

# 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**

**SENATE**

Friday, February 25, 1972

Senate called to order by the President.

Prayer by the Rev. Father John L. Dougher of Augusta.

Reading of the Journal of yesterday.

**Joint Order**

Out of order and under suspension of the rules, on motion by Mr. Hoffses of Knox,

ORDERED, the House concurring, that when the House and Senate adjourn, they adjourn to Monday, February 28, at 1 o'clock in the afternoon.

(S. P. 770)

Which was Read and Passed.

Under further suspension of the rules, sent down forthwith for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Hoffses of Knox,

Recessed until the sound of the bell.

**(After Recess)**

Called to order by the President.

**Orders**

Mr. Tanous of Penobscot presented,

ORDERED, the House concurring, that there is allocated from the Legislative Account the sum of \$3,000 to the Special Interim Legislative Insurance Study Commission established at the regular legislative session pursuant to H.P. 1848 to continue its study on matters of no-fault automobile insurance, pool underwriting associations for fire and extended coverage insurance, promotion of pool associations by School Administrative Districts, cancellation and nonrenewals of agencies and policies and inclusions of mental illness and treatment by psychologists under health insurance plans, as well as rate filings by insurance companies and rating bureaus.

(S. P. 769)

Which was Read and Passed.

Sent down for concurrence.

**Committee Reports****House****Ought to Pass in New Draft**

The Committee on Natural Resources on, Bill, "An Act Relating

to Discharge of Waste from Watercraft." (H. P. 1555) (L. D. 2016)

Reported that the same Ought to Pass in New Draft Under Same Title (H. P. 1585) (L. D. 2044)

Comes from the House, the report Read and Accepted and the Bill in New Draft Passed to be Engrossed.

Which report was Read and Accepted in concurrence, the Bill in New Draft Read Once and Tomorrow Assigned for Second Reading.

**Divided Report**

The Majority of the Committee on Taxation on, Bill, "An Act Establishing a Forest Lands Taxation Policy Using A Productivity Approach." (H. P. 1557) (L. D. 2018)

Reported that the same Ought to Pass in New Draft Under Same Title (H. P. 1577) (L. D. 2034)

Signed:

Senators:

WYMAN of Washington

HICHENS of York

FORTIER of Oxford

Representatives:

ROSS of Bath

FINEMORE

of Bridgewater

COLLINS of Caribou

MORRELL of Brunswick

DAM of Skowhegan

CYR of Madawaska

TRASK of Milo

COTTRELL of Portland

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported that the same Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-553).

Signed:

Representative:

McCLOSKEY of Bangor

Comes from the House, the Majority Ought to Pass in New Draft report Read and Accepted and the Bill, in New Draft, Passed to be Engrossed as Amended by House Amendments "A" (H-556) "B" (H-567) "C" (H-568) and "F" (H-573).

Which reports were Read.

Mr. Hichens of York then moved that the Majority Ought to Pass Report of the Committee be Accepted.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Martin of Piscataquis, tabled and

Tomorrow Assigned, pending the motion by Mr. Hichens of York to Accept the Majority Ought to Pass Report of the Committee.

### Divided Report

The Majority of the Committee on Health and Institutional Services on, Bill, "An Act Permitting Veterans with Medical Experience to Take the Licensed Practical Nurses Examination." (H. P. 1473) (L. D. 1916)

Reported that the same Ought to Pass in New Draft Under Same Title (H. P. 1584) (L. D. 2042)

Signed:

Senators:

GREELEY of Waldo  
MINKOWSKY  
of Androscoggin

Representatives:

SANTORO of Portland  
CLEMENTE of Portland  
BERRY of Madison  
CUMMINGS of Newport  
PAYSON of Falmouth  
DOYLE of Bangor  
LEWIS of Bristol

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported that the same Ought Not to Pass.

Signed:

Senator:

HICHENS of York  
Representative:  
McCORMICK of Union  
DYAR of Strong

Comes from the House, the Majority Ought to Pass in New Draft report read and Accepted and the Bill, in New Draft, Passed to be Engrossed.

Which reports were Read.

On motion by Mr. Greeley of Waldo, the Majority Ought to Pass in New Draft Report of the Committee was Accepted in concurrence, the Bill Read Once and Tomorrow Assigned for Second Reading.

### Senate

#### Ought to Pass in New Draft

Mr. Schulten for the Committee on Natural Resources on, Bill, "An Act to Revise the Site Location of Development Law." (S. P. 723) (L. D. 1981)

Reported that the same Ought to Pass in New Draft Under Same Title. (S. P. 767) (L. D. 2045)

Mr. Dunn for the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on, Bill, "An Act to Appropriate Moneys for the Expenditures of State Government and Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1972 and June 30, 1973." (S. P. 724) (L. D. 1982)

Reported that the same Ought to Pass in New Draft Under Same Title (S. P. 768) (L. D. 2047)

Which reports were read and Accepted, the Bills in New Draft Read Once and Tomorrow Assigned for Second Reading.

### Second Readers

The Committee on Bills in the Second Reading reported the following:

#### House

Bill, "An Act Relating to Restoration to State Service." (H. P. 1579) (L. D. 2036)

Bill, "An Act to Grant Adult Rights to Persons Eighteen Years of Age." (H. P. 1581) (L. D. 2038)

Which were Read a Second Time and passed to be Engrossed in concurrence.

Bill, "An Act Relating to Per Diem Allowances and Expenses for Members of the State Board of Barbers and State Board of Hairdressers." (H. P. 1580) (L. D. 2037)

Which was Read a Second Time.

Mr. Hichens of York then presented Senate Amendment "A" and moved its Adoption.

