urge you for the good of our fine Fish and Game Department to vote for the indefinite postponement of this bill.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and

Members of the House: I certainly look upon the gentleman from Lincoln, Mr. Porter, as a very fair-minded man. However, I hope he will reconsider what appeared to me as a sort of a threat against any member of this Legislature who chose to vote against this bill at this time. I am sure I have a great many friends among the fish and game people of the State of Maine and I expect because of a decision that was arrived at in a caucus here the other day that I am going to vote against Mr. Porter this morning, because of the fact that I was definitely assured in that caucus that we would in January have ample time for — or I perhaps shouldn't say January — when and if we have a special session, we would have plenty of time to analyze all of these matters.

Now I have got some gripes too and I would have to oppose taking and setting up the Bureau of Pesticides Control where this Committee has agreed to put it. It would be in a group that would be antagonistic to the interests of agriculture and forestry. I would have to definitely oppose setting it up under the proposed arrangement that this committee has come up with.

However, after listening to the arguments of the State Government Committee the other day in our caucus, I certainly agreed at that time to wait until the special session and settle all of these problems and I regret very much. I think perhaps that this fish and game one has been pulled out here with the threat that all of our fish and game enthusiasts will all be told that we voted against them and against their best interests and their best desires. I am probably going to go along with Mr. Porter in the final analysis; however, I do think he is taking an unfair position.

I hope that what I have said — I am sure that I have a great confidence in the press, and if we do take such a vote under a roll call I do look to the press to correctly state the reason, we'll say, why I and many others I believe are going to vote as I am going to vote, against Mr. Porter. The rea-

son why we did this is because we had agreed that we would settle all of these problems at a later date, and I have confidence after listening to our leadership in that caucus that this very thing was going to come about. I have got to have faith that it is going to come about because I have the same questions as Mr. Porter does. I am going to vote against him this morning, roll call or no roll call, and suffer the consequences.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Jutras.

Mr. JUTRAS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Those who vote against Mr. Porter's motion are not voting against Fish and Game or Sea and Shore Fisheries Departments. This is not a bird bill; this is a bill concerning dollars and cents. The Sea and Shore Fisheries wardens and the wardens from Inland Fish and Game appeared before the Veterans and Retirement Committee and urged us to have them put in, along with the State Police, in the Department of Public Safety because it would give them the same retirement benefits that the State Police enjoy and the widows' benefits because of their hazardous duties, and they wish to be used as an emergency police force throughout the state whenever needed.

This is also saving money to the taxpayers, the people of Maine, especially where they have no organized police force in small towns. Yes, we are giving them a fringe benefit but it is like putting money in the bank, and I urge those of you who vote against Mr. Porter's motion that they are voting, to remind them they are not voting against Fish and Game or Sea and Shore Fisheries.

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

Mr. HENLEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I will second everything Mr. Jutras just said; I would like add a little bit to it. I shall certainly oppose the motion. I feel as Mr. Bragdon said also, that we have got to take a lot on faith. If we start tearing these bills apart-

now because of our individual objections to a few of the things that we do not like, we will be here until the next session anyway. I think, as Mr. Bragdon has said, we have been assured that we will have time and ample time to discuss, amend and change, and even reject.

Now just one more point on this particular bill. I feel that perhaps those that are taking issue with this grouping are losing sight of the fact that this does not as I say, repeat, it does not put all of these departments under one specific person; and they are not serving two masters. I think that you will find that the one thing in common which all of these groups in the Department of Public Safety is the common purpose of dealing with the powers of arrest. They are all officers who will protect life, property and possibly to enforce our laws.

Consequently, I think that is the part of the department which they feel should be grouped under that grouping. As far as the administration of those departments are concerned, the people are still going to be under their own departments, and with that simple explanation I urge you to oppose the motion.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I will be very brief. I view this as something like the super University of Maine which I was opposed and I would still be opposed to if we had a chance to vote on it today. I think it will accomplish about the same end. I certainly support the gentleman from Lincoln, Mr. Porter. I say if something is no good there is no sense in bickering with it for a year or two because the bad part of it I would like to see.

I don't think the Sea and Shore Fisheries or Inland Fish and Game should be in this deal at all and I view it as I told you about the Super University. I stood here on my feet on many occasions to oppose that it is going to save money. I think the only argument for this is that they are going to save money and I think this

should be a lesson to you people, the University of Maine when they put that all in one box, so to speak, and I think that you have got the same kind of a box here. And I hope you will go along with the gentleman from Lincoln, Mr. Porter, and kill this thing now so we won't have to talk about it for two years.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird.

Mr. STARBIRD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I oppose the motion of the gentleman from Lincoln. I believe these groupings of law enforcement officers do go together. In answer to the gentleman from Enfield, our problem with the Super U was that after we set up the framework we largely let them put the flesh on the bones.

I think if he will look at Section 2, the organization of these departments, it's we the Legislators who are going to put the flesh on the bones. It's we who are going to tell these people how they are going to be put together and set up in the final analysis. That is how we are going to save money. If we had done that with the Super U we probably would have saved money there. I urge you to go against the gentleman from Lincoln, please.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Southport, Mr. Kelley.

Mr. KELLEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I wish to support the motion of Mr. Porter. I have been very close to the Fish and Game Department and the Sea and Shore Department for the last 30 years. I would like to correct some thoughts that have been given to you here today. In the first place, if you go back to your Legislative Research Committee on reorganization, they did not recommend that Sea and Shore and Inland Fish and Game be brought into this general structure.

The Sea and Shore wardens, the Inland Fish and Game wardens have all police powers that a State Trooper has; and in many instances they have aided them. The fact is, there is a very close, fine working relationship between

all three bodies. They are all on the same communication setup. The first radio that the Fish and Game Department ever had was given to them by a sportsmen's club that I have the pleasure of being the president of.

This communications of course is very necessary. Now when it comes to the problem of equal retirement benefits, I would like to point out that the Inland Fish and Game and the Sea and Shore wardens contribute the same percentage out of their pay toward the retirement funds as a State Trooper. The State Troopers can retire in 20 years and it is 25 for the Inland Fish and Game and Sea and Shore wardens. So basically, although they would like the same 20 year retirement, they wouldn't necessarily gain it by this conglomeration.

I hope that you people will recognize the high degree of training necessary for a man to be a good Sea and Shore warden or a good Inland Fish and Game warden. You can't take them and move them around as much as you can a State Trooper. Their local knowledge is of great necessity to them, the knowledge of the local people as well as the conditions. If you had worked closely with the Sea and Shore Department you would have found that they came out with an estimate of 900,000 lobster traps set on the coast of Maine this last year. If you go through the records on the accounts taken off the back of the licenses you will find a very different figure. The correction is made by the local knowledge from the local wardens.

I urge you to support Mr. Porter's motion and I also think that you will find in the furthest corner of the building that that gentleman too believes that these two forces should not be brought in under State Police.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. McTeague.

Mr. McTEAGUE. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It strikes me that all of the various law enforcement functions do have some things a little bit special about them. Certainly the wardens do, both Sea and Shore and Fish

and Game. So do the people now in the Insurance Commission, who are more or less an arson squad or a fire investigation squad, and so do the State Police with their special knowledge in the area of traffic and traffic safety.

Part of the contents of the organizations that were placed under this bill were originally on a separate bill of which I was the sponsor. But I recognize the very hard and effective work the State Government Committee has done in making these hard choices and making them as well as they can and yet leaving us some flexibility to deal with new problems that they may be unforeseen at this time at the special session.

I would hope very much that all of us who are committed to governmental reorganization will go along and will defeat the motion for indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lewin.

Mr. LEWIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: All of the other bills that we have been hearing with reference to reorganization pertain to combining departments. This particular bill this morning would take out certain elements from different departments and put them together under a different head. I would like to briefly say that the Inland Fish and Game Department is divided into three sections, the wardens service, the research management, and the hatchery division.

Each of these divisions are dependent on the other. If we should split up certain sections of a department it is possible that the efficiency can be greatly decreased. Extra help necessarily would be needed to replace those that are under a different regime. And I cannot see money being saved in this program.

I support the motion of the gentleman from Lincoln, Mr. Porter.

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

Mr. COONEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In answer to Mr. Lewin, this has been done in other de-

partments too. We have taken many smaller bureaus out of an individual department and moved it into another department where we thought it would be more appropriate. I think the arguments that we ought to think about today concerning these wardens are that they see themselves, at least to my understanding, as law enforcement people. They seek the same retirement benefits. They seek from our committees the same enforcement rights as far as the law goes.

And I would remind you that this is, in my opinion, not the time to try and make these revisions. The interim committee will be meeting fish and game clubs, the departments, individual legislators can all come and make their recommendations as well as try and make changes during the special session.

So I certainly hope we defeat the motion of Mr. Porter and give this bill passage.

Thereupon, Mr. Porter of Lincoln withdrew his motion for a roll call.

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

Mr. MARSTALLER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hope you will vote against the motion for indefinite postponement. The committee has made this grouping in terms of the function, and when we put the flesh on the bones, so to speak, when we try to bring these departments into shape, if we find these groupings do not fit or are unworkable, we certainly will have this in mind and we certainly will hear what the various people have to say and that special committee will deal with this and then when the legislature comes back we can again look at the groupings. And I hope that as we just went along with another bill in terms of revenue sharing in which many people shared the idea, some felt that it had some problems, that you will go along with this idea and see if we can come up with a good solution.

Thereupon, Mr. Dudley of Enfield 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 Lincoln, Mr. Porter, that An Act to Create the Department of Public Safety, House Paper 1426, L. D. 1852, be indefinitely postponed. If you are in favor of that motion you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Bailey, Baker, Barnes, Bartlett, Birt, Bourgoin, Brawn, Bunker, Call, Carrier, Churchill, Clark, Dam, Dudley, Dyar, Emery, D. F.; Emery, E. M.; Faucher, Finemore, Good, Hall, Hawkens, Herrick, Hewes, Immonen, Kelley, K. F.; Kelley, R. P.; Lawry, Lee, Lewin, Lewis, MacLeod, Maddox, Manchester, McCormick, McNally, Mills, Mosher, Parks, Pontbriand, Porter, Rand, Santoro, Shute, Silverman, Simpson, T. R.; Susi, Trask, White, Wight, Williams, Wood, M. W.; Wood, M. E.; Woodbury.

NAY — Albert, Ault, Bedard, Bernier, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Berube, Binnette, Bither, Boudreau, Bragdon, Brown, Bustin, Carter, Clemente, Collins, Conley, Cooney, Cote, Cottrell, Crosby, Cummings, Curtis, A. P.; Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Cyr, Donaghy, Dow, Doyle, Drigotas, Evans, Farrington, Fraser, Gagnon, Gauthier, Genest, Gill, Goodwin, Hancock, Hanson, Hardy, Haskell, Hayes, Henley, Hodgdon, Jutras, Kelleher, Kelley, P. S.; Keyte, Kilroy, Label, Lessard, Lincoln, Littlefield, Lizotte, Lynch, Mahany, Marsh, Marstaller, Martin, McKinnon, McTeague, Millett, Morrell, Murray, Norris, O'Brien, Page, Payson, Rocheleau, Rollins, Ross, Scott, Shaw, Sheltra, Simpson, L. E.; Slane, Smith, D. M.; Smith, E. H.; Starbird, Tanguay, Theriault, Tyndale, Webber, Wheeler.

ABSENT — Carey, Curran, Fec-teau, Jalbert, Lucas, Lund, Mc-

Closkey, Orestis, Pratt, Stillings, Vincent, Whitson.

Yes, 54; No, 84; Absent, 12

The SPEAKER: Fifty-four having voted in the affirmative and eighty-four in the negative, with twelve being absent, the motion does not prevail.

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Enactor Indefinitely Postponed

An Act Proposing a Salary Adjustment for Certain Unclassified State Officials (H. P. 1427) (L. D. 1853)

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

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

Mr. DAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Again this week I rise to oppose L. D. 1853. In the first place, I think it carries a wrong title. I think it should be instead of An Act Proposing a Salary Adjustment it should read, An Act Proposing a Salary Increase for Certain State Officials.

Now as you go over these amounts — and before I get into this I would like to say, of course there will always be the objection raised that this is by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Council. Well any time you allow something to go on the books to give the people more money, it always seems that the advice comes out to let them have the larger amount, and it is always passed. I have yet to see any bill introduced in this session or the 104th that would reduce any of the top state officials' salaries.

Now if you go over these salaries and you break them down into the weekly salaries based on a 50-week year, which I gave them the benefit of the doubt, because I doubt very much if any of the top officials work 50 weeks a year. In number one alone this would bring it to \$470 a week, and in number two you would move down to \$440 a week. This is moving off with a \$50 a week increase which to me is way out of line at this time.

I don't feel it is necessary personally to give them any raise at all. However, I could go along maybe with a token raise; but to just arbitrarily take them all and give them a \$50 a week increase across the board, with the exception of one employee that has got a \$60 a week and the other one had a \$40 a week increase, they all are \$50 a week.

