

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

Friday, February 25, 1972

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Lawrence Merckens of Hallowell.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

Orders Out of Order

Mr. Lizotte of Biddeford presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that David Ladderbush and Ronald Gagnon of Biddeford and Guy Nadeau of Saco be appointed to serve as Honorary Pages for today.

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

Mr. Lebel of Van Buren presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that Louise and Paul Violette of Van Buren be appointed to serve as Honorary Pages for today.

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

Mrs. Wheeler of Portland presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that Karen and Kathleen McCormick of Union be appointed to serve as Honorary Pages for today.

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

Mrs. Berube of Lewiston presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that Ronald Carrier of Westbrook be appointed to serve as Honorary Page for today.

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

Mr. Curtis of Orono presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that William MacDonald of Winthrop be

appointed to serve as Honorary Page for today.

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

Joint Resolution

The following Joint Resolution presented by Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston and approved by a majority of the Committee on Reference of Bills for introduction in accordance with Joint Rule 11:

WE, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in First Special Session of the One-Hundred and Fifth Legislature now assembled, most respectfully present and petition The Honorable John H. Chaffee, Secretary of the Navy, as follows:

WHEREAS, in June, 1970, after bitter competition with Maine's Bath Iron Works, Ingalls Shipbuilding Division of Litton Systems, Inc., won a 2.6 billion dollar contract for destroyers; and

WHEREAS, Litton Systems, Inc., is between 12 to 16 months behind schedule on a previous contract and has yet to start building the first of the 16 ships as contracted; and

WHEREAS, the U. S. Navy vitally needs ships which Maine workers are capable and eager to build to keep the destroyer program moving; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That we, your Memorialists, recommend and urge the Secretary of the Navy to take appropriate action to review all contractual obligations between Ingalls Shipbuilding Division of Litton Systems, Inc., and the Navy with a view toward renegotiating those shipbuilding contracts which have been breached or can't be fulfilled on schedule by utilizing other available facilities; and be it further

RESOLVED: That a copy of this Memorial, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted by the Secretary of State to the Honorable John H. Chaffee and by the Secretary of State to the members of Senate and House of Representatives representing Maine in Congress, Senator Margaret Chase Smith, Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Representative

Peter N. Kyros and Representative William D. Hathaway, (H. P. 1591) The Joint Resolution was read.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I was prompted to present this resolution in some of my recent travels and after talking to representatives of some of the members of our delegation in Washington of both parties, including people in the hierarchy in the State of Rhode Island who are quite familiar with the Honorable John Chaffee. I think, as all of us do, that the selection for the contracts should have been Bath Iron Works in the first place, world renown ship-builders. I think as was predicted, the thing in Mississippi has got itself in such a mess that as the order states we are now from 12 to 16 months behind.

I think the impact of this memorial, although I am not necessarily one of those who has gone along with memorials at all times, but I think the impact of this memorial to the Honorable John Chaffee and to the members of our delegation will probably prove to be very fruitful and very very helpful to the program of defense and the program within the Armed Services as far as ship-building is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I move for the passage of this resolution.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I did not know this was coming in until this morning, but I did follow the contract situation very closely. At that time I did not believe that any one yard would get the entire contract because it made no sense to me to place our entire new Navy destroyer fleet in any one yard, even the Bath Iron Works.

I thought that in their good wisdom they would split it up, one yard on the west coast, one in the south and one in the east, but they didn't do this. This was during the time of Defense Secretary, Mr. McNamara, and evidently he

thought you could mass produce ships like you mass produce automobiles. That is not so.

I have never been one to favor memorials to Congress because I didn't think they did any good, but this is a bit different. It is directed to the Secretary of Navy, and if in any way it would help Maine shipbuilding I certainly would favor it.