Senate Amendment "A", Filing No. S-360, was Read and Adopted, and the Bill, as Amended, Passed to be Engrossed in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

### House - As Amended

Bill, "An Act Implementing the Reorganization of the Department of Secretary of State." (H. P. 1535) (L. D. 1978)

Bill, "An Act Relating to Relocation Assistance and Land Acquisition in State Projects." (H. P. 1554) (L. D. 2015)

Bill, "An Act Reallocating Funds for Auburn-Lewiston Airport Provided by 1967 Bond Issue." (H. P. 1574) (L. D. 2031)

Which were Read a Second Time and Passed to be Engrossed, as Amended, in concurrence.

Bill, "An Act Relating to Inherent Managerial Functions Under the Municipal Employees Labor Relations Law." (H. P. 1531) (L. D. 1974)

Which was Read a Second Time.

Mr. Berry of Cumberland then moved that the Senate reconsider its action whereby the Bill was given its First Reading.

Mr. Marcotte of York then requested a division.

Thereupon, Mr. Tanous of Penobscot requested a roll call.

The PRESIDENT: A roll call has been requested. Under the Constitution, in order for the Chair to order a roll call, it requires the affirmative vote of at least one-fifth of those Senators present and voting. Will all those Senators in favor of ordering a roll call please rise and remain standing until counted.

Obviously more than one-fifth having arisen, a roll call is ordered. The pending question before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Berry, that the Senate reconsider its action whereby L. D. 1974 was given its first reading. A Yes vote will be in favor of reconsideration; a No vote will be opposed.

The Secretary will call the roll.

#### ROLL CALL

YEAS: Senators Anderson, Bernard, Berry, Carswell, Conley, Graham, Greeley, Harding, Hichens, Hoffses, Johnson, Katz, Martin, Moore, Schulten, Sewall, Shute, Tanous, Violette and President MacLeod.

NAYS: Senators Chick, Clifford, Danton, Dunn, Fortier, Kellam, Marcotte, Minkowsky, and Peabody.

ABSENT: Senators Levine, Quinn and Wyman.

A roll call was had. Twenty Senators having voted in the affirmative, and nine Senators having voted in the negative, with three Senators absent, the motion to reconsider prevailed.

On motion by Mr. Tanous of Penobscot, the Senate then voted

to reconsider its action whereby House Amendment "A" was Adopted and, subsequently, on further motion by the same Senator, House Amendment "A" was Indefinitely Postponed.

On further motion by the same Senator, the Senate voted to reconsider its action whereby Committee Amendment "A" was Adopted and, subsequently, on further motion by the same Senator, Committee Amendment "A" was Indefinitely Postponed.

On further motion by the same Senator, the Senate voted to reconsider its action whereby it Accepted Committee Report "A".

The same Senator then moved that the Senate Accept Committee Report "B".

Mr. Marcotte of York requested a roll call on the motion.

The PRESIDENT: A roll call has been requested. Under the Constitution, in order for the Chair to order a roll call, it requires the affirmative vote of at least one-fifth of those Senators present and voting. Will all those Senators in favor of ordering a roll call please rise and remain standing until counted.

Obviously more than one-fifth having arisen, a roll call is ordered.

The pending question before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Tanous, that on Bill, "An Act Relating to Inherent Managerial Functions Under the Municipal Employees Labor Relations Law," that Report "B", that this bill be referred to the 106th Legislature, be Accepted by the Senate. A Yes vote will be in favor of referring this bill to the 106th Legislature; a No vote will be opposed.

The Secretary will call the roll.

#### ROLL CALL

YEAS: Senators Anderson, Bernard, Berry, Carswell, Chick, Conley, Danton, Graham, Greeley, Harding, Hichens, Hoffses, Johnson, Katz, Kellam, Martin, Moore, Peabody, Schulten, Sewall, Shute, Tanous, Violette and President MacLeod.

NAYS: Senators Clifford, Dunn, Fortier, Marcotte and Minkowsky.

ABSENT: Senators Levine, Quinn and Wyman.

A roll call was had. Twenty-four Senators having voted in the affirmative, and five Senators having voted in the negative, with three Senators absent, the motion prevailed.

Thereupon, the Bill was Referred to the 106th Legislature in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

#### **Senate-As Amended**

Bill, "An Act Implementing the Reorganization of the Department of Educational and Cultural Services." (S. P. 721) (L. D. 2010)

Which was Read a Second Time.

On motion by Mr. Berry of Cumberland, tabled and Tomorrow Assigned, pending Passage to be Engrossed.

#### **Enactors**

The Committee on Engrossed Bills reported as truly and strictly engrossed the following:

#### **Bond Issue**

An Act to Authorize Bond Issue in the Amount of \$8,360,000 for the Construction and Renovation of Higher Education Facilities at the University of Maine. (H. P. 1545) (L. D. 2001)

This being a Bond Issue and having received the affirmative votes of 25 members of the Senate, was Passed to be Enacted and, having been signed by the President, was by the Secretary presented to the Governor for his signature.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Harding.

Mr. HARDING of Aroostook: Mr. President, having voted on the prevailing side, I now request that we reconsider our action, and I hope that everybody here will vote against me.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Aroostook, Senator Harding, moves that the Senate reconsider its action whereby this bill was Passed to be Enacted. As many Senators as are in favor of reconsideration will please say Yes; those opposed No.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion did not prevail.

#### **Orders of the Day**

The President laid before the Senate the first tabled and spe-

cially assigned matter:

Bill "An Act to Revise the Maine Land Use Regulation Commission Law." (S. P. 709) (L. D. 1890)

Tabled — February 22, 1972 by Senator Schulten of Sagadahoc.

Pending — Passage to be Engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Schulten of Sagadahoc, retabled and specially assigned for February 9, 1972, pending Passage to be Engrossed.

The President laid before the Senate the second tabled and specially assigned matter:

Bill, "An Act Relating to Kindling Out-of-door Fires." (H. P. 1480) (L. D. 1923)

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Tanous.