Now I think that with the action that was taken last week here in the House on the gas tax, and with this one if it goes through, I think this will say to the people of the State of Maine that really there is not much concern in the legislature for their pocketbooks, and when I speak of the people of the State of Maine I don't speak of the ones that hold the high pay positions. I look back at my own community with the 1,500 people working in the shoe shops for \$1.60 an hour.

If we can come down here and maybe some of the representatives will go along with this raise because they may have to do business with these departments and it would put them on a little better footing, this is not my idea of being a good representative, because personally I could care less about these people. I feel they are being in some cases overpaid now, and if anything, there should be an adjustment downward instead of an adjustment upward. And I could care less whether these people that be in their departments when I went in to seek information, that said hello or whether they ignored me, because I do not feel that it is justifiable to buy cooperation from any state official by giving them an exorbitant raise; and this is just what we are doing here this morning if we allow this bill to pass.

I think this would be another great vehicle for the people of the State of Maine in the repeal of the income tax. And I would hope that as of last week when I stood up on this to oppose it I did not expect to receive too much support; however, I was quite elated when the vote was taken to find that 57 opposed the indefinite postponement motion of mine but 54 went along with it. I would hope

today that the ones that voted for the indefinite postponement last week, that since there has been no amendment offered to this bill to bring it down, that you would be **consistent today and go along with the motion** I am about to make. And now, Mr. Speaker, I make the motion that this bill and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Dam, moves that this Bill be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I regret that Mr. Stillings, who is on active duty, is not here to take up this bill with you. He has been the leader in the study that has been made with the help of outside consultants.

In the first place, I think Mr. Dam pointed out, but I would remind you that this is not a raise, this is a salary schedule which will be given to the Governor and **Council as a top rate bracket** for these people in the so-called unclassified service.

I also would remind you that the last time there was a pay raise these people got \$9 a week raise, **the same as everyone else**. And it has been the policy of the State to alternate the methods of providing for possible raises. In this **case there has been an 11% increase** for other state employees, and for certain of these people there has been a possible 11% increase, no more, except in those cases where after study it was found in the opinion of the committee that some people were in the wrong classification.

We have upped a couple or three of them but we have dropped several of them because we felt that based on sound wage and salary administration practice, that we took into consideration the number of employees these people were responsible for, the type of employee, the occupation of these people that they were responsible for, their own knowledge requirements for the job and qualifications; also the amount of money that they were responsible for as far as the

State is concerned. And it does seem to me that we are sort of nit picking when we try to say that **someone like the head of the Highway Department**, we are giving him too much if the Governor did decide to raise his salary and give him as much — let's say it would be roughly more than \$6,000 less than the president of Pogo U.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In the true spirit of economy and also because of very poor timing, we refused to grant legislators a thousand dollar increase to next term. Now these officials that we are talking about here today are being paid very well according to the standards of the State of Maine. And I agree with the gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Dam, that this bill should be indefinitely postponed, and when the vote is taken I request the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Lawry.

Mr. LAWRY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am naive, but not quite as naive to believe that this is not a pay raise. I haven't seen a politician yet that if you give him some money he won't spend it and ask for more.

I also would like to go along in thinking that the Representative from Skowhegan should be reprimanded for even thinking that we should take a step backward in the **scale of pay**. In times like these, when we are in a recession, call it what you want, it seems unconscionable that we would be putting the taxpayers of the State of Maine, putting on them again to raise salaries, which as the Representative from Bath said, are quite adequate.

I was going to say something about some individual heads, but they have pretty well been covered in previous debate. But one thing I would like to say while on the subject of payroll and taxes, I would like to go on record as being most appreciative for what the taxpayers of the State of Maine have put up with. They have sup-

ported this government and the federal government, and I think it is high time we showed them that we are a little bit considerate of their money and go along with the indefinite postponement of this bill.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill was one which the State Government Committee went through many agonizing hours in bringing to a final form. I would like to help the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Donaghy, to defend the bill before you because I think that, in contrast with what some of the other speakers said, that this is a reasonable measure. There is no money attached to it directly. It will enable, if it is deemed necessary by the Governor and Council, the salaries of some people to be raised. It also lowers the classification of certain other individuals.

We tried to figure out objectively what the people that are in this unclassified area do for work, how many people they supervise, and the amount of money that they supervise. I would like to take just one example. You notice that we have added the Commissioner of Education into the category number one. Now we have had a lot of interest on the part of educators throughout the state saying that the Commissioner of Education in the State of Maine should be paid more, and we have indicated that he will be able to be paid up to \$23,500.

And in answer to what Mr. Ross said about the people receiving a wage commensurate with what is standard for the state, I would like to point out to him and the rest of the members of the House that the incumbent in that job of Commissioner of Education, as I understand it, took a salary cut when he took his present job, and he came from within the State of Maine.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think the gentleman from Orono is being somewhat naive when he states

that there is no money involved in this; this is an impossibility, of course I did not hear the first part of the debate, and I do not know all about this bill because I have not had an opportunity to study it. Of course the money is set up in the Part II budget to provide for this salary increase. And because I do not have the Part II budget here, when I get through I would appreciate it very much if somebody would tell me what the total amount of the cost of this salary raise is. I understand it is probably somewhere in the neighborhood of 12 or 15 per cent increase, which is comparable with what the Appropriations Committee gave to the lower paid employees.

Somehow or other, strangely, I somehow feel and am highly sympathetic to the statements of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, that perhaps we would not be going too far wrong if we did not get too concerned about the passage of this bill. Granted, I buy the idea perhaps that high paid employees are entitled to raises, just the same as the lower paid employees. However, when we discussed the matter of the University of Maine, there was a group up there who strongly said, "You must do something for these low paid employees," and they were not as much concerned with regard to those in the \$25,000 bracket. And frankly, because I wouldn't know what to do with \$25,000 a year, it bothers me a little bit to understand why we are getting too concerned about these. I don't really worry that we are going to lose a great many highly paid employees if we should by any strange quirk of fate attempt to save this amount of money by not granting this increase.

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

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I will try to clarify this. I understand that the money, it is in the Part II budget. We have also got in the preamble that all employees that are not of a classified nature will receive the same pay increase as the classified employees. So if I am considering this right, these

employees are going to get a raise. And all that this bill does, which the State Government Committee has considered, is to rearrange some of the classifications. I see by the bill they have dropped some; evidently they felt that position was not a position that would require the amount of salary they got, and they have raised some.

The final institution of this program is up to the Governor and Council. This would give them a vehicle to use. But I would like to be corrected if I am wrong, but I believe we have got the language in the preamble of the Part II budget, and it has now been signed or enacted, or whatever happened to it down there, which these people are going to get a percentage raise, and they need this legislative document to change certain positions and categories.

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

Mr. DAM: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: To my good friend from Orono, Mr. Curtis, I would like to admit this morning that I must be rather thick in the head because I don't quite comprehend his statement that he made when he said no money was attached directly. Because in a statement made afterward, he said there was money in the Part II budget.

Now last Thursday they brought out, I think, the fact that this would cost \$110,000, approximately. Also to Mr. Curtis, he said some of these employees were put in a lower classification. This is true, but the same time they were reduced in their classification, they were still given a healthy raise. And as far as the people coming back to the State of Maine to work for less money, there have been quite a few in many fields that have come back to the State of Maine and have worked for less money than they can get in some other state because they want to live in the State of Maine, because they think the State of Maine is a good state. I don't think this has any bearing on this bill today at all.

And I think another area we should look at is that these departments, do they ever talk

about having any efficiency? Do they work to make their department more efficient?

Now when I look at one part of one category, one person or one department head, whatever you want to put the label on, and I see giving this man a raise, it is not a raise for efficiency; we have given the man a raise for inefficiency. Now to me, I just don't buy this at all, and I think the time has come to hold the line, and this is not holding the line when you grant these exorbitant raises. I do think that even right now, without this, that these department heads are getting paid and getting paid quite well, and I would hope that you would support the motion to indefinitely postpone.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have some fright of a bill of this nature for reasons that haven't been mentioned here this morning. My fright on a bill like this is delegating our power to the Council or anybody. Now this I feel, as I was sent here to do, to either raise, lower, or keep the same salaries, and this I want to do. Now if you were asked to vote for a bill for an increase or a decrease, that is one thing, but a bill of this type delegates your authority to somebody else, and this I am opposed to. So many legislatures have met here and delegated their power to a point where we almost don't have any.

Now for some of you in the House that have fright that some of these people are going to quit, I would like to enlighten you on this fright. Within my legislative district there are lots of qualified people that could fill any of these jobs, and most of them are unemployed at this time and would be tickled to death to have any one of these jobs. And I put my head on the line that they can do any one of these jobs; they are qualified people with lots of experience. Some of them have worked out of state and they would be tickled to get back here away from all the riots, and they

would be tickled to death to have one of these jobs. So don't have any fright about any of these people getting done. I would like to enlighten you on that.

Now there is just one other thing while I am on my feet, these people back home are getting less money and less jobs, and the economy of this nation and this state is getting worse and worse. Pick up your morning paper and look at the stock market the last three days, or any other barometer you want to look at. None of these suggest increases, and I hope that you this morning will go along with the gentleman, Mr. Dam, and see that this is buried deep in the files so that it doesn't come up again this year. It comes up every year and we increase them every year. And I think that it is time that we bring this to a crying halt as long as there are plenty of qualified people who want these jobs. So I don't think we need to say any more; just vote and think.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Back in the 103rd session we set up a salary system for unclassified state employees. And I can recall at that time the reason why it was done. The members of the State Government Committee then thought that this was the proper way of setting up categories, rather than having the Governor and Council just go anywhere that they wanted to and where the friendship might lie. But doing it this way, it was hoped that at least the salaries would be within a certain category that could be assigned to an individual and match it with the capabilities and the responsibilities that he might have.

Now I think to some degree we might be arguing a moot point this morning, because I think it is important to take a look at L. D. 1811 which is, of course, the Part II budget. And in the Part II budget, in the middle of the page, there is a section that deals with the unclassified employees subject to Governor and Council determination, and secondly, a

classification — also a section that deals with unclassified employees not subject to the Governor and Council.

Now both of these say basically the same thing, and what they say, and let me read it for you, it says, "With respect to unclassified employees whose wage rates are subject to Governor and Council determination, the Governor and Council shall grant similar and equitable treatment." This means that when we go home the Governor and Council is going to give them the same rate of increase that we gave the state employees in the same pay range. So we are not talking per se about raising money under this L. D.

As I understand it, according to the Legislative Finance office, these figures would have to be dispensed by law to the members of those departments, in accordance with the wishes of the L. D., and that is L. D. 1811, the Part II budget.

I am not saying that I approve or disapprove of this, and I am not saying that anyone sandbagged us into this because I think at that point in 1811, everyone had it before them then. It was brought to my attention this morning and it is indeed accurate, because the Finance Office tells me that this is exactly what would take place. Let me repeat it again, that the salaries are going to be adjusted accordingly under that L. D.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Lawry.

Mr. LAWRY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Eagle Lake, if I might.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may pose his question.

Mr. LAWRY: Mr. Speaker, do I understand correctly that whether we increase these upper limits that the raises can be made in excess of them?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Lawry, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin, who may answer if he chooses; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It is my understanding that if we do not change the rate structure as provided for in this bill, then under L. D. 1811 the Governor and Council would have to take the same percentage — the same percentage that they gave to the other employees in the same category and make it accordingly.

I have been informed that if we would pass this bill it would be possible actually not to give them some of the percentages that we have been talking about. Now I don't know any more than that, than what I am telling you now.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: The statement of the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin, is correct. I think that the House Chairman of the Committee would explain it further. I mean he referred himself to Mr. Stillings who is really the architect on this measure. I was asked to present it, and I could certainly agree with the thinking of both the gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Dam, and the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Lawry.

However, we have the language in the Part II budget wherein it concerns this program. I think in further answer to the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Lawry, they couldn't go beyond the will of the language in the Part II budget.

I also would like to comment on the remarks of the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley. I insisted that there be some language in the Part II preamble which would indicate that departmental heads could no longer just transfer at will from one category to another as they have been in the habit of doing. Because you people may not believe this, but I assure you that being a frequent visitor out of session of the legislature, what happens, and has happened, and will not happen now, is that departments are divided up between councillors, and the stack of orders are usually this high in transfers from one area to another, from Personnel Services to All Other,

to Capital and back and forth. And that is where the gentleman from Enfield and I agree wholeheartedly. And that is why on two occasions as a member of this Legislature I have advocated item by item line budgeting which would straighten out this situation once and for all.

There also was my insistence, and thank you very much for having supported me in the order that I put in for the University of Maine. I will say, however, that when you consider that the assistant to the Chancellor of the University of Maine is getting some \$5,000 more presently than the Commissioner of Education, you only get what you pay for. I am also mindful of the fact that a loaf of bread costs a fellow who digs the ditch as much as it costs the fellow who is the bank president. But that is the way the ball game operates and has been operating.

This is not a salary raise. It is not even a mandate to the Governor's Council. It is merely putting a salary range program within an adjustment that is already made in Part II.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I don't think I need to attempt to explain anything more about this. Perhaps I was aware that there was a salary percentage increase in the Part II budget; I didn't object to the members of the Legislature all being aware of this fact too.