Thereupon, the Joint Resolution was adopted and sent up for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

Orders

Mrs. Berube of Lewiston presented the following Joint Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Maine Education Council, established under chapter 452 of the public laws of 1967, is authorized and directed to study the academic and field training, certification, diploma and degree requirements for professionals, paraprofessionals and teacher aides in the Maine Head Start programs; and be it further

ORDERED, that the council submit a written report of its findings, together with any necessary recommendations and implementing legislation, to the next regular or special session of the Legislature; and be it further

ORDERED, upon passage, in concurrence, that a copy of this Order be immediately transmitted to said council as notice of this proposed study. (H. P. 1590)

The Joint Order was read and passed and sent up for concurrence.

On motion of Mr. Porter of Lincoln, it was

ORDERED, that Mr. Rocheleau of Auburn be excused from attendance due to a death in the family.

House Reports of Committees Ought to Pass in New Draft New Draft Printed

Mrs. Brown from the Committee on Natural Resources on Bill "An Act relating to the Management of Solid Wastes" (H. P. 1497) (L. D. 1940) reported same in a new

draft (H. P. 1587) (L. D. 2046) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was read and accepted.

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

Mr. LEE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This is quite a comprehensive bill. It looks to me like it includes all of our towns, cities and everything else under this act, and I would think we need a little studying time on that.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: For the benefit of the members of the House and the gentleman from Albion, this bill is the same bill that came to the Appropriations Table last trip around and was not funded because of lack of funds. There is nothing different about it at all, so it is really the same bill that we had under the regular session, and there is really nothing different in it. I would hope that that might answer the questions.

I think perhaps that we might move it along so we might get out of here at some point.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hope, Mr. Hardy.

Mr. HARDY: Mr. Speaker, may this lay on the table for one legislative day?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the House that the Report has been accepted. Is there objection to it having its two readings at this time?

Whereupon, the New Draft was read twice and assigned the next legislative day.

**Divided Report
Tabled and Assigned**

Majority Report of the Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act relating to Legislative Ethics" (H. P. 1538) (L. D. 1980) reporting same in a new draft (H. P. 1538) (L. D. 2048) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. JOHNSON of Somerset

CLIFFORD

of Androscoggin

WYMAN of Washington

— of the Senate.

Messrs. COONEY of Webster

FARRINGTON

of Old Orchard Beach

MARSTALLER

of Freeport

SILVERMAN of Calais

HODGDON of Kittery

CURTIS of Orono

BUSTIN of Augusta

Mrs. GOODWIN of Bath

— of the House.

Minority Report of Same Committee on same Bill reporting same in a new draft (H. P. 1589) (L. D. 2049) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. DONAGHY of Lubec

SHAW of Chelsea

STILLINGS of Berwick

— of the House.

Reports were read.

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

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of the Minority Report "Ought to pass."

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Donaghy, moves the acceptance of the Minority "Ought to Pass" Report.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that this would not happen, I am not sure why at this point, and I would hope that the State Government Committee might explain the actions of the majority report.

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

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I had hoped a miracle might happen and this might slide under the gavel for a couple or three readings, but it hasn't. This is the story.

We worked very hard and long on this ethics bit. And there seems to be the point that we have reached now that the more we try to do the bigger quagmire we get

in, not because we have done anything wrong but we seem to worry about our image with the press. And after an editorial was distributed to you yesterday by Representative Kelley, it would seem that it only confirms the fact that if we continue on this basis, where it can be called, and perhaps rightfully so, the puppets of Mr. Don Hansen and have, instead of the usual wooden structure of a puppet, we have, they put some jello in it for a backbone of the thing.

For years there have been laws on the books that said that we could not conspire or defraud. All these many things, they are still there. We have a House and Senate that has gone on for many years. I don't think that the caliber of this House has changed any great amount in the last few years. From time to time, there are differences of opinion between the Houses and within the leadership. But generally speaking, I think that they have done a very fine job and I think they will continue to do a fine job.

So if this bill, which proposes to wipe off of the books, the ethics bill, which in my opinion and the opinion of others puts this legislature in a very poor light and position, if we wipe this off the books. I have prepared a joint resolution to be offered here that would put ethics back under the joint rules of the House and Senate where it has been for years and where I feel that it belongs.