Mr. TANOUS of Penobscot: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: Just as a point of explanation on L. D. 1923, at the regular session of the 105th Legislature the subject matter of this particular bill was thoroughly debated and the bill was passed and, of course, enacted into law and signed by the Governor. But apparently the sponsor of the bill had made an error and had not amended two sections of the particular bill, which he should have done in order to give the law some effect.

In effect, when we adopted it, it became inconsistent with Title 12, Section 1401. The bill had only amended Section 1402, which relates to the same subject matter. Now, if the sponsor of the bill had realized that this was an error and an inconsistency in the law, he might have come to the Judiciary Committee and requested an inclusion in the errors and inconsistencies bill which would have amended this, but apparently he chose to submit legislation on his own to correct the error that was made by the original bill which was presented at the 105th regular session.

Now, this matter was thoroughly debated at the regular session, and apparently the Legislature saw fit to adopt the provisions of changing that particular paragraph in the law whereby people would be permitted to use Sterno, gasoline and charcoal stoves both in the

organized and unorganized townships without having to get a permit from a fire warden. So this bill as it is, actually, L. D. 1923, only seeks to amend an error and an inconsistency in the law.

Senator Shute from Franklin has an amendment which is pending, which we will be voting on in a few moments, which would permit the use of Sterno, gasoline, charcoal and other fuel fires in organized townships. But as far as the unorganized townships are concerned, they would be limited to using these stoves within 100 yards, which is 300 feet, from the road. This is what his amendment does, and I merely mention this to you as a matter of explanation on how you might feel about this particular bill, as to whether you want to support the original intent of the document which we passed or whether you want to support Senator Shute's amendment. Thank you.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Franklin, Senator Shute.

Mr. SHUTE of Franklin: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I want to thank the good Senator from Penobscot for helping to explain the amendment which I have offered on this document.

I think the effect of this amendment is to continue the permit procedure only in the remote areas of the unorganized part of our state. This permit is the only way that the forest rangers in the unorganized areas are informed as to where people are going on the land of another camp or to a fishing area.

I can imagine that if this bill passed as it is now constituted, without the amendment, that you would find large landowners all over the state would be closing certain sections of their land to people who would like to use these resources, and this is why I became concerned about this problem.

This is another way that you can supervise fire control, vandalism in unorganized areas, and be helpful in case of any emergency or accident, and then proper communications can be carried out.

I do know that during the hearing of this bill the Forest Commis-

sioner voiced a grave concern with the original version of L. D. 1923. This amendment, I think, would be much more palatable to not only Forestry, but to the landowners involved. It seems to me that this is a sensible way to get away from unrealistic procedures in municipalities, to avoid unnecessary procedures near public roads in the unorganized territory, and to avoid unnecessary requirements with respect to our licensed Maine guides. I hope you will support the concept of this amendment.

The PRESIDENT: Is it now the pleasure of the Senate that Senate Amendment "A" be adopted?

Thereupon, the Bill, as Amended, was Passed to be Engrossed in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

The President laid before the Senate the third tabled and specially assigned matter:

Bill, "An Act Relating to Guarantees by the State Industrial Building Authority and the Maine Recreation Authority." (S. P. 706) (L. D. 1887)

Tabled — February 24, 1972 by Senator Sewall of Penobscot.

Pending — Passage to be Engrossed.

Mr. Violette of Aroostook presented Senate Amendment "B" and moved its Adoption.

Senate Amendment "B", Filing No. S-361, was Read and Adopted and the Bill, as Amended, Passed to be Engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

The President laid before the Senate the fourth tabled and specially assigned matter:

Bill, "An Act Relating to Penalty for Sale of Certain Drugs." (H. P. 1582) (L. D. 2040)

Tabled — February 24, 1972 by Senator Shute of Franklin.

Pending — Motion by Senator Tanous of Penobscot to Accept the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Franklin, Senator Shute.

Mr. SHUTE of Franklin: Mr. President, I would oppose this motion and ask for a division. I would like to speak to the motion.

The PRESIDENT: A division has been requested.

The Senator has the floor.

Mr. SHUTE: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I rise with trepidation, knowing that I will be confronted by a battery of lawyers within the Senate and, recalling not too many months ago when we had a bill of a similar nature that came before this body, I am reluctant to proceed because I know that the walls will crash in here very shortly. But I think this is the type of bill that the State of Maine is waiting for us to enact.

I think what we also need is a little background material on the problems of drugs here in the state, the abuses of drugs, and the big problem to which this bill addresses itself, the drug pushers, the traffickers in drugs.

The February issue of the American Legion magazine, to which some of you may subscribe, carries a story about the many faces of the drug problem in our country. You may be surprised to know that the American Legion has led the fight against drug abuse in our nation since 1951. As a matter of fact in 1951 drug abuse in the United States was so visibly bad, according to this Legion article, that the American Legion sponsored a national conference on drug abuse in New York City. It goes back this far.

The growth of drug abuse is a long-term trend, and efforts to trace its roots must be found in long-term trends. So you can rule out such events as the Vietnam War as a root cause in our drug problems. It does, however, leave urban decay in, and I am sure you would agree with me that most of our problems in drugs and drug traffic started within the big cities, and it has spread out from there.

Another long-term trend which has undoubtedly contributed much to the growth of drug abuse, taking it far away from the slums of the cities, is the barrage of indoctrination, now at least 40 years old, which teaches new generations of youngsters that they are not accountable for their actions. You are familiar with some of the educational philosophies that were advanced in the 1930's, in which

the young had been taught that the young should be taught to believe nothing and challenge everything. We are now reaping some of the rewards of that philosophy in this day and age.

Many an urban school is a frightening place for administrators. Would you believe that federal figures have shown that in New York City 35,000 school children are taking heroin in the arm today, and similar situations exist in other school systems? And you in your own community have had experience or have heard of them, of drug traffickers and drug pushers, and of children, even down to the grammar school age, that have been exposed to drugs by these sick individuals.