If anything about the whole matter bothers me, it is the fact of what is the connection between the bill which you are now considering that came out of the State Government Committee, and how does one tie in with the other? If any member of the State Government Committee would choose to attempt to explain that—perhaps it has already been explained, because I was out when some of the debate was made, but I am not familiar with this tie-in.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oakland, Mr. Brawn.

Mr. BRAWN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: I did oppose this bill the other day, and

I still oppose it today. I made a statement the other day that this would exceed a \$160,000 or \$180,000. After talking with some of the people who were better informed than I, this could run to better than a half a million dollars.

Now when we speak about percentages here this morning, 12 per cent, you just take your little pencil and paper; a man that is getting \$22,000, and he gets 12 per cent, he has got a raise of \$2,640. That makes his pay at the end of the year \$24,640. Take the little man that works underneath him who is getting \$6,000, and he gets 12 per cent. He is getting a \$720 raise; so he does not get only \$6,720 at the end of the year.

In other words, the fat guy is getting fatter and the poor guy is getting poorer, and each year that you do this they are going farther and farther apart. Gentlemen, I have talked with some of the men in these departments. They figured if they asked for this they might get something. They didn't expect any \$2,500 raise right across the board. I haven't found any of them that have.

Now I am afraid where we have just passed this gasoline tax, should we go to work and do a thing like this, that John Q. Public will vote against this tax which we have now coming before referendum, and where are we going to get this extra money from?

And when they tell me about these men that are so well dedicated that we cannot get along without them, we better pay them; gentlemen, 90 percent of these men or women that are in these positions could not get a job with this amount of money, and I doubt if they could get a job anywhere else at this pay. And when I see young men and women come out of our colleges today and they cannot find a job even during the summer, only to shovel gravel, mow lawns, and some of them can't get that to do. I know one boy that is peddling eggs right now to try to get a dollar. Now these people don't want to think that someone can't fill these jobs, and they can fill it for less than that.

While we are so tight here for money that we cannot raise \$37,000 for one position, and still we can

step in here and say \$200,000 to a half a million, I think it is time that this was indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westfield, Mr. Good.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Considering the fact that the starting rates for some employees of the University of Maine is \$64 a week, and the starting salary of some Maine state employees is \$73.20 a week, I think it is utterly ridiculous to advocate a raise for employees getting three or four hundred dollars a week now. We have University of Maine employees working for less than \$1.63, and we have State of Maine employees that are working for less than \$100 a week. I think that is enough said about this.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: There have been several speakers who have mentioned that this money is in the Part II budget. I can see no harm in not spending all of the Part II budget, but for once saving a little bit of it. There are many qualified and well educated persons holding masters degrees and PhD degrees who are currently unemployed all over this country. They would jump at the chance to come to Maine for \$21,000, \$20,000, \$19,000, or even the lowest paid in this bill, which is \$14,500.

If we defeat this specific bill, and the Governor and Council do it anyway, I don't believe they will be acting in a very responsible manner, and I am quite sure that the people of the State of Maine will realize that fact.

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I arise to support the motion to indefinitely postpone, and there are just one or two little incidents I want to state here. Example — I think the Governor and Council won't give these people these increases because generally

they are very responsible people in there and they usually go along with the wishes of the members of this Legislature, whether it is the 105th or the 104th.

And I think Mr. Dudley made a good point when he was talking about delegating their power. It seems to me we are quite concerned over department heads and classified and unclassified employees, and it seems now that they are saying that the Governor and Council have got an opportunity in this particular bill to bring up pay increases. I just wondered where some of these people were when we were talking about the unclassified people at the University. I feel that if there is anything constructive we could do here, as what Mr. Jalbert's order was pertaining to, looking into the financial structure of the University of Maine, perhaps we ought to take and bring back the salaries of these people and have them being paid down here. We don't have any control over it.

As Mr. Good stated, that up there they start in at \$64, and the classified employee down here may start at \$73, and the difference between them is too much, I feel that if we want to be constructive and if we want to do something for the people up at the University of Maine that we have been hollering about in here, I think we ought to vote this bill down this morning because the Council, believe me, I believe in the Governor's Council; I have always supported it. I would never vote to repeal it, because they are responsible people and they try to do the wishes of this Legislature.

And if we tell them right here and now that we don't want to pass this document and we don't want those people to get those increases, those responsible people in here are going to bear us in mind and when these pay requests come up they are going to my way of thinking, are going to kill them.

Mr. Finemore of Bridgewater moved the previous question.

The SPEAKER: For the Chair to entertain a motion for the previous question it must have the consent of one third of the members pres-

ent and voting. All members desiring the Chair to entertain the motion for the previous question will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken, and more than one third of the members present having expressed a desire for the previous question, the motion for the previous question was entertained.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is, shall the main question be put now? This is debatable with a time limit of five minutes by any one member.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am going to speak in opposition to the motion on the floor. I too would like to get out quickly, but I have one little example I would like to place in the debate, and I think it will be important.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Lawry.

Mr. LAWRY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I too have one little point, but I would just as soon forego it so we can move the question.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a corporal I would like to listen to the remarks of Mr. Lawry. I am opposed to the motion for the previous question.

The SPEAKER: All in favor of the main question being put now will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

82 having voted in the affirmative and 39 having voted in the negative, the main question was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Dam, that L. D. 1853 be indefinitely postponed. 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 Skowhegan, Mr. Dam, that An Act Proposing a Salary Adjustment for Certain Unclassified State Officials, House Paper 1427. L. D. 1853, be indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence. If you are in favor of that motion you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Albert, Ault, Bailey, Baker, Barnes, Bartlett, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Berube, Binnette, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Bragdon, Brawn, Brown, Bunker, Call, Carey, Carrier, Carter, Churchill, Clark, Cote, Cottrell, Crosby, Curtis, A. P.; Cyr, Dam, Drigotas, Dudley, Dyar, Emery, D. F.; Emery, E. M.; Evans, Faucher, Fecteau, Finemore, Gagnon, Genest, Good, Goodwin, Hall, Hawkens, Henley, Herrick, Immonen, Jutras, Kelleher, Kelley, K. F.; Kelley, P. S.; Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Lawry, Lebel, Lee, Lessard, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Littlefield, Lizotte, Lynch, MacLeod, Maddox, Manchester, Marsh, McCormick, McNally, Mills, Mosher, Page, Parks, Porter, Rand, Rocheleau, Rollins, Ross, Scott, Shute, Silverman, Simpson, L. E.; Susi, Tanguay, Trask, Tyndale, Webber, Wheeler, White, Wight, Williams, Wood, M. W.; Wood, M. E.; Woodbury.

NAY — Bedard, Bernier, Birt, Bither, Bustin, Clemente, Collins, Conley, Cooney, Cummings, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Donaghy, Dow, Farrington, Fraser, Gill, Hancock, Hanson, Hardy, Haskell, Hayes, Hewes, Hodgdon, Jalbert, Kilroy, Lucas, Lund, Mahany, Marstaller, Martin, McKinnon, McTeague, Millett, Morrell, Murray, Norris, O'Brien, Payson, Pontbriand, Shaw, Simpson, T. R.; Slane, Smith, E. H.; Starbird, Theriault.

ABSENT — Curran, Doyle, Gauthier, McCloskey, Orestis, Pratt, Santoro, Sheltra, Smith, D. M.; Stillings, Vincent, Whitson.

Yes, 93; No, 45; Absent, 12.

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

Sent up for concurrence.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I now move that we reconsider our action whereby this bill was indefinitely postponed, and I certainly hope you will vote against me.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, moves the House reconsider its action whereby the Bill was indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I want to thank Mr. Ross for opening this up again. The point that I wanted to make before, and I think that it is important that we keep a little example like this —

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that he may not debate. The previous question has been entertained and put. This is a matter of reconsideration and it is not debatable because of the previous question mandate.

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I hope it is reconsidered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, that the House reconsider its action whereby this Bill was indefinitely postponed. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

31 having voted in the affirmative and 95 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

An Act Establishing a State-Municipal Revenue Sharing Program (H. P. 1428) (L. D. 1859)

Was 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.

Order Out of Order

Mr. Dyar of Strong presented the

following Joint Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the State Departments of Health and Welfare and Labor and Industry be authorized and directed to investigate and study sanitation, food handling and the employment of minors under existing law, as they relate to the operation and working conditions in summer camps of both profit and nonprofit corporations; and be it further

ORDERED, that said departments report the results of such investigation and study to the 106th Legislature (H. P. 1435)

The Joint Order was received out of order by unanimous consent, read and passed and sent up for concurrence.

(Off Record Remarks)

On motion of Mr. Susi of Pittsfield,

Recessed until two-thirty o'clock in the afternoon.

After Recess
2:30 P.M.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

Orders of the Day

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

SENATE JOINT ORDER — Re Creation of Joint Interim Committee to study financial impact upon State of Maine of (S. P. 524) (L. D. 1519) "An Act relating to Payment of Expenses of Supreme Judicial Court and The Superior Court by the State." (S. P. 667)

Tabled — June 21, by Mr. Porter of Lincoln.

Pending — Passage in concurrence.

On motion of Mr. Porter of Lincoln, retabled pending passage in concurrence and tomorrow assigned.

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

SENATE JOINT ORDER — Re Speaker of House and not exceeding 4 members of the House, President of Senate and not exceeding 4 members of the Senate; also Law

and Legislative Reference Librarian Edith L. Hary, attend conferences of National Legislative Conference during 1971 calendar year. (S. P. 648) — In Senate, read and passed. — In House, passed as amended by House Amendment "A" (H-470) in non-concurrence.

Tabled — June 21, by Mr. Porter of Lincoln.

Pending — Further consideration.

On motion of Mr. Porter of Lincoln, retabled pending further consideration and tomorrow assigned.

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

JOINT ORDER — Re Secretary of Senate's duties and responsibilities when Senate is not in session. (S. P. 654) — In Senate, passed.

Tabled — June 21, by Mr. Porter of Lincoln.

Pending — Passage in concurrence.

On motion of Mr. Porter of Lincoln, retabled pending passage in concurrence and tomorrow assigned.

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

JOINT ORDER — Re Interim telephone privileges (S. P. 655) — In Senate, passed.

Tabled — June 21, by Mr. Martin of Eagle Lake.

Pending — His motion to reconsider passage.

On motion of Mr. Porter of Lincoln, retabled pending the motion of Mr. Martin of Eagle Lake to reconsider passage and tomorrow assigned.

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

An Act Providing for the Taxation and Preservation of Farm, Forest and Open Space Land (H. P. 1418) (L. D. 1834)

Tabled — June 21, by Mr. Susi of Pittsfield.

Pending — Passage to be enacted.

On motion of Mr. Evans of Freedom, under suspension of the rules, the House reconsidered its action

of June 15 whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed.

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

House Amendment "A" (H-494) was read by the Clerk.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This entire bill, as you well may remember, is the enabling legislation under current use law passed by the people in referendum. The original bill was L. D. 14. A great deal of time was spent in the redraft of L. D. 1834, but it is in conflict, certain parts of it, with the forest productivity tax. This amendment solves these problems.

Now our friends in the Third House with their Brooks Brothers suits, their fancy words, their suave method of persuasion, are not putting it over on us in this amendment, I will guarantee. And as House Chairman of Taxation, I am in favor of the amendment.

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

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I haven't seen the amendment, and I would like to have someone explain just—maybe it came out, I guess, yesterday, but I would like to know in brief just what the amendment does. I thought we had worked this bill up to its final form, and I wish someone would explain.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Freedom, Mr. Evans.

Mr. EVANS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would explain that this amendment corrects a few errors that the Attorney General's office wanted and removes the taxation of forest lands because it was in conflict with 1788, which we passed a few days ago, and one other bill. And that is the exact thing that actually this does. There was a few things in it that the Attorney General's department wanted worded differently, and we changed it so that it would be worded according to what they required, and took the forest lands out of it. Otherwise

than that it is practically the same bill that we had before.

Thereupon, House Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

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

An Act relating to the Board of Registration in Medicine" (H. P. 1378) (L. D. 1798) — In House, passed to be enacted — In Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

Tabled — June 21, by Mr. Gill of South Portland.

Pending — Further consideration.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Payson.

Mrs. PAYSON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We have occasionally in the state doctors who should not continue to practice medicine until they can straighten out their own lives. Either because of ill health, drug addiction or alcoholism, they are threatening the lives of their patients.

This bill is aimed at providing protection for the public through a board against these dangerous doctors. I believe we have an obligation to allow the resolution of the small legal disagreements so we the public can have the protection we need. The doctors want this bill; the public needs it, and the disagreement can be easily compromised.

I therefore move that we insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

Thereupon, the House voted to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

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

An Act to Establish Stepparents Responsibility to Support Stepchildren (S. P. 640) (L. D. 1833)

Tabled — June 21, 1971 by Mr. Shaw of Chelsea.

Pending — Passage to be enacted.

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

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

Bill "An Act Providing for a Full-time County Attorney for Cumberland County" (H. P. 194) (L. D. 332). In House, Committee Amendment "A" (H-389) adopted.

Tabled — June 21, by Mr. Birt of East Millinocket.