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

Mr. MARSTALLER: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: As a signer of other report by the committee on the new draft of the ethics bill, I would explain the main features of this bill. This bill would keep the present ethics committee intact but would further define a conflict of interest which would be when proposed legislation, for instance, will result in a direct significant financial gain for you and your spouse.

In other words, we have narrowed down the area of a conflict of interest to financial gain. Also, in this draft, anyone who files a

complaint would have to file it under oath and the member would have full protection of the law in any hearing and would have a right to sue if a false complaint was lodged. So we feel that this new draft does define the conflict and does give the member protection.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is not my intention to delay the adjournment of the House, but I think we have been given two very important reports under two various L. D. titles and two various L. D. numbers, today L. D. 2048 and L. D. 2049. It is Friday, I note a great many empty chairs for no doubt good reasons.

But I would like to have an opportunity, at least, to study both of these bills. I think it would be fair enough to ask somebody to table this measure until at least Monday so we could look the situation over over the weekend, pending acceptance of any report.

Whereupon, on motion of Mr. Hancock of Casco, tabled pending the motion of Mr. Donaghy of Lubec to accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report and specially assigned for Monday, February 28.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act relating to Interceptor Sewers and Pumping Stations of Waterville Sewerage District and Municipalities Within Kennebec Sanitary Treatment District" (S. P. 758) (L. D. 2030)

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

Third Reader Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act relating to Clarifying Definitions Relating to the Potato Industry of Maine" (S. P. 762) (L. D. 2033)

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

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

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have an amendment that I want to present to this bill Monday, and to save needless debate and give the opposition a chance to look it over and study it, I hope some kind gentleman would table this for one legislative day.

Whereupon, on motion of Mr. Finemore of Bridgewater, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Monday, February 28.

Bill "An Act relating to Reporting Tumors and Establishing a Statewide Tumor Registry" (S. P. 766) (L. D. 2043)

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

Orders of the Day

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

House Divided Report — Majority (8) Ought not to pass — Minority (6) Ought to pass — Committee on State Government on Resolution Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Reduce the Age of Qualification as a Member of the Maine House of Representatives to Twenty Years (H. P. 1508) (L. D. 1950)

Tabled — February 24, by Mr. Farrington of Old Orchard Beach.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Donaghy of Lubec to accept Majority Report.

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

Mr. FARRINGTON: I am having an amendment drawn up and it is not quite ready. I would appreciate it if someone would table this for one legislative day.

Whereupon, on motion of Mr. Parks of Presque Isle, retabled pending the motion of the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Donaghy, to accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report and specially assigned for Monday, February 28.

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

Bill "An Act Reallocating Funds for Professional Contractual

Employees for the Joint Standing Committees of the Legislature and a Pay Raise for Members of the Legislature" (H. P. 1450) (L. D. 1893) — Committee Amendment "A" (H-559) adopted.

Tabled — February 24, by Mr. Gill of South Portland.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

On motion of Mr. Bither of Houlton, under suspension of the rules, the House reconsidered its action of February 23 whereby Committee Amendment "A" was adopted.

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

House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" (H-574) was read by the Clerk.

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

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker, may I inquire through the Chair for an explanation of what is being done here?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Donaghy, poses a question through the Chair to any member who may answer if they choose.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Bither.

Mr. BITHER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The only thing this amendment does and I repeat again, the only thing this does is take the extra \$1,000, if it goes through, and put it into the second year. It does not, I repeat again, this does not change the pay for the special sessions, which will be \$25 on the next time around, or the next special session. It does not change expenses; it only affects that extra \$1,000, if it is passed.

I would like to also say that it is my understanding, and I know this has happened before and I think some of the members here know more about this than I do, that we have tried to get Internal Revenue to split this \$2500 into two years and they say it cannot be done. And it cannot be done because the law very specifically says, I believe the law says in

the State of Maine, that we shall be paid \$2500 for the regular session, period. And for that reason, Internal Revenue won't let you split it up over two years.