What L. D. 2040 does is put the clamp on the drug pusher and provide mandatory penalties. I am sure that you can agree with me too that the courts have demonstrated their inability to deal properly with the drug problem, not only here in the State of Maine but in many other parts of the country. You have seen the television program "Let's Make a Deal." I sometimes wonder if in our court system when they are faced with a drug charge, the prosecuting attorney, in looking at some of the laws on our books, decides to make a deal with the defense attorney.

As an example of the type of abuse of the laws which this legislature has passed are the mandatory sentences for persons convicted of a crime while in possession of a firearm, and it is true, charges have been reduced. And I feel that this is the responsibility of prosecutors who have become weak-kneed in the face of a charge by the people and by the legislature to enforce more strictly the laws that the legislature has passed. So it is that courts and attorneys then are really flying in the face of a law passed by the legislature and, in effect, they are denying the public will.

I think it is time we said to the courts, said to the prosecuting attorneys, let's take the drug pusher, let's give him a mandatory sentence as prescribed by L. D. 2040 and its amendment, put him where he belongs, in the brig, and then



let's throw the key away. This is one way we can treat the drug problem in the State of Maine, and I think that you should join with me and go into the temple and throw these evil money changers out of their money-making habits. I hope you will oppose the motion to accept the Ought Not to Pass Report.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Harding.

Mr. HARDING of Aroostook: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: As a family man, who is a man who would have as much concern certainly as anybody in this Senate about the horrible situation which we face on drugs, what a dream it would be if by passing this bill here we could take care of this problem.

There is only one weakness in that dream: it has been tried and it has failed. The Federal Narcotics Act of 1937 made mandatory penalties, even for marijuana. It was unsuccessful that it was repealed in 1960 to give the courts discretion on it.

Now, insofar as our own state is concerned and the sponsor of this bill, for whom I have the highest regard, the deepest respect and affection, but still when we came to the marijuana thing a few years ago a similar kind of thing was on the books, and you can read it, about the mandatory provisions of 18 to 20 and how you were put in jail, and so on. This was unworkable, and it was repealed by this legislature.

Now, on this bill that we have, I suggest to you—and don't take my word for anything—just look at the bill yourself; this bill was hastily drafted. It was so poorly drafted that they made a new draft of the bill, which is before you. The new draft was so poorly done that they have made an amendment to correct it. And in the amendment of corrections, now it is a greater crime, according to the amendment, to give somebody one of these forbidden drugs than to sell it. You could get up to ten years for giving them the drug, but if you actually did catch one of these pushers, the most you could give him would be five years.

So this thing is very hastily done, it is very poorly done, and it does not solve the problem.

Now, who were the proponents of this bill before the committee? There were three people who appeared: there was the sponsor, there was a young lady who—I don't know what her background was—she seemed very disturbed, and there was a young man who just got out of the Navy. Those were the proponents. The Attorney General was not there. No official of his office was there. No law enforcement officer was there. But who were the opponents of this? Everybody in Maine who had had any experience in this field, including the Maine Drug Commission, Dr. Schumacher, Dr. Christie, who assist these people that have this torment, they were all there to oppose it. Why? Because it has been tried and it has failed. That is why they opposed it.

Now, I want to give you just a little background, if I may. I can't identify these people who appeared in executive session before this committee, but I want to tell you a little bit of the background of how this drug trade really works, and why this would be such an abominable thing to have on the books. We have people who import drugs of heroin in this country, and when they are imported their imports have a value of half a million dollars. They are the importers. They will resell that to a distributor, resell it to a wholesaler, and down to a retailer. But in this area that we are talking about here, say a college kid goes and he will buy, say \$10 worth of hard drugs, and others will kick in with him. He brings it back and distributes it among them. Now, these people were the undercover people, and they told us that this is the kind of people this bill is aimed against, it is really the victims, because all they have is \$5 to \$10 to make a buy with. So they make a buy, and who are those that are convicted? These are the victims that are convicted. But these people told us, they said, "If you would have the confidence in the law enforcing officers and give us law enforcement, we could go to this retailer, but it would

cost us \$10,000 to make the buy from him. We could make that buy and we could put him out of business. Or, if the federal government really wanted to do something about it, they could chip in the big dough of \$100,000, or half a million dollars, and make these buys and put them out of business.

So, what we object to is this kind of thing, because we are not getting at the heart of it. I like the bill as it is because you could give a fellow up to twenty years if you caught a real pusher. Instead of reducing it, as it is here, if you ever caught one of these pushers, a real pusher, all you could give him would be five years. But what this would be used against, however, as a practical way, according to these people who had worked in the undercover, it would be used against the victim, the small, petty user, as we would say. So this is why I oppose this.

If we had the knowledge on this, and believe me, it is being worked on, we should draft a bill which would be aimed at the real pusher. There are studies being made on this on the federal level and by the Compact of States. The idea of it would be that if a person was in possession of any of this contraband illegally to a value of, say \$500, this would put him into the high category because you would know he intended to sell it. Then I wouldn't care what kind of a penalty you had against that kind of a person. But here you don't have such a thing.

Now, the reason that we haven't been able to draft that, and they have been working on it, is how do you establish the value of the contraband? Now, this is being worked on. Like Steve Simmons told us. "Be patient, and you can come out with a bill which will be meaningful." This bill is not meaningful. It will set us back and it will hurt our own enforcement problems. It does not have the endorsement of the law enforcement people in this state nor anybody who is familiar with the drug problem. So I hope you will support the motion of Senator Tanous to accept the Majority Report of the Committee.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Tanous.

Mr. TANOUS of Penobscot: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I rise to support Senator Harding in his comments to you this morning relative to this very important document before us.