Pending — Adoption of House Amendment "A" (H-495)

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the adoption of House Amendment "A". The Chair will order a vote. All in favor of adopting House Amendment "A" will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken. 58 having voted in the affirmative and 16 having voted in the negative, House Amendment "A" was adopted.

Mr. Farrington of Old Orchard Beach offered House Amendment "B" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "B" (H-498) was read by the Clerk.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr Speaker and Members of the House: I hope the House realizes what it is doing. It is now making full-time county attorneys in all of the counties one by one.

The SPEAKER: Is it now the pleasure of the House to adopt House Amendment "B"?

(Cries of "Yes" and "No")

The SPEAKER: The Chair will order a vote. All in favor of adopting House Amendment "B" will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken. 49 having voted in the affirmative and 36 having voted in the negative, House Amendment "B" was adopted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lund.

Mr. LUND: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I move indefinite postponement of the bill and its

accompanying papers, and would speak briefly to the motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lund, moves indefinite postponement of the Bill and its accompanying papers. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. LUND: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Just a couple of days ago, last Friday I guess it was, we moved to indefinitely postpone the bill which established full-time county attorneys in six counties and I spoke in favor of that motion. I voted in favor of it and all but a handful of you did too.

The principal argument I think against this approach to a serious problem is that it represents a piecemeal approach and one which will serve to prevent our being able to establish an overall solution to this problem. I have no question in my mind but that we have a problem of prosecution in Cumberland County. We have a problem of prosecution in every county. And I had a sick feeling in my heart as I noticed an emergency bill indefinitely postponed in the Senate and the House today. It would have sought to give to us a second part-time assistant county attorney in this county. This was an emergency bill and it had the unanimous support of the State Government Committee. We need it badly in this county. We are the only county of comparable size that doesn't have two assistants.

My hope is that we can deal with this problem on a state-wide basis and not on a piecemeal basis. I think this kind of approach is going to prevent us from working a solution on a state-wide basis.

I don't know if we are going to be able to do it this session or not. We voted today to join in a Committee of Conference on a bill which would give us a vehicle to establish a state-wide system of prosecutors. But I can assure you although there are more people in Cumberland County, the quality of the problem exists in every county. I would therefore hope that you would join me and reassert the principle that we voted on last week when we indefinitely postponed the other bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair rec-

ognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. McTeague.

Mr. McTEAGUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to attempt in a short time to respond to some of the comments of my good friend the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lund. We debated this before and I know the hour is late and we all hope to get out of here. I hope that other bills which are pet projects or contrary to pet projects of other people aren't debated and redebated again this week. I guess under the rules you can have as many swipes at a bill as the times it comes before us.

We voted to recognize that although we cannot correct all the evils and undesirable features in the world, that we could do something about the problem of crime in our most populous county. I think it is something we should do. I further think that the continuous attacks by the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lund, upon this particular bill, and his seeming unwillingness to approach the problem in any manner other than his own particular bill, makes it somewhat difficult for those of us who have hoped to take a more flexible approach, and favor as I do favor the same concept that he espouses for dealing with the problem state-wide. But when there are continuous attacks on other possible solutions to the bill it may make it difficult to support his favorite project.

To get back to the merits of the thing for a moment or two. It may be true that Kennebec County, and I accept the gentleman's assurances this needs an assistant, another assistant, a second one; but Cumberland County needs this. They need it not because it is something that is good for us, not because it is a goody down there like another building, but because we have the most significant problem of crime in this state. We want to deal with it. This is a way to deal with it.

As it stands now you have part-time prosecutors and full-time criminals and full-time criminal defense counsel, and the odds are uneven and all too often the State, which represents the people, loses

the fight in criminal cases not because the man isn't guilty but because the case cannot, due to the part-time officials involved, always be adequately prosecuted.

I agree that this is also a problem in varied extents in other counties, but I would assure the gentleman although he practices here in Kennebec and I in Cumberland, that he cannot imagine without practicing there the extent of the problem in the county of Cumberland. He cannot imagine the frustration of the police officers who go out and make arrests and waste time sitting day after day after day because there is no one there to prosecute the case at that time.

If we are a law and order legislature for good or ill, this is a real law and order issue because unless we provide for the adequate and professional prosecution of crime in this county where the problem is the greatest, we leave the odds in favor of the criminal. I don't think that this is something that any of us want to do.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that when the vote be taken it be taken by the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt.

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, I move this lie on the table for one legislative day.

Whereupon, Mr. Ross of Bath requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt, that this Bill be tabled for one legislative day, pending the motion of Mr. Lund of Augusta, that it be indefinitely postponed. A vote has been requested on the motion. All in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

21 having voted in the affirmative and 73 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt.

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Discussing this afterwards as to why I moved

to table, it seems at the present time we are going in two directions. We do have a Committee of Conference on the full-time county attorneys. Until that Committee of Conference is resolved it doesn't seem practical to try to do this on a piecemeal basis. I think that you have got to wait and find out what the action of the Committee of Conference is and what the action of this body and the other body will be before you can make any definite action on this. And I still believe that the motion to table does have some merit.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Hewes.

Mr. HEWES: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In reply to the gentleman from East Millicocket and the gentleman from Augusta, I don't know whether you can speak for this House on the full-time county attorney bill, full-time county attorneys all over the State. The question is whether we should have county attorneys or district attorneys. By that I mean whether you have one county attorney from Sagadahoc County and one from Lincoln and one from Knox, or one from the three counties, or one from two of those counties. We also don't know whether it is going to be a two or four-year county or district attorney, and we don't know how he will be selected. Whether he will be elected by the people or appointed by the Governor without the Council's aid, or appointed by the Governor with the aid and consent of the Council, or appointed by the Attorney General. So there are several issues to be decided on the full-time county attorney's bill and I don't know how the other house will respond to their conferees either.

Now the gentleman from Pittsfield this morning, as I understood, asked that all bills be brought to the engrossment stage today. We have tabled this particular bill day after day — I appreciate your letting it be tabled — but as I understood the gentleman from Pittsfield this morning, it has got to get to the engrossment stage today. If not it may

be killed outright. So I would respectfully request that we pass this on to engrossment and if it develops that the other full-time county attorney's bill that was referred to by the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lund, a few moments ago, does eventually get to enactment, we can dispose of this bill as need be.

I wish to point out that the full-time county attorney's bill has a substantial appropriation on it, and in view of the supplement number two, which I have just had a chance to look at here, a good — apparently 27 bills were indefinitely postponed this morning, I would question how much success a full-time county attorney's bill will have in the Appropriations Committee.

In short, I respectfully urge you to vote against the pending motion to indefinitely postpone L. D. 332. I would ask that you then vote in favor of it and let it be engrossed.

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

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I got in on this because we have done a great deal of work in the State Government Committee on this. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to be on the same side as Mr. McTeague at this time as well as the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth. I hope you will not kill this bill but get it through to engrossment at least.

This is a compromise type of thing and as was stated, the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lund, doesn't seem to be in the mood to compromise, but I am afraid that he is either going to have to compromise or lose his bill altogether; and I think compromise is part of politics.

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 express-

ed a desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: If I am not incorrect, it is in the engrossment stage right now with two amendments added. If we were to pass it to be engrossed, we would not see it again until it came back here for enactment. Now I concur with the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lund. I am not an attorney. I am not a resident of Kennebec County. Mr. Lund has never approached me on this, but I am sure that he has no personal vendetta because a bill of his was killed. But this specific bill was for Cumberland County. Now you have added Penobscot County, and also York County. This is a very poor approach and I support the motion to indefinitely postpone.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: My position on this would be that I don't believe this Legislature is going to pass a full-time county attorney bill for the whole State of Maine. It seems to me we are wasting our time to fool with it.

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

Mr. NORRIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would hope that you would go along with us this afternoon and vote against indefinite postponement, and most particularly the members of the counties in question. I hope those delegations at least stick together and vote against indefinite postponement.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have been told that I should care because I wasn't involved anyway. This didn't involve Androscoggin County; it involved Kennebec, Cumberland, and Penobscot Counties — York County, I mean. But what does concern me is I

spoke before we convened this afternoon with what I consider a very good attorney who is a member of the 105th Legislature. And I said, "Would you take this job now?" He said, "No, but I would have taken it 10 years ago." And I said, "10 years ago where did you go for your advice as a lawyer before you made any move? And it took me 10 minutes to get his answer that he did go to the front office, that was his father's office.

Now somewhere along the line it behoves me that this program — and I am repeating what I said yesterday, and I have repeated it before — this thing for four years has been enmeshed in politics. And until such time as this program — and I would be for it — is thoroughly studied; and until such time as the full-time county attorneys are given the proper salaries; and until such time as you decide what two or three smaller counties you are to get together; and until such time as you have a state-wide program and not a helter skelter program like you have got now, because just as sure as you are a foot high, that when this thing reaches the other body there will be one or two more amendments, you will reopen it and it will come back here and there will be two or three more amendments and we will be back here where we were before. And then finally, after having lost a great deal of time and effort, somebody will make a motion to indefinitely postpone and that motion will succeed.

Mr. Speaker, what is now the motion before the House?

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lund, that this bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker: I hope that this bill be indefinitely postponed as well as all its accompanying papers and when the vote is taken I move it be taken by the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER: The yeas and nays have been ordered. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lund.

Mr. LUND: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: There have been a couple of statements made which were somewhat inaccurate and a

couple of other comments that I would like to answer to. In the first place, it has been suggested that I have other legislation pending in this area. There is other legislation pending in this area, but it is not mine. I have submitted no bills dealing with this area this season.

Second, I would like to point out that the measure which was being considered by the State Government Committee and the amendments that were being considered by the State Government Committee, and which many of us were hopeful were going to come out of that committee, instead of what did come out, would have been a provision calling for appointment of the full-time prosecutors with approval by the Chief Justice of the Court or the resident Justice in the area, which is as close as we could seem to work out toward getting it on a nonpolitical basis.

The suggestion has been made that I am unwilling to compromise, and I would say that that is not the case. I think I have been as prepared to compromise where it is feasible to do so as anybody has. But there are two directions that you go in this area. You either go left or you go right. I don't see how there is a compromise between having elected officials full time and a system of appointive officers.

Now it has been suggested, "so that we can start to solve the problem this way." It seems to me if we start to solve the problem this way it is going to make it very very difficult to go back and solve it a different way for several reasons. For one thing, these areas that think their problem is solved are not going to be interested in solving it for the rest of us.

I would also like to point out that unless I misunderstand the pending bill, it is not effective until January of '73. I notice that Mr. Hewes is nodding his head. This suggests to me that we can solve this problem just as adequately in a special session as we can now, if the problem is to be solved. Nothing that we have to do has to be done here and now; we can do it just as well at a special session if we will cool down and deal

with the problem on its merits instead of on some other basis.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lund, that Bill "An Act Providing for a Full-time County Attorney for Cumberland County," House Paper 194, L. D. 332, be indefinitely postponed. A roll call has been ordered. If you are in favor of that motion you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no.

ROLL CALL.

YEA — Baker, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Berube, Binnette, Bragdon, Brawn, Brown, Call, Carey, Carter, Collins, Cooney, Cote, Crosby, Cyr, Dam, Dow, Dyar, Emery, E. M.; Finemore, Gagnon, Good, Hall, Hanson, Hardy, Hawkens, Henley, Herrick, Jalbert, Kelley, K. F.; Kelley, P. S.; Keyte, Lawry, Lessard, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Lizotte, Lund, Lynch, MacLeod, Maddox, Manchester, McCormick, McNally, Millett, Morrell, Mosher, Page, Parks, Pontbriand, Porter, Rocheleau, Rollins, Ross, Scott, Shaw, Silverman, Simpson, T. R.; Susi, Theriault, Trask, Tyndale, Webber, Wight, Williams, Wood, M. W.; Wood, M. E.

NAY — Albert, Ault, Bailey, Barnes, Bartlett, Bernier, Birt, Bither, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Bunker, Carrier, Churchill, Clark, Clemente, Conley, Cottrell, Cummings, Curtis, A. P.; Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Donaghy, Doyle, Drigotas, Dudley, Emery, D. F.; Evans, Farrington, Faucher, Fecteau, Fraser, Gauthier, Gill, Goodwin, Hancock, Haskell, Hayes, Hewes, Hodgdon, Immonen, Jutras, Kelleher, Kelley, R. P.; Kilroy, Lebel, Lee, Lucas, Mahany, Marsh, Marstaller, Martin, McKinnon, McTeague, Mills, Murray, Norris, O'Brien, Payson, Rand, Shute, Simpson, L. E.; Slane, Smith, D. M.; Smith, E. H.; Starbird, Wheeler, White, Woodbury.

ABSENT — Bedard, Bustin, Curran, Genest, Littlefield, McCloskey, Orestis, Pratt, Santoro, Sheltra, Stillings, Tanguay, Vincent, Whitson.

Yes, 69; No, 67; Absent, 14.

The SPEAKER: Sixty-nine having voted in the affirmative and sixty-seven having voted in the

negative, with fourteen being absent, the motion does prevail.

Sent up for concurrence.