Now, this way, that \$1,000 is a second year salary, that is what it amounts to, and will not be affected or will not affect your Internal Revenue statement or your income tax at all. This is really a tremendous tax saving for a good many members of this House.

I estimated, Mr. Speaker, that in the two branches of the House, and of course I had to estimate this, this is only a guesstimate, that there are some 59 members of this House, either 65 or will be 65 before too many years or very shortly. If you figure 55, and for every one of these people that are on Social Security there is a loss today of \$1320 that goes back to the Federal Government. So not only is this a loss to each individual member, but this is a loss to the economy of Maine because this is money that goes back to the Federal Government and does not come into our economy.

This would amount to somewhere between 70 and 75 thousand dollars to the membership of this House. I hope that clears it up.

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

Mr. VINCENT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to direct a question to Mr. Bither who just spoke on the \$1,000 pay raise in the second year. I would like to inquire how this will affect the per diem that we earn during the special session, how the \$1,000 will be spread out over and above the salary we are presently drawing at a special session.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Vincent, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Bither, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. BITHER: Mr. Speaker, I thought I just said that but I will say it again. I am glad to repeat it again because I want that cleared up very definitely. A lot of members spoke to me this morning about that same thing. This does

not affect the \$20 or \$25 it will be next session; this does not affect the pay of the special session, whatsoever.

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question. I am sure the finance office will be interested, when is the \$1,000 to be paid in the second year, at the beginning or on December 31?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Livermore Falls, Mr. Lynch, poses a further question through the Chair to the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Bither, who may answer if he chooses, and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. BITHER: Mr. Speaker, this doesn't present any problem; Mr. Garside tells me this doesn't present any great problem. It might be better if we had specific dates in here, but this is pay for the second year and he has suggested that it be paid through a period of so much per month or something like that.

He said it will offer no problem whatsoever to him. Now, I don't know whether it offers a n y problem to you, but it doesn't offer any problem to him. He can pay it in the second year without any problem or any trouble.

Thereupon, House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" was adopted.

Committee Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto was adopted.

The Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended and sent to the Senate.

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

Bill "An Act to Correct Errors and Inconsistencies in the Education Laws" (H. P. 1468) (L. D. 1911) — Committee Amendment "A" (H-555) adopted.

Tabled — February 24, by Mr. Lynch of Livermore Falls.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

Mr. Simpson of Standish offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" (H-562) was read by the Clerk.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman could indicate whether this is going to allow them to have absentee ballots or whether it is forcing them to have absentee ballots in the school administrative district elections.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson, who may answer if he chooses.

The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. SIMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Right now under the present SAD setup, there is a conflict in the laws between how the SAD shall vote on capital improvement programs. This does not pertain to budgets; this is on capital improvement programs such as new schools or the dissolutionment of a district, anything that has to be done by secret ballot.

The laws right now, by the way of the Attorney General's office and the Department of Education, the intent of the law is that absentee ballots be used by all towns or not at all. And the way it is set up right now, some towns use them and some don't. Therefore some towns in an SAD are disenfranchised by the nonuse or by the minor use of absentee ballots. So it would be up to the school district directors now to either authorize absentee ballots for the entire district or none at all, but not from one town to another.

Thereupon, House Amendment "A" was adopted.

Mr. Millett of Dixmont offered House Amendment "B" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "B" (H-564) was read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. MILLETT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House: This amendment is very definitely not to correct an error or an inconsistency in the educa-

tion laws. Therefore, I will not attempt to convince you that it is, in substance, a nonsubstantive matter. It is something which I feel very strongly is in need of being done. And, in a sense, it is to clear up an inconsistency of interpretation and it relates strictly to the area of the release of information which is of a personal nature relative to pupils. And what the bill or the amendment would attempt to do would be to provide some specific guidelines for the benefit and protection of school officials to spell out under which terms release of information would be authorized.