There is no question that we are all interested in doing away with the problem of drugs and drug abuse. You have before you a letter which I received from Dr. Christie, which was distributed. He appeared at the hearing. Dr. Christie, incidentally, is the son of a former member of this body from Presque Isle, and he is working with drug addicts day in and day out in the hospital at the Maine Medical Center. He mentions in his letter his reasons why he is opposed to L. D. 2040 for mandatory sentences for drug abusers, as proposed in the bill.

I went further. I also spoke with Richard Cohen of the Attorney General's Department. In fact, he appeared before the Judiciary Committee on another matter. And he was asked about mandatory sentences, as to whether he agreed with them, especially in this particular respect, and as I recall, his answer was that he did not support mandatory sentences.

I know that Warden Robbins, who appeared before our committee at regular sessions, mentioned also that this is certainly not a deterrent, and disagrees with mandatory sentences in matters of this nature.

Personally, I feel that mandatory sentences should be invoked, but not to a jail. I feel that we should have mandatory sentences to a hospital, a treatment center, somewhere where these people can be helped, like we have done for the alcoholics and the mentally ill. The drug addicts, and most of these people that Senator Harding mentioned at the local level, that we can pinch day in and day out, are our high school kids, the vast majority of them, who casually furnish their friends or who might divide a purchase between their friends, and they are sellers. They are sellers just as much as the

hard-core seller is, under this particular law.

Now, I agree that if we could draft a bill to jail the fellow that is at the top, the individual who is a real pusher, I agree with Senator Shute from Franklin, this guy, if we can nab him, let's convict him, lock him up and throw away the key. That man at the top is the one that Senator Harding has referred to that we can't raise enough money to catch like we do the youngsters, the inexperienced ones, the ones that sell or furnish to feed their habits, and I would certainly support a bill for mandatory sentences wherein these people would be sent to a hospital where they should be treated. Thank you.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Bernard.

Mr. BERNARD of Androscoggin: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: If the Chair would, I would like to pose a question through the Chair to the previous speaker. That question would be: How would you propose to treat a pusher who doesn't use drugs? How do you take this person and put him in a hospital? What do you treat him for?

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Bernard, has posed a question through the Chair which the Senator may answer if he desires.

Mr. HARDING of Aroostook: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: To answer the question, when we are talking about the pusher everyone here is agreed that the pusher who sells this drug for money, for profit, ought to be in jail and I don't care about the limit. But the court now has that discretion and, as the good Senator from Androscoggin knows, they had some drug problems down in his county and those people who were pushers and in the pusher category were sentenced to prison under our present law. That is where they ought to be.

All we ask here is that you don't have a bill like this that takes away the discretion so that you can distinguish between the victim and the fellow who is making mil-

lions of dollars. There are people in this country who are making million and billion of dollars on this drug traffic, and we are not touching them. But this type of bill is aimed at the victim, and this is why we oppose it.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Bernard.

Mr. BERNARD of Androscoggin: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I would like to take issue with the statement of the previous speaker, Senator Harding from Aroostook, as to the fact that the drug pushers in Lewiston are in jail. I would like to know from the good Senator, since he is so knowledgeable in this field, exactly how many are in jail right now from that raid. As I understand it, it is zero.

Now, I was in that area because I happen to live right across the bridge, and I happened to know one of the individuals as he was interested and came up to my shop wanting to take scuba diving lessons. I think what he really wanted to do was get in contact with a lot of young people who take my classes. That man was brought to court, and he reached in his hip pocket and shelled out \$4,000 for bond. The word is around that he is back on the streets right now and he has already doubled his money.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Hancock, Senator Anderson.

Mr. ANDERSON of Hancock: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: True to form, when you mention the word mandatory the barristers hit the ceiling. Now, I am not going to belabor this question, but I heartily concur with everything my seatmate, Senator Shute, has said and I will vote accordingly.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from York, Senator Hichens.

Mr. HICHENS of York: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I can't add too much to what the good Senator from Franklin has already said. We are all familiar with the many drug surveys, both national and state, the seminars and conferences, but I noticed

an article not too long ago where at a national seminar in Washington D.C. this last fall a principal of a large high school said that 85 percent of his time was spent handling the drug problem in his school rather than on education.

To me, outside of what it does to these teenagers and people all over our country, the fact that this money which we put into education is being used to handle this problem bothers me very much. 48,000 teenagers died from the use of drugs in New York City in the year 1970. In last week's *Kennebec Journal* we saw a picture of a raid which was made here where eight people were arrested for growing and selling drugs. The police, the one whom I spoke with the day before yesterday as I rode to Portland with him, stated that the penalties are too light to scare these pushers and distributors and that is why they can't do too much about it.

Here this morning we have an opportunity for definite action. Let's do something worth-while, reject the motion, and eventually pass this bill or have these attorneys come up with something better, which to date they haven't done although they had plenty of time to do so.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Conley.

Mr. CONLEY of Cumberland: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: We are clearly discussing an extremely emotional problem that is not only confronting the state but is confronting the nation and, apparently, the world.

I can recall the good words of the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Harding, with respect to mandatory jail sentencing in a bill that we passed a session ago, and that was just on possession of marijuana. I would like everyone here to just do a little research over the weekend and find out how many people were actually sentenced to jail because of the fact they were caught in possession of marijuana. In fact, we tied the court's hands so because of the severity of the penalty that we had to come back in the regular session

of this legislature and repeal the law.

I think we are really talking about one of the most hypocritical problems that could confront us. I think this is a lark in many, many ways. Just recently I was listening to the national news, I think it was about two weeks ago, when one of our governmental commissions which was set up on a national level came forth with their results of a survey showing that the greatest hard drug problem that we have in this country is not the pills or heroin, or everything we talk about in relation to hard drugs, but the greatest drug problem we have in this country is alcohol. And the state and federal governments are the ones who sit back and collect the great wealth and profits that are made through the sale of this product.

Now, when we find somebody guilty of being over-drugged by alcohol we generally throw them in jail. We don't do anything to the seller of that particular drug. In fact, we don't even provide the facilities that are necessary to help rehabilitate an individual the facilities that are necessary to help rehabilitate an individual who does become addict.