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

Bill "An Act to Revise the Site Location of Development Law" (H. P. 1373) (L. D. 1790) — In House, indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence on passage to be enacted. —In Senate, enacted in non-concurrence.

Tabled — June 21, by Mr. Susi of Pittsfield.

Pending — Motion of Mrs. Brown of York to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Newport, Mrs. Cummings.

Mrs. CUMMINGS: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede from indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Newport, Mrs. Cummings, moves that the House recede from indefinite postponement.

Mr. Lee of Albion requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Newport, Mrs. Cummings.

Mrs. CUMMINGS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to read from an article by Anne Morrow Lindbergh.

"To save the earth will take a revolution in values, a new ethic that thinks and acts in terms of guardianship of the planet and its life. Such an ethic runs counter to a lot of sacred American beliefs, rugged individualism, that too often means each man out for himself; limitless growth; progress, measured by size, wealth, efficiency — all cherished values of a materialistic society.

A revolutionary change in values does not usually come without (some) suffering —"

Right now realtors, real estate developers, and town and city fathers are, naturally, feeling that they are suffering. They are more interested in their present income from land promotion and sales than they are in the overall good for the entire State of Maine. I say naturally, because it is indeed a rare person who can look beyond his immediate gain or comfort.

But I am convinced that real estate values will greatly benefit in the long run if they are protected now. Like parents who protect their daughters from greedy advances of unprincipled suitors, or perhaps a better example is of the grocer who speeded up the sale of a slow-moving item by putting a sign over them, saying "only one to a customer".

This bill is designed not to restrict land sales, but to clarify the law that is already on the books. The amendment that I would like to offer removes the section dealing with traffic, although if you will give it some thought, you will realize that any large influx of houses with their multiple inhabitants create traffic problems. We have deleted the word "structures", so the 60,000 square foot applies only to one building, not to many. We still feel these are valid reasons to warrant the protective eye of the EIC, but if it makes the bill more palatable, then we are glad to compromise once more.

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

Mr. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I am a little bit confused here. The other day the House indefinitely postponed this bill and then the motion to reconsider was also defeated.

I think perhaps, Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. On a motion of this type, under these circumstances, does a simple majority prevail or is it a two-thirds?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that now it has been to the Senate and it is a non-concurrent matter, and a simple majority would be sufficient to recede from indefinite postponement and also recede from passage to be engrossed.

Mr. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and gentlemen, I hope that the motion does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Emery.

Mr. EMERY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: This bill is against the home rule concept as far as I am concerned. We have been talking about home rule all

year, so let's stick with home rule. And I hope we stick by our former vote and defeat this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Machias, Mr. Kelley.

Mr. KELLEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: **I support the motion of Mrs. Cummings, or rather the amendment, and I doubt if anyone expected that the original bill as enacted by the 104th Legislature would be wholly bullet proof. L. D. 1790 is an attempt to plug some of the holes in a bill which in 1969 plowed new ground and even then was expected to require from time to time some adjustments.**

Now in the 104th when we rushed this bill through with almost evangelical fervor, no one dared to oppose it. In the climate which prevailed at that time, not even the most case-hardened lobbyist raised his voice against it. Now, two years later, a change has taken place, and those special interest groups who stand to gain by the continued rape of our land and our resources have now dared to openly oppose this attempt to make the Site Location Law more meaningful.

The developers who would hack up the landscape into house lots the size of postage stamps with little or no regard for the capacity of the land to take care of the sewerage and plumbing problems, the fast buck boys who would, with never a backward glance, turn a beautiful landscape into a long longitudinal slum of parking lots, honky-tonks and hamburger stands, all in the name of "progress," and the people who take the attitude, "it is my land, I will do with it as I please," all of these opponents would enthusiastically kill this bill.

For my part, I never took the attitude that having enacted the Site Selection Law, that we could rest on our oars and forget the whole problem. And I would remind the members of this House of a statement by Abe Lincoln during the Lincoln-Douglas debates. He said, "The issue of human rights versus property rights will continue long after Judge Douglas and I are gone."

Now we must disabuse ourselves

of our previously held convictions that the privilege of owning property carries with it the privilege to do with it as we will, regardless of the consequences to our neighbors. And in that connection I would like to remind that the other day the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Bither, mentioned that gravel was a nonregenerating product and that when the present supply is exhausted there will be no more.

Of even more importance is our **topsoil because mankind lives on approximately nine inches of topsoil, and it took Mother Nature one hundred years to make one inch of this precious substance and when it is gone, whether we pave it over in parking lots, poison it with chemicals or whether it washes out to sea, when it is gone, then this planet becomes as sterile and dead as the moon. We own land, yes, but in a larger sense we hold it in stewardship for the next generation. We can through greed ruin it; or we can through common sense pass it on to the next generation to use some of the beauties which we are accustomed to and which we take so lightly.**

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I support the motion of the lady from Newport.

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

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I find this is quite an act to follow. I do have a speech written here so I am going to bore you with reading it, but there are a couple of points that Mr. Kelley might have addressed himself to. We are talking about a bill, not just performing a little oratory. I am not very good at that, but anyway, in the first place, the Environmental Improvement Commission has consistently maintained that they **are understaffed and underfunded** and, therefore, handicapped in the administration of the Site Selection Law. They have come to this session of the legislature asking for more money to do the job properly. And by the way, they got it in the Part II budget, \$350,000 of it.

If L. D. 1790 were merely a clarification of the law it would be a worthwhile document. However,

the EIC has assumed much of its authority administratively. In other words, this was originally primarily for industrial site selection; but all of a sudden, no matter what you did, they found a way of trying to tell you that you came under the EIC regulations. Now they are asking this Legislature to legalize that assumption. Not only that, but it broadly expands their area of responsibility. Let me point out some of the ways in which this bill does that.

If you would turn to Section 2, paragraph 2, in the first place L. D. 1790, in its definition of development which may substantially affect environment, expands its responsibility for commercial or industrial developments to any state, municipal, education or charitable developments, including subdivisions. In other words, it isn't just the individual; it isn't just the corporate developer, it is our state, our municipalities, our schools, our churches, they are all to be brought under the EIC's guiding wing. In other words, the EIC will not only be involved with commercial and industrial developments in the Site Selection Law, but they are going to be looking over the shoulder of the state, the University of Maine, churches, and other charitable organizations and every city and town within Maine. It seems to me that this in itself is a monumental task.

I continue on Section 2, paragraph 2. They tell us that they have left the twenty-acre exemption in but have changed the 60,000 square feet of land area exemption to floor space, which means that four normal Cape Cod houses with garages would be exempt, but five of them on 2½ acres of land would come under this law. They have further made developers responsible for traffic on roads that are not part of the development, on public roads that the developer has no control over whatsoever. They have made him responsible, and this is in Section 5, paragraph 2, they have made him responsible for correcting conditions that he cannot correct. They are also demanding a developer, and remember, when we say developer we are talking in terms of cities, towns,

churches, schools, as well as homes and commercial developments must obtain a certificate of compliance—this is under Section 7—with the conditions that the Commission may see fit to impose upon the development. In many cases, these conditions are so extensive and so costly that the developer cannot possibly comply with them until the development is nearly completed and most of the property sold. This makes financing extremely difficult.

If you have a chance, look over the Statement of Fact in the back of the L. D. This will show you how much this document will broaden the powers and responsibilities of the EIC. I submit to you that the EIC is still a baby—a baby that has not yet filled the shoes it is presently wearing. We have given them the funding and the staff to administer the present law satisfactorily. I don't think it is right to give all this additional responsibility to them and have a repeat of the last two years' unsatisfactory performances. I think this bill asks for too much too fast. We have a workable law on the books now. For the first time, it is fully funded. Let's see what kind of a job they can do with that before we extend ourselves once again.

I hope that you will defeat the motion of the lady from Newport.

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

Mr. AULT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Mr. Kelley having preceded Mr. Donaghy, it gives me great pleasure to put him in a position of a thorn between two roses. This rewrite came out of the Natural Resources Committee with a unanimous report, right from the experienced House Chairman to the lowly freshman, the representative from Wayne. We believed in it; we didn't believe there was any great problem for the people that were going to be affected by it, and we thought it was for the betterment of the State of Maine. I urge you to support the gentlewoman, Mrs. Cummings.

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

Mr. NORRIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I will be very brief, but I see that our lead based paint pusher back here has changed his mind since we got into another area that doesn't hit quite as close to home.

If this bill were in such fine form as my friend, Mr. Ault says, why do we at this point have to start amending it, have to start making it right for the people in this House? We have had this bill with us all session, and we have tried to work out something that was workable, and apparently it isn't.

Now this was turned down by a 30 vote margin, a 30 vote margin the other day in the House, and I thought we were through with it. But it has gone over to the Senate and it is back with us. I certainly hope that you will vote against the motion to recede so that we may adhere to our former action and kill this bill and put it in its proper form.

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

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I think you all have the biographies of ourselves in the Trucking News pamphlet. Now I have the greatest respect and admiration for the people who are speaking against this bill. But if you look here, you find that perhaps they might be prejudiced, because Mr. Norris is a real estate broker, Mr. Donaghy is a real estate broker, and so is Mr. Hancock.

Now I think they should get up and fight for their positions, but I think we should weight our judgments, our balanced judgements, knowing that they are most interested as realtors in this kind of a bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Farrington.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am not a real estate broker. I have some questions to clarify some of my complaints in Old Orchard again. I tried, I directed them at Mrs. Brown yesterday; and she directed them back to Mr. Curran who was vacant

from his seat. I think today I would like to direct them at Mrs. Cummings and see what happens here.

The first question is, Section 7, Revised Statute Title 38, 484A, page 3 of the bill, Mrs. Cummings, certificate of compliance. Do any of the amendments take care of that complaint?

The second question is under Section 2, Title 38, 482, subsection 2, page 2. Do any aspects of the amendments offered to this point satisfy that objection of some of my local real estate people? Would you care to answer those?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Farrington, poses a question through the Chair to the gentlewoman from Newport, Mrs. Cummings, who may answer if she chooses; and the Chair recognizes that gentlewoman.

Mrs. CUMMINGS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I don't know that I am quite aware what the objections are of the real estate people in your communities, but the amendment that I would like to offer would be to strike out the word 'or structures' on the 14th line under Section 2, page 2, so that it now would read 'or which occupies a single parcel, a structure.' So that 60,000 feet would apply only to a structure that the 60,000 feet was within one building, so that you wouldn't get at cluster that would come in under this, so the condominiums or any group of buildings would no longer be under this. As for Section 7, I have no amendment that would change that at all.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask through the Chair to the Clerk if House Amendment "C" to this bill had been adopted?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that the House engrossed this as amended by House Amendment "A" and House Amendment "C" on June 15.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In reference to the question of the gentleman from Old

Orchard, his first point was the question of Section 7. If he would look on page 2 of House Amendment "C" under filing number H-449, that problem is taken care of.

His second question, which he posed to the gentlewoman from Newport, in reference to the other section that he referred to, would be taken care of by the amendment that Mrs. Cummings would offer if she would be in a position to do so, if the House would recede.

Now it would seem to me today that we might give the opportunity to the gentlewoman to present her amendment. If we find at that time that this is totally unacceptable to the three members of the real estate division, then I can fully agree with that provision. But it seems to me that we ought to give the gentlewoman the opportunity to present that amendment, and at that point if we want to kill the whole bill, and it is going to be before us anyway again.

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

Mr. MARSTALLER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question to anyone who could answer. If this bill now covers municipalities, and a town or city wishes to construct a schoolhouse, and they get their plans approved by the Department of Education, do they then have to have a further approval by the EIC?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Marstaller, poses a question through the Chair to anyone who may answer if they choose.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Newport, Mrs. Cummings.

Mrs. CUMMINGS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would certainly think that they would have to come under the approval of the EIC. This is a major structure which therefore would affect the environment. And that was the whole point of establishing the Environmental Improvement Commission in the first place.

So it is not a legally informed answer, but I would say yes.

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

Mr. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In reply to the statements that were made by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cottrell, I would suggest to him that if realtors are not to be allowed to vote on those subjects in which they are most knowledgeable, that educators should not be allowed to also on those subjects of which I feel they are knowledgeable.

The other day — yesterday I believe it was — in this House, when we were debating this same bill, one of the proponents of the bill got up and spoke at some length; and the biggest argument that he could give for this bill was that the EIC wanted it. Nothing else. The EIC wanted it, therefore it was right, therefore it was good, and therefore we must have it. I think perhaps that even at this late stage in our legislative journey that a bill should be introduced here that would change the name of the EIC, the Environmental Improvement Commission, to the GIM, God in Maine.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson.

Mr. SIMPSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I happen to be a real estate broker. I don't know as a broker whether it would mean dollars and cents in my pocket whether this was passed or not. In fact, I think if it were I could maybe care less as far as a broker goes.

But I look at it from another point of view, because I happened to have a little episode happen in my town that this would apply to, and I think it comes back to Mr. Marstaller's point of view and so forth. We had a young man who was a builder who had quite a few other people working for him who bought a tract of land in town, and he wanted to build some houses on it. He came to my planning board and wanted acceptance of this development.