It provides for six specific authorizations by people authorized by the parents, including the parents, officials, law enforcement officers and for the purpose of college and university transcript information. The purpose is only to provide a common ground by which schools will be required to release information of a personal nature with respect to their pupils.

Thereupon, House Amendment "B" was adopted.

On motion of Mr. Lynch of Livermore Falls, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Monday, February 28.

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that when the House and Senate adjourn, they adjourn to Monday, February 28, at one o'clock in the afternoon. (S. P. 770)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

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

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

Senate Divided Report — Report "A" (6) Ought to pass in New Draft — Report "B" Ought not to pass — Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Five Million Dollars on Behalf of the State of Maine to Resurface Certain Highways" (S. P. 728) (L. D. 2006) — New Draft (S. P. 765) (L. D.

2039) under same title. In Senate, Report "A" accepted and Bill passed to be engrossed.

Tabled — February 24, by Mr. Lizotte of Biddeford.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Lee of Albion to accept Report "B" in non-concurrence.

On motion of Mrs. McCormick of Union, retabled pending the motion of Mr. Lee of Albion to accept Report "B" in non-concurrence and specially assigned for Monday, February 18.

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

An Act Authorizing Town of Dresden to Vote on Certain Liquor Local Option Questions. (H. P. 1494) (L. D. 1937) — In House, enacted — In Senate, failed passage to be enacted.

Tabled — February 24, by Mrs. Lincoln of Bethel.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Ross of Bath to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bristol, Mr. Lewis.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I realize this is Friday and this is the last item on the calendar, but there are some things that I would like to say in regard to this and I hope that you will hear me out.

As you recall, the House originally passed this measure by 105 votes; it being an emergency measure it needed 101. It went to the other body, and it was quite apparent if and when all members of that body happened to be present that the bill had a good chance of enactment. Yesterday it came onto the floor of the other body and it looked as though the 22 votes were there to pass this as an emergency measure.

During the early morning hours, a certain individual appeared in the other body and sat through the session, and as a result it went down to defeat by two votes. In other words, those two votes had previously been on the affirmative side.

I was presented a copy of the last election in which I ran by a member of the other body

and he repeated a statement made by the individual who had given him the copy of the last election in which I ran, showing that I lost the town of Dresden by five or six votes. And he said that the statement was made that the reason I was fighting so hard for this bill was to win the town of Dresden in the upcoming election. He failed to note at the bottom of the total votes cast, that I had carried my eight towns by something like 2100 to 700, which sort of disproves the belief that I really needed the support of Dresden to win an election, although I certainly would appreciate it if I could carry the town of Dresden.

At this time I would like to thank the members of this House who supported this bill and also those three or four members who originally had an amendment attached to this bill. They lost their amendment but they, in spite of that, cooperated fully with me and came to me and told me that they would support this measure.

I have put considerable time into this bill, primarily because I believe that this would be a good thing for the town of Dresden. I have talked with several members of the House yesterday afternoon and this morning and my first inclination was to say, "Oh, to heck with it, let's give up and forget it." But, since I have carried it this far, I certainly hope that you will go along with the motion of Mr. Ross from Bath to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I agree with the remarks made by the gentleman. I have a suggestion and I am not sure he might want to buy this in this sense.

I am wondering whether or not we might let the other body try to redeem itself by removing the provision and asking for the Committee of Conference, by simply insisting. And that way, we put ourselves in a better position of having them put themselves on the line again. It seems to me, I think, a better way to approach the problem and I wonder if the

gentleman from Bath might change his motion to be just to insist on our action of final enactment.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would be willing to change that motion if it is all right with Mr. Lewis.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bristol, Mr. Lewis.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Thank you,

Mr. Martin and Mr. Ross. I agree with this suggestion wholeheartedly.

Whereupon, Mr. Ross of Bath withdrew his motion to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

Thereupon, on motion of the same gentleman, the House voted to insist.

On motion of Mr. Porter of Lincoln,

Adjourned until Monday, February 28, at one o'clock in the afternoon.