I concur very, very strongly with Senator Harding and Senator Tanous that to pass this law is only again going to tie the hands of the judges within our courts, because I feel very strongly that what is going to happen is that either the case is going to be dismissed or the charge is going to be reduced and we will not do what is meant by the intent of the law.

We are concerned about our kids and, as you all know, I am the proud father of twelve children, and I keep my fingers crossed and say my evening prayers that my kids will always be able to be strong enough to avoid the temptations of indulging in any of these particular hard drugs that we refer to. But I have known so many of my friends in Portland who have had children who have become exposed and who have perhaps become weak and sort of caved in to a fad of trying a particular drug, whether it be marijuana or something else. I have seen these people

end up in the courts or I have seen them end up in jail. And I honestly feel that we cannot make laws merely to solve our social problems in this state. To me, we are being extremely unfair to the youngster who does try to experiment. We are not really getting to the core of the problem, the meat of the matter, getting the guy who is really reaping the rewards or awards, the profits that are made from the sale of these things. So I think really the best thing to do is to follow the course of the three members of the Judiciary Committee in this Senate who very wisely reported this bill out Ought Not to Pass.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognize the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Clifford.

Mr. CLIFFORD of Androscoggin: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I hadn't intended to speak this morning, but there were some statements made by the other Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Bernard, and I thought perhaps I could shed some light on some of the statements that he has made.

First of all, I want to go on record as urging you to support Senator Tanous, Senator Harding and Senator Conley.

I am somewhat familiar with the situation in Androscoggin County that Senator Bernard referred to. That was a recent drug raid during the month of December, or I guess it was the early part of January, I am sorry. There were some sixty or close to sixty indictments handed down by the grand jury. As a result of these secret indictments there were thirty-five or close to thirty-five arrests. Now, many of these cases are still pending on the docket in Androscoggin County because the judge who sat there during the January term had to leave to attend to some court duties in another country, and he left some of the cases pending. But many of the cases were disposed of. About five or ten minutes ago I talked with the County Attorney's office in Androscoggin County, and they gave me some statistics on the number of convictions as a result of this raid and the number of jail sentences, Men's Correc-

tional Institution sentences, or State Prison sentences handed down as a result of these raids.

There were four people convicted of being present where marijuana was kept, and these four people were put on probation. In every other case there was a conviction, and there was one acquittal as a result of those cases handled to date. In every case where there was a conviction, either for the sale of a hard drug or for the possession of a hard drug, there was a jail sentence handed down. Now, as we all know, a person has the right of appeal, and in some of these cases where a conviction resulted there may have been an appeal; I don't know. If there is such an appeal, the judge is under an obligation to set bail. If the convicted person has the money to raise bail, he can go free pending the outcome of his appeal. This is what Senator Bernard may have had reference to, but I would merely like to point out that this is in the orderly process of our judicial system, and to take this right to appeal and right to bail out of our system would be denying that person due process. So I don't want the members of this body to become confused as a result of anything that he said.

Once again, I would urge you to support the position or the motion of Senator Tanous to accept the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Graham.

Mr. GRAHAM of Cumberland: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I would like to add my opposition to this well-meaning but counter-productive bill. Man lives not by bread alone, but by myths. And one myth that is current in this vicinity is the belief that by passing a law we can solve a social problem.

This bill will be a reversion to medieval curing of crime, namely, that by increasing the penalty attached to the crime you deter crime. But actually it is a truism of criminology that it is not the severity of the penalty but the certainty of prosecution that deters the crime. This bill will clog the

courts and, therefore, it will delay justice. It will also influence juries to let the defendants go free because they will be appalled by the severity of the penalty that they will impose if they give convictions. This bill, in other words, will prevent justice and enlarge our problem. Alas, we cannot jail the drug problem and throw away the key. Thank you.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Knox, Senator Hoffses.

Mr. HOFFSES of Knox: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I do not rise to debate an issue with our learned legal profession. I would take note, however, that the lawyers seem to be determined to pick apart this particular bill and are hesitant to provide this body with a suitable measure that can control the problem which this country is being faced with today.

I do support the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Franklin. I would also like to call your attention to a situation in New York. At a conference a short time ago of the Council of State Governments, a speaker who was in charge of the drug problem in the southern district of the State of New York pointed out to us some of the facts and the costs which they are faced with down there. The figures which this gentleman recited to us are really and truly beyond imagination. This gentleman informed us that in the southern district of the State of New York, which comprises the City of New York, that the state appropriates \$342,000,000 to attempt to control the drug problem in that district of New York. He went on to say that this does not include, that it does not include, \$40,000,000 more to try to control the problem among the juveniles. Now, quick addition brings that figure up to \$382,000,000 which is being expended of the taxpayers' money to try to solve and to control this problem. Think of what \$382,000,000 could do to help our elderly, to help the less fortunate.

I urge you, ladies and gentlemen

of this body, to oppose the motion by the distinguished gentleman from Penobscot, and I hope we pass this piece of legislation.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Franklin, Senator Shute.

Mr. SHUTE of Franklin: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: Before we conclude this debate, and before the thought escapes me, I would like to request a roll call, that the vote be taken by the yeas and nays.

I think that we perhaps have spent an overly long time on this, and it is an emotional issue. And I refer to a remark made by Senator Harding and Senator Tanous about those people who attended the hearing on this bill. He spoke of a department head, a prosecuting attorney from the Attorney General's Department, he spoke of a psychiatrist, and another department head. I think it is predictable that these people do have the time necessary to come to these hearings and raise their objections to it. After all, when you are getting \$36,000 a year you can take a few minutes out to come over and oppose a bill, and a head shrinker can take time off from his practice to come up here and oppose the bill.