Well, it would take him at least two months to get through the planning board by the time he brings in his plans to us and so

forth, and we give him our objections, and so forth, and he brings them back. Now at that time I approached the EIC and asked them if they wouldn't approve this first before we did; and they said, "Definitely no, that we are not going to handle it until the local planning board handles it." So we took it on. We spent two months. We got the man all in the position, the thing was approved by the town, and then suddenly the EIC then wanted him to duplicate the efforts and go into greater detail than what we did.

Suddenly the banks stopped the funds for this fellow. He came here to the EIC, and if you look down here in this Section 483 where they used to have 14 days, and he came up here and within 14 days he was not given his notice. But suddenly they threw out a couple of things they had in question which circumvented the 14 days. Then they set him up for a hearing. He came here two or three times for a hearing, and was postponed each time he came. His crew was suddenly laid off. He was out of business; the young people who were working for him wondered where they were going to get their income from.

Finally the EIC told him if he came to the hearing that everything was in line that he would get his permit. He came up here, came in, they were lacking one paper, a letter from the Department of Health and Welfare. They called down to the Department of Health and Welfare, the letter was signed, it was on the man's desk, but the secretary said she did not have the authorization to send it up here.

He then had to return home. He asked at the time whether they could send it to him and give him approval. They said, "No, don't tell us when we will give you approval, we will give it to you in due time, and we meet every two weeks. Come back in two weeks and we will reconsider it."

This man went almost nine months on a development, trying to get a development through that went through with no objection whatsoever from the EIC. Now if they want a bill, a bill that is go-

ing to take and clarify some of the statutes, or some of the problems in the statutes, I would suggest that they bring in a bill that would clarify some of them, and they have done this in certain sections. But if you look in there they buried some real good vital parts of it that aren't clarifications. They are really areas that strengthen this thing, and strengthen it considerably.

Now I would look at just section 5 alone, and I know I did some work on this to try to clarify this. But I am not satisfied yet. As I read this now, a subdivision development, a man could go out here and divide off a three acre piece of land into one lot, and the second time he comes along and divides it off he has created a subdivision development. And that thing then is going to fall under the jurisdiction of the EIC. And that is under 20 acres. And as far as I can see there are going to be a lot of people that are going to have small developments, and when that third thing is sold off the way this thing reads right now, the EIC will come underneath jurisdiction.

Your schools will; all your buildings will. I would submit to you that right now they don't have the staff to do it, and will hold up construction on schools and everything else in this state when there is no need of it. I think these are things that are buried in here that makes the bill objectionable.

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

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to go on record as not trying to impugn the character or the honesty or the thought and the knowledge that these three men I have mentioned have. I also will state, and the records will show, that I have had a real estate license for over ten years.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Emery.

Mr. EMERY: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: Many of us in here are concerned with the economic conditions of the State. If this bill goes through you are

going to see a further recession, because the small developer is going to be put out of business. My grandfather, your grandfather, your uncle, everybody who has bought a piece of land to sell for putting away a few dollars for their old age is not going to be able to sell it under this law.

One party in the western part of the state told me, he said, "I have been fooling around now for six months. I spent about \$40,000. I still am not anywhere, and I am going to have to run around here another six months. I am going to go out of business. I know another fellow who used to build 35 houses a year, now he is down to four, pretty soon he won't be building any, and that is about 50 guys out of work."

If this bill goes through you are going to see more out of work, we are going to have a bigger recession, and the only people doing business in this state are going to be the big fellow with the dollar.

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

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am not quite as worried about this as some of the realtors seem to be. I actually also am a real estate agent over in Canada. And we don't have this kind of thing to put up with over there.

But beyond this, I am not worried about developers. I would ask you to turn to page 2, Section 4, and it says—and this is all new, with the exception of six words—"Person: Person means any person, firm, corporation. . ." and then we start, and this is new, "association, partnership, municipality or other local government entity, quasi-municipal entity, state agency, education or charitable organization or institution or legal entity."

Now you start telling me I am worried about developers. I am worried about my town; I am worried about my county; I am worried about my state. I am worried about every citizen in this state. The EIC is going to run the state if we let it. They want to.

I would hope that you will not

go along with the gentle lady from Newport.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentlewoman from Newport, Mrs. Cummings, that the House recede from indefinite postponement on Bill "An Act to Revise the Site Location of Development Law," House Paper 1372, L. D. 1790. All in favor of receding will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

40 having voted in the affirmative and 82 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Norris of Brewer, the House voted to adhere.

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

SENATE JOINT ORDER — Re Amending Joint Rules of the Senate and House of Representatives (S. P. 674)

Tabled — June 21, under the rules.

Pending — Passage in concurrence.

Thereupon, the Joint Order was passed in concurrence.

On request of Mr. Smith of Waterville, by unanimous consent, the following matter was taken up out of order:

An Act relating to the Management of Solid Waste (H. P. 1383) (L. D. 1803) which was passed to be enacted in the House on June 14 and passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" on June 7.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to back up this bill of mine two steps to attach an amendment which will strip the appropriation. This bill, solid waste management act, sailed through this House and the other body almost without debate.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read the paper.

Whereupon, the Clerk read the paper.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I move we recede from passage to be enacted.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Smith, moves that the House recede from passage to be enacted.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Very briefly, the appropriation was attached to the bill because of the considerable federal matching money which is up to 75 per cent, which is available; and because the appropriation would enhance the implementation of the act. The bill was indefinitely postponed in the other body because of the appropriation.

The bill is thoroughly effective without the appropriation, and the Division of Sanitation in the Department of Health and Welfare which will implement the bill concurs. As such I feel it is not in violation of Joint Rule Number 12; and that is why I respectfully ask the House to recede from passage and to recede to be engrossed so that I can offer House Amendment "B".

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

Mr. LEE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This morning we got an education in how to handle these matters. I don't know that I even spoke against solid waste. I think maybe there are some good things about it, and probably some bad. But there surely is a sum of money that we surely can't afford, and the Senate has done the responsible thing. I think we have got to do the same thing.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will order a vote. The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Smith, that the House recede from passage to be enacted. If you are in favor of receding you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

49 voted in the affirmative and 61 voted in the negative.

Mr. Martin of Eagle Lake 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 Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The gentleman from Waterville has made the point, and made it well, that the money is not necessary in order to make the bill effective. As I understand it, the money would have added six positions, but also would have been money which would have been used for the purposes of using — of getting federal funds.

Unfortunately, in the hurry from one body to the other in the closing hours, this thing always happens. It was agreed that we were going to be able to take care of this problem without the money. Unfortunately, it left the other body without the amendment, and someone forgot about it.

Now in speaking with the people over there, and speaking with the department, the point made by the gentleman from Waterville is correct. Now if we want to kill it because we are opposed to the management of solid waste, that is a valid point. But it is possible to pass this bill without the appropriation, and to make it effective. And so therefore I would ask you to recede.

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

Mr. CAREY: Mr. Speaker, I pose a question through the Chair to the Minority Floorleader. And that question would be: He has been around long enough to know that if we pass this thing without these

six people in there this year, what is going to happen at the special session or the next session? We will be asked to fund those six people.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Carey, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin, who may answer if he chooses; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am not naive enough to assume that this Legislature in special session or the next one in a regular session could not add 50,000 people to the appropriation. I am only saying that this bill could be implemented without a price tag. Any department, and all of them, will come back, including this one, or the 120 other departments, 100 boards and commissions that we have got, will come back in next session requesting more money regardless of what we do with them today. And this may be unfortunate, but it is true.

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

Mr. SUSI: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Again I won't be speaking on the merits of this particular bill. But this is one of the bills that was on the Appropriations table, and is being killed off. I don't know if this is clear to all of you.

Now this morning we handled several of these bills that had been killed in the Senate, came over here, and there were no objections to it. I think we made an observation this morning that as we kept killing it was going to be more and more difficult to take. And there is a story with each of these bills. There is no question about it.

So I would like to point out to you the implications of the action that you are considering at this time. If you were to go along with the sponsor of this bill and allow the addition of an amendment it means reengrossment; it opens it up; it gives reason to believe that when your bill comes along which has been killed there is a chance for you to move and tell your story

on it too. So I want you to think well about it. It is in your power to do this if you wish, but I think that it will delay the session considerably, and I doubt that the gain from your action would be worth the misery of the extra time that would be involved to accomplish this.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Smith, that the House recede from passage to be enacted on An Act relating to the Management of Solid Waste, House Paper 1383, L. D. 1803. The yeas and nays have been ordered. If you are in favor of receding you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Albert, Ault, Baker, Barnes, Bernier, Boudreau, Brown, Bustin, Call, Carrier, Clemente, Conley, Cote, Cottrell, Cummings, Dow, Drigotas, Dyar, Emery, D. F.; Emery, E. M.; Farrington, Faucher, Fecteau, Fraser, Goodwin, Hardy, Herrick, Hewes, Kelleher, Kelley, P. S.; Kilroy, Lebel, Lucas, MacLeod, Marsh, Martin, McCormick, McKinnon, McTeague, Morrell, Murray, Pontbriand, Slane, Smith, D. M.; Smith, E. H.; Starbird, Tyndale, Webber, Wood, M. E.; Woodbury.

NAY — Bailey, Bartlett, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Berube, Birt, Bither, Bourgoin, Bragdon, Brown, Bunker, Carey, Churchill, Clark, Collins, Curtis, A. P.; Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Cyr, Donaghy, Dudley, Finemore, Gauthier, Gill, Good, Hall, Hancock, Hanson, Haskell, Hawkens, Hayes, Henley, Hodgdon, Immonen, Jutras, Kelley, K. F.; Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Lee, Lessard, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Lizotte, Lund, Lynch, Maddox, Manchester, Marstaller, McNally, Millett, Mosher, Norris, Page, Parks, Payson, Porter, Rand, Rocheleau, Rollins, Ross, Santoro, Scott, Shaw, Shute, Silverman, Simpson, L. E.; Simpson, T. R.; Susi, Theriault, Trask, White, Wight, Williams, Wood, M. W.

ABSENT — Bedard, Binnette, Carter, Cooney, Crosby, Curran, Dam, Doyle, Evans, Gagnon, Genest, Jalbert, Lawry, Littlefield, Mahany, McCloskey, Mills, O'Brien, Orestis, Pratt, Sheltra,

Stillings, Tanguay, Vincent, Wheeler, Whitson.

Yes, 50; No, 74; Absent, 26.

The SPEAKER: Fifty having voted in the affirmative, seventy-four in the negative, with twenty-six being absent, the motion to recede does not prevail.

Thereupon, the House voted to adhere.

The following papers from the Senate were taken up out of order by unanimous consent.

Indefinitely Postponed

From the Senate: The following Order:

WHEREAS, the Maine Legislature in its past thirteen sessions since 1945 has rejected legislation that would provide for the inclusion of chiropractic services in the Maine Workmen's Compensation Law; and

WHEREAS, at this session of the Legislature, bills have been introduced not only to include chiropractic services in Workmen's Compensation, but also to require payment for such services under Blue Cross — Blue Shield and to require all insurance policies to be rewritten to provide payment for chiropractic treatment under the guise of preventing discrimination in insurance; and

WHEREAS, these bills, though related, have been referred, without overt indication that they comprise components of a planned legislative program, to three separate Legislative Committees; and

WHEREAS, the definition of "chiropractic" has remained essentially unchanged since 1923 thereby giving rise to the question of the extent of its meaning and whether it does or should include the diagnosing of medical ills or the use of x-ray equipment and analysis of x-ray films and the diagnosis and treatment of medical ills not related to the human spinal column; and

WHEREAS, there is therefore considerable uncertainty as to the legal extent of the definition of the practice of "chiropractic" as it bears on the actual practice of chiropractic performed in the State of Maine, and as it relates to the

diagnosis and treatment of human disease; and

WHEREAS, no objective study of the practice of chiropractic in the State of Maine has ever been conducted by the Legislative Research Committee or by any other objective group representing the welfare of the people; and

WHEREAS, it is the responsibility of the Maine Legislature through the passage of legislation to protect the welfare of its citizens from such harm as may exist from the failure to define and license the various healing arts and to protect the integrity of public health and welfare programs such as Workmen's Compensation and public and private medical or health insurance; now, therefore, be it

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee is directed to study the proper role of chiropractic in the State of Maine, with particular reference to its actual practice, to the education and training involved therein, to the tests and certifications required for the practice thereof, to its definition as presently contained in the Revised Statutes, Title 32, Section 451, to the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder and to its proper role in conjunction with Workmen's Compensation, Blue Cross — Blue Shield and other public and private medical health and accident insurance policies and programs; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Legislative Research Committee shall report its findings and conclusions together with any proposed legislation bearing upon the subject of this order to the next special or regular session of the Legislature; and be it further

ORDERED, that there is appropriated from the Legislative Account the sum of \$3,000 to the Committee to carry out the purposes of this Order; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Committee shall have the authority to employ such professional and technical assistance as it deems necessary within the limits of funds provided. (S. P. 399)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

In the House the Order was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Jutras.

Mr. JUTRAS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I notice from this order that a \$3,000 appropriation has been made to conduct a study calling in for experts and professional technical assistance. This to me seems to be a farce or a joke to have an order of this type with a \$3,000 price tag on it, expecting the Legislative Research Committee to do a lot of work on it. I move for the indefinite postponement of this order.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Jutras, moves the indefinite postponement of this Order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Farrington.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, could this order be tabled for one day, please?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Farrington, moves this Order be tabled for one legislative day pending the motion of the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Jutras, that it be indefinitely postponed. The Chair will order a vote. All in favor of tabling will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

4 having voted in the affirmative and 85 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

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

Mr. LEE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: After listening in the Labor Committee to the chiropractors for one long long afternoon and evening, and understanding what they do do, and what they are supposed to do, I think it needs a study, and I hope you wouldn't indefinitely postpone this order.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Emery.

Mr. EMERY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have

killed a lot of money bills today. I say we ought to kill this order. There is \$3,000 here that some of these elderly people can use.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Payson.

Mrs. PAYSON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hope that you will vote against indefinite postponement and allow this order to take its place on the Appropriations table.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore.

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I feel just the same as the previous speaker. I think that this could stand a study and I hope you will go against the indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Jutras, that Senate Joint Order, S. P. 399, be indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence. If you are in favor of the motion you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

55 having voted in the affirmative and 44 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

Sent up for concurrence.

From the Senate: The following Order:

WHEREAS, like the school they attend, the minutemen of Millinocket have an ancestry rich in courage and pride; and

WHEREAS, for the past 35 years, George R. Wentworth has played a prominent part in this heritage as both educator and coach; and

WHEREAS, he has consistently influenced and cultivated those rich human qualities of wisdom and fair play in persons of all ages; and

WHEREAS, his beloved Mount Katahdin has witnessed 39 graduations, 540 victories and 185 defeats and more recently his retirement as coach of the minutemen; now, therefore, be it

ORDERED, the House concurring, that in recognition of the unbounded energy, professional capacity and profound influence

which have marked the services of George R. Wentworth during his long and distinguished career as educator and coach in the public school system of this State, the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the 105th Legislature, now assembled, publish and declare this Order which extends herein their affection, their gratitude and their admiration, all of which he has won on the basis of his many years of outstanding service; and be it further

ORDERED, that we now proclaim him as an ambassador of goodwill for the State of Maine; and be it further

ORDERED, that a suitable copy of this Order be transmitted forthwith to Coach Wentworth in token of the sentiments expressed herein. (S. P. 676)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

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

Order Out of Order

Mr. Scott of Wilton presented the following Joint Resolution and moved its adoption:

WHEREAS, the Members of the Legislature have learned of the unexpected death on June 21st of Richard E. Fuller of Windsor; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Fuller was serving as Supervisor of Benefits in the Unemployment Compensation Division of the Maine Employment Security Commission; and

WHEREAS, the loss of the wise and learned counsel of this loyal state servant, after thirty-three years of dedicated public service, is most significant; and

WHEREAS, in recording our sorrow at his passing, let the record show the admiration of all who knew and worked with him and that his contributions to country, community and the State of Maine have been of lasting benefit; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Members of the One Hundred and Fifth Legislature of the State of Maine, now assembled on this 22nd day of June, tender their deep sympathy to the bereaved family with assurances of sharing in this personal loss and offer homage of

love and reverence to the memory of a true public servant; and be it further

RESOLVED: That a suitable copy of this Resolution be sent to his devoted wife and his father-in-law, Representative Earle R. Hayes, as a token of our esteem. (H. P. 1436)

The Joint Resolution was received out of order by unanimous consent, read and adopted and sent up for concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matters

An Act Increasing Assistance to War Orphans in Securing Higher Education (S. P. 17) (L. D. 45) which was passed to be enacted in the House on January 26 and passed to be engrossed on January 26.

An Act relating to Community Mental Retardation Services (S. P. 153) (L. D. 422) which was passed to be enacted in the House on March 2 and passed to be engrossed on February 24.

An Act relating to Appropriation and Allocations to the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped (S. P. 214) (L. D. 660) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 21 and passed to be engrossed on May 18.

An Act relating to Disability Retirement and Retirement Allowances under State Retirement System (S. P. 243) (L. D. 704) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 21 and passed to be engrossed on May 18.

An Act Empowering the Environmental Improvement Commission to Conduct Studies Relating to Noise Pollution (S. P. 407) (L. D. 1223) which was passed to be enacted in the House on June 11 and passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and House Amendment "A" on June 8.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur on the preceding five items.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act relating to Retirement Allowance for Former Governors (S. P. 521) (L. D. 1419) which was

passed to be enacted in the House on April 15 and passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" on April 7.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Hodgdon.

Mr. HODGDON: Mr. Speaker, I move that we insist and ask for a Committee of Conference and would speak briefly to my motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Hodgdon, moves that the House insist on its former action and ask for a Committee of Conference.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. HODGDON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I probably am embarking upon an act of futility, but embark I must. This bill has been discussed in the House and we had almost unanimous approval of it. For those of you who do not remember, at the present time there is only one former Governor involved and there is a very very small amount of money involved. I am quite surprised that the people would take this off the Appropriations table to kill, when I am sure that there are bills with much more money attached and certainly less moral value.

I insisted before and I would reiterate that I believe that we as the people of Maine, not only this Legislature but we of the people of Maine owe certain things to people who have devoted their life to public service, especially as Governor of the State of Maine, and I would ask you to join me on my motion to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

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

Mr. HENLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am sorry I have got to disagree with my friend Mr. Hodgdon. I opposed this bill when it went through. I know the Governor in point. I do not believe that the Governor is in such bad straits as stated, and there are many many deserving people that are going to lose money be-

cause of taking these bills off the Appropriations table.

I don't know why an ex-Governor should be exempted. As I said before, it is no magic word to me. I soon will be an ex-legislator, but I don't expect anybody to weep about it. I do happen to know that there is income for this ex-Governor, he is also an ex-Senator, he is also a military man, ex-military; and so he definitely is not destitute. He cannot be destitute.

Now I don't know quite why there is such a torch carried on this particular thing. Again, I think that we are going along pretty smoothly in the finishing phase of this session. There will be many bills here that will strike pretty strongly at sponsors and the people who supported it, possibly including some of my own. But as Mr. Susi just said, someone can stand up and debate why every one of them is a little bit different from every other one.

I ask you to allow this one to go the same as the rest of these are going, and let it go at that and let's get on with the session.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, moves that the House recede and concur, and the Chair will order a vote. All in favor of receding and concurring will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

78 having voted in the affirmative and 24 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act Providing for Scholarships for North American Indians Residing in Maine (H. P. 260) (L. D. 342) which was passed to be enacted in the House on April 21 and passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" on March 25.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act Providing for Adult Education (H. P. 384) (L. D. 499) which was passed to be enacted in the House on March 26 and passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" on March 19.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. LUCAS: Mr. Speaker, I am having an amendment prepared for what it may be worth for this particular item and I wonder if I might set this aside until later in today's session.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I move that this item lie on the table until later in today's session.

Whereupon, Mr. Ross of Bath requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin, moves that this matter be tabled until later in today's session. A vote has been requested on the tabling motion. All in favor of this being tabled later in today's session will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

32 having voted in the affirmative and 68 having voted in the negative, the motion to table did not prevail.

Thereupon, the House voted to recede and concur.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act to Establish a Colt Stake Program for Maine Standard Bred Horses (H. P. 476) (L. D. 837) which was passed to be enacted in the House on April 27 and passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" on April 20.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, I move that we insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Kelleher, moves that the House insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, now moves that the House recede and concur.

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise a little timidly here on this particular item, but this was before the Appropriations Committee, and I didn't get a chance to go in and talk to those wise and capable gentlemen because the appropriation was just a might too high. And I know I am not able to say that I talked to other members of the body, and I won't, where they would be willing to consider a Committee of Conference. So I just ask the indulgence of the House. This bill isn't really that bad and it is going to be reduced considerably, and I know it can generate a lot of money if you will just be patient; and if you want to kill it tomorrow that is all well and good. But I would just like to have it go to a Committee of Conference to show where we don't need quite so much money as they put on. These gentlemen did a fine job, but they just tacked too much money onto the program, that is all.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: Probably in a more serious vein, if the amendment was put on this bill it would really cut the appropriations drastically. We must remember that the harness racing program brings us a tremendous amount of revenue in Maine. We must also remember that harness racing had its birthplace in the State of Maine, and our horses, particularly our good horses, are leaving us.

This would allow for the second year of the biennium for a very paltry sum, the beginning of a colt program. And it wouldn't be but three or four years before this would begin to pay off, and pay off big as far as revenue is concerned.

I come from an area where there is a great deal of racing time, and a great many horses that are housed year round. And this is one program here that will be needed in order for us to help to support programs of education, programs of mentally retarded, and other programs as we go on. It can't all be done out of wampum, and it can't all be done out of money coming out of the clouds. Arrangements might be made, and it has been informally discussed, with some members on the other side of the aisle, and so as least I don't think there would be a great deal lost if there was an insisting and a Committee of Conference on this measure.

I would certainly hope out of deference to the good gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, that you would vote against the motion to recede and concur so that we could then ask for insisting and a Committee of Conference.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I come from John R. Braden country, and I have a great weakness for good horseflesh. I also hold the gentleman from Bangor in very high regard. I hope you will go along with his request.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Windsor, Mr. Hayes.

Mr. HAYES: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: The gentleman from Bangor and I haven't always seen eye to eye on some things around here. But on this one I have to go along with him. I, fortunately or otherwise, have been involved in this sort of a racket for some 50 years and know something about this business of raising colts and keeping our racing going in Maine. So I just want him to know, and the rest

of you to know, that for once we agree.

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

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I have enjoyed going along with the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Kelleher, many times. But I think that I should call your attention to the fact that we have put under the hammer assistance for war orphans, community mental retardation services, employment of the handicapped, disability and retirement allowances, many such things as this. I think that our colt program can go by the board too, and perhaps if they take ten cents off the take or something they can finance their own colt program.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am fully aware that we have turned down some programs along the line of mental retardation and other programs along that same line, but we have also put on a great many of these programs and we have also put on a greater percentage of money in the newly founded vocational school in Washington County that I helped to support 100 percent. It is programs like these that we are going to help keep on giving money to those areas.

I am fully aware of what we have passed and what we didn't kill. This is a sound program. It is an attempt to keep what is not only a great pastime but actually an industry alive. We would like to have you help us do it by amending a measure that would strike out the money for the first year, put in a little money for the second year, to help an industry survive and a great pastime go on to a better programming.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will order a vote. The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross that the House recede and concur. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

42 having voted in the affirmative and 62 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the House voted to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

The Speaker appointed the following Conferees on the part of the House:

Messrs. KELLEHER of Bangor
HALL of Windham
JALBERT of Lewiston

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act to Regulate Sewer Utilities (H. P. 503) (L. D. 649) which was passed to be enacted in the House on March 9 and passed to be engrossed on March 2.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act Appropriating Funds for Comprehensive State-wide Planning and Services for the Developmentally Disabled (H. P. 564) (L. D. 1740) which was passed to be enacted in the House on April 20 and passed to be engrossed on April 13.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would simply rise to say that if I could amend this and take the money off they could get some funds from the federal government. However, we have got this program in effect, it is certain it pays now; so therefore I would move that we recede and concur and look forward to it in a special session.

Thereupon, the House voted to recede and concur.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act to Appropriate Funds for Payment to Veterinarians for Vaccinating against Brucellosis (H. P. 626) (L. D. 849) which was passed to be enacted in the House

on March 25 and passed to be engrossed on March 18.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Windham, Mr. Hall.

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that we insist on our former action and request a Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Windham, Mr. Hall moves that the House insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Gill.

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wish Mr. Hall would be as generous as I was. I would like to point out, and if I am incorrect would someone correct me, that the Commissioner of Agriculture said this is a program that they had in the past at one time. It is a program that would be nice to have now. However, as I recall, he was more interested in some other parts of this Part I and this Part II budget and he gave us the impression that this is something that would be nice to have but certainly I feel that the previous item would be nice to have too; so therefore I would move that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Gill, moves that we recede and concur. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Windham, Mr. Hall.

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill was one that was on the program until the last session of the legislature, the 104th, and it was taken out for lack of money. And at that time there was around 16,000 or 17,000 calves that were vaccinated each year, and since this money has been stopped they have dropped down now to around 1,500. I am afraid if we do away with this program at this time that we are going to be back the same as we were a number of years ago, having a lot of brucellosis breaking out over the state.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt.

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Very briefly, about a year ago the Appropriations Committee reviewed, as an interim committee, reviewed many parts of the Current Services budget, talking with department heads of programs that were in there. At that time the Commissioner of Agriculture said that he did not feel that there was a need for this, that this program that has been carried on for quite some years at the present time didn't seem to be necessary and he suggested that one of the items that could be removed from the budget — now this had been in the agricultural budget for quite a few years, he felt that at the present time the condition of the cattle herd in the state is in good enough shape so they could remove it and I would support a motion to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Gill that the House recede and concur. All those in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

63 having voted in the affirmative and 32 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act relating to the Transportation of Students to Technical and Vocational Centers (H. P. 669) (L. D. 906) which was passed to be enacted in the House on April 7 and passed to be engrossed on March 31.