What about the mother from Auburn who came home one day and found the brains of her son splattered all over the ceiling and a note left behind? This is an emotional issue. She wasn't at that hearing; she is too ashamed to appear at this hearing.

What about the father of the young man who was a heroin addict and died at the ripe old age of twenty-eight years? These are the people who didn't appear at this hearing. They are ashamed of the fact that a member of their family was hoodwinked by a drug pusher. And this is what this bill would do, hopefully, put this man where he belongs. I hope you will oppose the motion of ought not to pass.

The PRESIDENT: A roll call has been requested.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Bernard.

Mr. BERNARD of Androscoggin: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: Unfortunately since I have been in this legislature, going on some six years now, I have sat here and listened to debate covering bills of all natures, and inevitably whenever the word "mandatory" arises the lawyers are quick to defend. It would appear that the lawyers would defend the word "mandatory" because if such a bill is passed it sort of limits their ability to wheel and deal behind the scenes. That is just what is being debated here; whether or not they can continue in this state to wheel and deal, whether it be drugs, habitual drunkenness on our highway, or any of the other social ills that we are afflicted with.

This morning at 6:30 I was awakened by a phone call. Following the phone call I had a little discussion with my wife and, I think many of my fellow colleagues, back home the wife occasionally gets involved in some of the votes that are taken here, and we discussed this particular bill. I finally asked her, "How would you vote in my particular place?" We have two boys home, five and ten years old. And she says, "Well, my first duty is to my two sons." That is as far as it went. I assume she meant she would do everything in her power to keep them out of jail. Now, that is, if they were being abused by a pusher.

However, as far as a pusher goes, I think it is the responsibility of the parents to teach their kids that drugs are bad and that they should keep away from them. Now, in analyzing the situation in my particular family, I feel this way: that if some guy sticks a dirty filthy needle in the arm of my young boy, my obligation is to put him away for good, and I mean six feet under.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Harding.

Mr. HARDING of Aroostook: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: Would to God it were possible to pass this bill and take care of this problem which Senator Shute has mentioned, what an easy solu-

tion it would be. For anyone here to suggest that I, as a lawyer, and that is way down on the list of my accomplishments — I am first of all a father, first of all, I am a citizen, I am a State Senator, and last of all I am a lawyer — for anyone to suggest that we lawyers who come here and give of whatever little ability we have, or whatever little learning we have of the court process, we give you the benefit of it — but for you to suggest that we in any way intend to profit from a bill of this type, it is the cruelest thing that has ever been suggested to me in this body. I wish that it were this simple, folks; it is not.

I don't want to get ahead of myself, but coming up in the next bill ahead there is something that will deal with this problem of crowded court dockets; this will deal with it. This here, the reason I oppose it is because we don't guess as to whether or not it will be effective; we know that it will be ineffective because it has already been tried on the federal level and failed.

My good friend, the Senator from Knox, has mentioned New York. There they have this drug problem, it is true. They have their jails full three times over, three times over they have their jails full, and this has not solved it in New York. It runs much deeper than that. So, all I plead with you, from my benefit, Senator Clifford has been a prosecutor, I have been both prosecutor and defendant, and we know from our experience that this will worsen the already tragic experience, and the federal government has proven that it worsens it. This is why we plead with you, don't make a bad situation worse, which this bill will do.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Violette.

Mr. VIOLETTE of Aroostook: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I did not intend to speak at all on this bill, and I don't plan to speak very long, but I do want to make one reference with regards to perhaps how lawyers vote. And I would want to tell my good friend, Senator Bernard from An-

droscoggin County, that I am a lawyer, and because my associate is an Assistant County Attorney in the County of Aroostook I do not practice criminal law.

I think in toto this bill will not accomplish what so many of us would like it to accomplish.

I do want to make one additional comment on how do we go about combating our drug problem and this great problem we have. We have the appropriations bill before us that we are going to be considering later on, and there is an item in the budget for \$50,000 for the Maine Drug Commission to use in the State of Maine in helping those unfortunate people who have drug problems to correct them, and to assist in educational programs throughout the state to try to combat and try to influence our young people, particularly our young people, of the dangers of drugs and to stay away from them and to assist them. We have a measly \$50,000 appropriation in that budget out of about \$14,000,000, and this is cut to \$25,000. This is the value, I think, that we place on how to arrive at solving our drug problem. It seems to me — I don't question anybody's intentions at all, this is not the case — but I question how we proceed on our values and how to go about solving this awful problem.

I am the father of five children, four sons and one daughter, and because the drug abuse is no respecter of families, and I could wake up tomorrow morning and find that my own child is involved in the drug problem. I think about it every day, it frightens me and it scares me. But it seems to me that the emphasis we place on it is only in one direction, and we have failed utterly in providing the means and providing the funds to combat this drug problem, and the opportunity to provide the funding and the educational and instructional abilities that we ought to try in order to help combat it. I think in the long run that this is where it is going to be won with our young people. I think this is where it is going to be won, or lost, and yet we fail to provide even a marginal effort, a financial

effort, within our state to combat this problem. I sometimes question our priorities in attacking this problem. That is all I want to say at this time.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Sagadahoc, Senator Schulten.

Mr. SCHULTEN of Sgadahoc: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: On this L. D. 2040, "An Act Relating to Penalty for Sale of Certain Drugs", I feel certainly there are many things here that I do not understand, that I have not had the background to fully understand, on the problem as it relates to our youth today. I share with all others here the deep concern we have, our willingness really to do anything that we can to help the youth, to eliminate this problem, and to see that those who are really guilty are punished.

The arguments this morning seem to deal more with specifics, and I find that perhaps my judgment is being influenced by specific cases rather than the over-all drug problem, but when I look and listen to every lawyer in this Senate body stand up and unanimously ask us to believe in them that this bill should not pass, I, as a State Senator, have such high regard for these individuals and their profession that it is inconceivable to me that they could do less than maintain the high principles of conduct with which they are charged, and on that basis, if for no other, I certainly will support the motion of Senator Tanous that this bill should not pass.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Franklin, Senator Shute.