An Act relating to Increases in School Assessments in School Administrative Districts (H. P. 702) (L. D. 945) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 5 and passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" on April 29.

An Act relating to Stating Purposes of Bond Issues Referred to the People (H. P. 788) (L. D. 1064) which was passed to be enacted in the House on April 13 and passed to be engrossed as

amended by Committee Amendment "A" on April 6.

An Act Broadening the Sales and Use Tax Exemption on Water and Air Pollution Control Facilities (H. P. 862) (L. D. 1186) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 28 and passed to be engrossed on May 24.

Resolve Appropriating Funds to Prevent Sawdust Pollution at South Branch Lake and Saponac Pond in Penobscot County (H. P. 894) (L. D. 1214) which was finally passed in the House on April 15 and passed to be engrossed on April 8.

An Act relating to Definition of Retail Sale under Sales and Use Tax Law (H. P. 898) (L. D. 1218) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 5 and passed to be engrossed on April 23.

An Act relating to Fees for Marketing and Advertising Farm Products (H. P. 1047) (L. D. 1438) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 4 and passed to be engrossed on April 28.

An Act Providing Handrails for Stairs in Public Buildings (H. P. 1082) (L. D. 1148) which was passed to be enacted in the House on March 31 and passed to be engrossed on March 12.

An Act relating to Exemptions from Real and Personal Property Taxation for Industrial Disposal Systems (H. P. 1131) (L. D. 1559) which was passed to be enacted in the House on June 2 and passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" on May 28.

An Act relating to Financial Assistance to Institutional Teachers in Obtaining Professional Credits (H. P. 1218) (L. D. 1409) which was passed to be enacted in the House on April 1 and passed to be engrossed on March 25.

An Act to Create a Commission to Prepare a Revision of the Insurance Laws relating to Delinquent Insurers (H. P. 1228) (L. D. 1497) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 27 and passed to be engrossed on May 21.

An Act relating to Elementary School Guidance Counsellors (H. P. 1268) (L. D. 1670) which was passed to be enacted in the House

on April 22 and passed to be engrossed on April 15.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur on the preceding twelve items.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act relating to Distribution of Certain Taxes to Municipalities (H. P. 1323) (L. D. 1735) which was passed to be enacted in the House on June 4 and passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" on May 28.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Morrell.

Mr. MORRELL: Mr. Speaker, I move that we insist.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Morrell moves that the House insist on its former action.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore.

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore moves that the House recede and concur.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Morrell.

Mr. MORRELL: Mr. Speaker and MEMBERS of the House: I hope that we don't recede and concur. This bill would reimburse the communities for any further class of exemption on the municipal level from the personal property tax. There is no appropriation necessary here. There is a little bit of a question as to whether or not it would apply to any exemptions granted during this session. However, if there were any, they would not be applicable until 1972 and we could clear it up and would clear it up in the special session. So I think this bill has some merit and I would hope that you would not recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the

gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore, that the House recede and concur. The Chair will order a vote. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

70 having voted in the affirmative and 23 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act relating to Constitutional Amendments Printed on Instruction Sheets (H. P. 1385) (L. D. 1808) which was passed to be enacted in the House on June 15 and passed to be engrossed on June 9.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur.

Conference Committee Report

Report of the Committee of Concurrence on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on

Bill "An Act relating to Membership on Board of Registration for Professional Engineers" (H. P. 1322) (L. D. 1734) reporting that they are unable to agree.

Signed:

McNALLY of Ellsworth

CAREY of Waterville

NORRIS of Brewer

—Committee on part of House.

BERRY of Cumberland

SCHULTEN of Sagadahoc

CLIFFORD

of Androscoggin

—Committee on part of Senate.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

The following Bills on their passage to be enacted were taken up out of order by unanimous consent.

Passed to Be Enacted Emergency Measure

An Act to Make Allocations from the General Highway Fund for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1972 and June 30, 1973 (S. P. 661) (L. D. 1856)

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. 102 voted in favor of same and 15 against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Bond Issue

Tabled and Assigned

An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Ten Million Three Hundred Thousand Dollars on Behalf of the State of Maine to Build State Highways (S. P. 662) (L. D. 1857)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. In accordance with the Provisions of Section 14 of Article IX of the Constitution a two-thirds vote of the House being necessary, a total was taken. 71 voted in favor of same and 39 against.

Mr. Donaghy of Lubec 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 passage to be enacted. If you are in favor of enactment you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Albert, Bailey, Baker, Barnes, Bernier, Berube, Birt, Bither, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Bragdon, Brown, Bustin, Call, Carrier, Clark, Collins, Curtis, A. P.; Cyr, Donaghy, Dow, Drigotas, Dyar, Finemore, Fraser, Gauthier, Gill, Good, Hall, Hanson, Haskell, Hawkens, Hayes, Hewes, Immonen, Jalbert, Kelley, K. E.; Kelley, P. S.; Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Kilroy, Lebel, Lee, Lewis, Lincoln, Lucas, MacLeod, Maddox, Mahany, Manchester, Marsh, Martin, McKinnon, McNally, McTeague, Millett, Mills, Murray, O'Brien, Page, Payson,

Pontbriand, Santoro, Scott, Shaw, Silverman, Simpson, T. R.; Smith, D. M.; Starbird, Theriault, Wheeler, White, Williams, Wood, M. W.; Wood, M. E.; Woodbury.

NAY — Ault, Bartlett, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Brawn, Carey, Clemente, Conley, Cote, Cummings, Dam, Dudley, Emery, D. F.; Emery, E. M.; Farrington, Faucher, Fecteau, Hancock, Henley, Herrick, Hodgdon, Jutras, Lawry, Lewin, Lizotte, Lund, Lynch, Marstaller, McCormick, Morrell, Mosher, Parks, Porter, Rand, Rocheleau, Rollins, Ross, Shute, Simpson, L. E.; Slane, Smith, E. H.; Susi, Trask, Tyndale, Webber, Wight.

ABSENT — Bedard, Binnette, Bunker, Carter, Churchill, Cooney, Cottrell, Crosby, Curran, Curtis, T. S., Jr., Doyle, Evans, Gagnon, Genest, Goodwin, Hardy, Kelleher, Lessard, Littlefield, McCloskey, Norris, Orestis, Pratt, Sheltra Stillings, Tanguay, Vincent, Whitson.

Yes, 76; No, 46; Absent, 28.

The SPEAKER: Seventy-six having voted in the affirmative and forty-six having voted in the negative, with twenty-eight being absent, this Bill fails of enactment.

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

Mr. SUSI: Mr. Speaker, I move that we reconsider our action whereby this Bill failed of enactment.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi, moves the House reconsider its action whereby this Bill failed of enactment.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the reconsideration motion be tabled for one legislative day.

Thereupon, Mr. Emery of Auburn requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, that this matter be tabled for one legislative day, pending the motion of the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi, that the House reconsider its action whereby this Bill failed of passage to be enacted. All in favor of tabling will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken. 75 having voted in the affirmative and 47 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act Appropriating Funds to Provide Services for Handicapped Persons in Rehabilitation Centers (H. P. 254) (L. D. 336)

An Act Clarifying the Statute Relating to Realty Subdivisions (H. P. 1034) (L. D. 1425)

An Act to Create a Commission to Prepare a Revision of the Criminal Laws (H. P. 1211) (L. D. 1658)

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

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

Indefinitely Postponed

An Act relating to Establishment of a State Building Code (H. P. 1417) (L. D. 1836)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Carrier.

Mr. CARRIER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is the famous building code here, a bill which we discussed a few times before. We killed it once and it survived the second time, and this bothers me because I think this actually is not a good bill for the people in the State of Maine.

I still feel today the problem, any problem as far as building codes are concerned, should be settled within the local communities. We have communities which have ordinances and others that haven't. To those of you who have voted against this bill, if you haven't got any ordinance in your town this doesn't affect you one way or the other. So I don't understand why you could not actually support the indefinite postponement of this bill.

Now this actually sets requirements, and by amendments

actually the Housing Authority has been deleted from it, so I just wonder who will administer this bill. Nobody answered that before. And also if you have studied this BOCA report, there is such foolish things in there as saying that pipes that make unnecessary noise, this would be in violation of the code. I submit to you that this is not a good bill, and again I ask all of you to actually support the motion of indefinite postponement, which I now make, and I ask for a roll call please.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Carrier, moves the indefinite postponement of this Bill.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Dyar.

Mr. DYAR: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It would seem proper this afternoon to indefinitely postpone this bill. In the past several weeks we have passed legislation which would stop a person from building, and if they can sneak through the regulations to build, they couldn't afford to pay the taxes after they build. So I hope this afternoon we will indefinitely postpone this bill.

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 Westbrook, Mr. Carrier, that this Bill be indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence. If you are in favor of that motion you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Albert, Ault, Bailey, Baker, Barnes, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Berube, Bragdon, Brawn, Call, Carey Carrier, Clark, Collins, Conley, Curtis, A. P.; Cyr, Dam, Donaghy, Dow, Drigotas, Dudley, Dyar, Emery, E. M.;

Faucher, Fecteau, Finemore, Fraser, Gauthier, Good, Hall, Hancock, Hanson, Hawkens, Hayes, Henley, Herrick, Hewes, Hodgdon, Immonen, Jutras, Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Kilroy, Lawry, Lebel, Lee, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Lizotte, MacLeod, Manchester, Marstaller, McCormick, McNally, Millett, Mills, Mosher, Page, Parks, Pontbriand, Porter, Rand, Rocheleau, Scott, Shaw, Shute, Simpson, L. E.; Simpson, T. R.; Susi, Theriault, Tyndale, Webber, White, Wight, Williams, Wood, M. W.; Wood, M. E.

NAY — Bartlett, Birt, Bither, Bourgoin, Brown, Bustin, Clemente, Cote, Cummings, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Emery, D. F.; Farrington, Haskell, Kelley, P. S.; Lucas, Lund, Lynch, Mahany, Marsh, Martin, McTeague, Murray, O'Brien, Payson, Rollins, Slane, Smith, D. M.; Smith, E. H.; Starbird, Woodbury.

ABSENT — Bedard, Bernier, Binnette, Boudreau, Bunker, Carter, Churchill, Cooney, Cottrell, Crosby, Curran, Doyle, Evans Gagnon, Genest, Gill, Goodwin, Hardy, Jalbert, Kelleher, Kelley, K. F.; Lessard, Littlefield, Maddox, McCloskey, McKinnon, Morrell, Norris, Orestis, Pratt, Ross, Santoro, Sheltra, Silverman, Stillings, Tanguay, Trask, Vincent, Wheeler, Whitson.

Yes, 80; No, 30; Absent, 40.

The SPEAKER: Eighty having voted in the affirmative and thirty having voted in the negative, with forty being absent, the motion does prevail.

Sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Carrier.

Mr. CARRIER: Mr. Speaker, I now move that we reconsider our action whereby this bill was indefinitely postponed and I hope you vote against my motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Carrier, moves that the House reconsider its action whereby this Bill was indefinitely postponed. All in favor of that motion will say aye; those opposed will say no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion to reconsider did not prevail.

The following papers from the Senate were taken up out of order by unanimous consent.

From the Senate: The following Order:

WHEREAS, many of Maine's senior citizens who are retired on fixed incomes are in need of relief from the burdens resulting from property taxes; and

WHEREAS, the property tax relief for the elderly proposal contained in Legislative Document 1817, "An Act to Relieve Certain Elderly Householders from the Extraordinary Impact of Property Taxes," may provide the relief needed by Maine's senior citizens; now, therefore, be it

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee be authorized and directed to study the subject matter and the long range funding requirements of the Bill, "An Act to Relieve Certain Elderly Householders from the Extraordinary Impact of Property Taxes," House Paper No. 1400, Legislative Document No. 1817, introduced at the regular session of the 105th Legislature; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Committee study the provisions of the Bill, "An Act to Relieve Certain Elderly Householders from the Extraordinary Impact of Property Taxes" and the Federal Welfare Law and Regulations to determine whether persons who will receive relief under said Bill who also receive Aid to the Aged, Blind and Disabled under Part 2 of Title 22 of the Revised Statutes will continue to receive as high a level of assistance under the Aid to the Aged, Blind and Disabled program, and be it further

ORDERED, that the State Bureau of Taxation and the State Department of Health and Welfare be directed to furnish such information and assistance as the Committee deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Order; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Committee report its findings, together with any necessary recommendations, at the next regular or special session of the Legislature. (S-677)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

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

Non-Concurrent Matters

Joint Order relative to Legislative Research Committee study feasibility of community college concept (H. P. 1434) which was passed in the House earlier in the day.

Joint Order relative to Departments of Health and Welfare and Labor and Industry study

sanitation, food handling and employment of minors (H. P. 1435) which was passed in the House earlier in the day.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur with the Senate on the preceding two Joint Orders.

On motion of Mr. Pratt of Parsonsfield.

Adjourned until nine o'clock tomorrow morning.