Mr. SHUTE of Franklin: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I would like to inquire from the Senate Secretary what the divided report was in regard to this bill and, after he has reported this, I am sure you will agree that we have gone through a period of debate here this morning where some of the lay people have been arrayed against the legal fraternity, and this is perhaps good, but I am sure if you listen very carefully to the divided report you will find one member of the bar on our side, Mr. Secretary.



The PRESIDENT: The Secretary will read the committee report.

The SECRETARY: The Ought Not to Pass Report was signed by Senator Tanous of Penobscot, Senator Harding of Aroostook, Senator Quinn of Penobscot, Representative Lund of Augusta, Representative Orestis of Lewiston, Representative White of Guilford, Representative Kelley of Caribou, Representative Wheeler of Portland, and Representative Page of Fryeburg. The Ought to Pass in New Draft Report under the same title, was signed by Representative Henley of Norway, Representative Hewes of Cape Elizabeth, Representative Baker of Orrington, and Representative Carrier of Westbrook.

The PRESIDENT: Is the Senate ready for the question? The pending question before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Tanous, that on Bill, "An Act Relating to Penalty for Sale of Certain Drugs," the Senate accept the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report of the Committee.

A roll call has been requested. Under the Constitution, in order for the Chair to order a roll call, it requires the affirmative vote of at least one-fifth of those Senators present and voting. Will all those Senators in favor of ordering a roll call please rise and remain standing until counted.

Obviously more than one-fifth having arisen a roll call is ordered. The pending question before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Tanous, that the Senate Accept the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report of the Committee on Bill, "An Act Relating to Penalty for Sale of Certain Drugs". A Yes vote will be in favor of accepting the Ought Not to Pass Report; a No vote will be opposed.

The Secretary will call the roll.

YEAS: Senators Berry, Carswell, Clifford, Conley, Graham, Harding, Katz, Kellam, Martin, Minkowsky, Shulten, Tanous, Violette and President MacLeod.

NAYS: Senators Anderson, Bernard, Chick, Danton, Dunn, Fortier, Greeley, Hichens, Hoffses, Johnson, Marcotte, Moore, Peabody, Sewall and Shute.

ABSENT: Senators Levine, Quinn and Wyman.

A roll call was had. Fourteen Senators having voted in the affirmative, and fifteen Senators having voted in the negative, with three Senators absent, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Minority Ought to Pass in New Draft Report of the Committee was Accepted in concurrence and the Bill in New Draft Read Once. House Amendment "A" was Read and Adopted and the Bill, as Amended, Tomorrow Assigned for Second Reading.

The President laid before the Senate the fifth tabled and specially assigned matter.

SENATE REPORTS — from the Committee on County Government on Bill, "An Act Relating to Revenue Sharing and Financial Relief to Counties for Expenses of the Superior and Supreme Judicial Courts." (S. P. 712) (L. D. 1986) Majority Report, be Referred to the 106th Legislature; Minority Report, Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A".

Tabled — February 24, 1972 by Senator Tanous of Penobscot.

Pending — Motion by Senator Martin of Piscataquis to Accept the Majority Report be Referred to the 106th Legislature.

On motion by Mr. Tanous of Penobscot, retabled and Tomorrow Assigned, pending the motion by Mr. Martin of Piscataquis that the Senate Accept the Majority Report of the Committee.

#### Reconsidered Matter

On motion by Mr. Harding of Aroostook, the Senate voted to reconsider its previous action whereby Bill, "An Act Relating to Disclosure of Economic Interests by Legislators", (H. P. 1572) (L. D. 2029), was Passed to be Engrossed.

Thereupon, House Amendment "K" was Read and Adopted and the Bill, as Amended, Passed to be Engrossed in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

#### Papers From The House

Out of order and under suspension of the rules, the Senate voted to take up the following:

**Joint Resolution  
STATE OF MAINE**

In the Year of Our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred and Seventy-two

Joint Resolution Memorializing the Honorable John H. Chaffee, Secretary of the Navy, to Review All Contractual Obligations Between Litton Systems, Inc., of Pascagoula, Mississippi and the Navy

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 and can 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 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.

Comes from the House, Read and Adopted.

Which was Read.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Sagadahoc, Senator Schulten.

Mr. SCHULTEN of Sagadahoc: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: This Joint Resolution was placed on my desk at least after we came back into session from a recess. Certainly the motives expressed in this Joint Resolution are very fine, very noble. However, I do notice that the Bath Iron Works is mentioned as one of the principals in this Joint Resolution. Now, it so happens I am the Senator from District 18, which comprises the Bath Iron Works, and certainly I was among practically everyone in the State that was terribly disappointed when the Bath Iron Works was not chosen or did not win this shipbuilding award in 1970.

However, nearly two years has passed by, and now we are being asked to send a joint memorial to Secretary Chaffee, which probably is a good idea, though I occasionally have reservations in my mind about these memorials as to how effective they might be. What I am really concerned about though is that, while our motives are pure, I wonder if anyone has contacted the Bath Iron Works, which is a private corporation, to ask them if they wish us to do this. I am not clear on this point since no one contacted me concerning the Joint Resolution. No, I have not had the opportunity, because of the debate in the session here, to contact the Bath Iron Works to ask them, and so what I am really requesting, or hoping for, is that someone in this body would table this Joint Resolution until Monday so that I might have an opportunity to check with the Bath Iron Works to see how they feel about it.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognize the Senator from Knox, Senator Hoffses.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Hoffses of Knox, tabled and Tomorrow Assigned, pending Adoption.

The Adjournment Order having been returned from the House, Read and Passed in concurrence, on motion by Mr. Hoffses of Knox,	Adjourned until Monday, February 28, 1972, at 1 o'clock in the afternoon.
---	---