

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 Sixth
Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

Volume II

April 23, 1973 to June 5, 1973

KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Thursday, April 26, 1973

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Charles Bates of East Corinth.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

Orders Out of Order

Mr. Strout of Corinth presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that Norma Greatorex, Alan Strout, Sherry Blackwell of Corinth, Janet Miller, Karen LeClair of Kenduskeag and Stanley Richie of Bradford be appointed Honorary Pages for today.

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

Mrs. Lewis of Auburn presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that Patrick Orr and Keith Brown of Auburn be appointed Honorary Pages for today.

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

Papers from the Senate Reports of Committee Leave to Withdraw

Report of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Relating to Retirement of Justices of the Supreme Judicial Court, the Superior Court and Judges of the District Court" (S. P. 163) (L. D. 418) reporting Leave to Withdraw.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Relating to Limitation of Exclusion or Modification of Warranties on Consumer Goods" (S. P. 314) (L. D. 980)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

Messages and Documents

The following Communication:

THE SENATE OF MAINE

Augusta

April 25, 1973

Hon. E. Louise Lincoln

Clerk of the House

106th Legislature

Dear Madam Clerk:

The President appointed the following conferees to the Committee of Conference on Bill, "An Act Raising the Maximum Age of a Juvenile Offender" (H. P. 489) (L. D. 643):

Senators:

RICHARDSON

of Cumberland

ROBERTS of York

ALDRICH of Oxford

The President appointed the following conferees to the Committee of Conference on Resolve, to Reimburse Berkshire Mutual Insurance Company for Damage to Property of Leonard Smith by Highway Construction (H. P. 353) (L. D. 468):

Senators:

JOLY of Kennebec

ALDRICH of Oxford

ROBERTS of York

The President appointed the following conferees to the Committee of Conference on Bill, "An Act Relating to Penalty for Recklessly Causing Death by Operation of a Motor Vehicle." (H. P. 202) (L. D. 275):

Senators:

TANOUS of Penobscot

SPEERS of Kennebec

BRENNAN of Cumberland

The President appointed the following conferees to the Committee of Conference on Bill, "An Act Regulating Water Well Construction and Pump Installation." (S. P. 173) (L. D. 428):

Senators:

JOLY of Kennebec

ROBERTS of York

ALDRICH of Oxford

Respectfully,

Signed:

HARRY N. STARBRANCH

Secretary of the Senate

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

The following Communication:
THE SENATE OF MAINE

Augusta

April 25, 1973

Hon. E. Louise Lincoln
Clerk of the House
106th Legislature

Dear Madam Clerk:

The Senate voted to Adhere to its action whereby it Indefinitely Postponed, Resolve, Designating Lewiston-Auburn Bridge as "Louis Jalbert Bridge." (H. P. 366) (L. D. 481), and all its accompanying papers, in non-concurrence.

The Senate also voted to Adhere to its action whereby it Indefinitely Postponed, Bill, "An Act to Include Operators of Industrial Wastewater Treatment Plants in the Operator Certification Program." (S. P. 478) (L. D. 1534), in non-concurrence.

Respectfully,

Signed:

HARRY N. STARBRANCH
Secretary of the Senate

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

Petitions, Bills and Resolves Requiring Reference

The following Bills, approved by a majority of the Committee on Reference of Bills, were received and referred to the following Committees:

Transportation

Bill "An Act Relating to Illuminated Advertisements on Motor Vehicles" (H. P. 1460) (Presented by Mr. Strout of Corinth)

(Ordered Printed)

Sent up for concurrence.

Agriculture

Bill "An Act Relating to Willful Killing or Injury to Certain Animals" (H. P. 1461) (Presented by Mr. Wood of Brooks)

(Ordered Printed)

Sent up for concurrence.

Orders

On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act Regulating Water Well Construction and Pump Installation" (S. P. 173) (L. D. 428) the Speaker appointed the following Conferees on the part of the House:

Messrs. PARKS of Presque Isle

DYAR of Strong
HOBBINS of Saco

The following Communication appearing on Supplement No. 1 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

STATE OF MAINE

Office of the Secretary of State

April 25, 1973

To the Honorable Richard D. Hewes, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred and Sixth Legislature:

In compliance with the Constitution and Laws of the State of Maine, I have the honor to herewith report the return of votes cast for Representative to the One Hundred and Sixth Legislature in the Town of Kittery at a Special Election held April 17, 1973, according to a review of the return made by the Governor and Council, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Representative Henry W. Hodgdon of Kittery, as follows:

John N. M. Howells of Kittery received 768

Frank R. Kauffman of Kittery received 783

Signed:

JOSEPH T. EDGAR
Secretary of State

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

STATE OF MAINE

Office of the Secretary of State

April 25, 1973

To E. Louise Lincoln, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred and Sixth Legislature:

In compliance with the Constitution and Laws of the State of Maine, I hereby certify that a Special Election was held in the Town of Kittery on April 17, 1973, for the purpose of electing a Representative to the One Hundred and Sixth Legislature to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Representative Henry W. Hodgdon of Kittery; that at said election Frank R. Kauffman of Kittery, having received a plurality of all votes cast in said election, as contained in a report submitted to the Governor and Council under date of April 25, 1973, appears to have been elected a Representative to

the One Hundred and Sixth Legislature.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have caused the Great Seal of the State of Maine to be hereunto affixed this twenty-fifth day of April in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and seventy-three and of the Independence of the United States of America, the one hundred and ninety-seventh.

Signed:

JOSEPH T. EDGAR
Secretary of State

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

House Reports of Committees Ought Not to Pass

Mrs. Wheeler from the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Relating to Withdrawal from Participation in the Cumberland County Recreation Center" (H. P. 981) (L. D. 1295)

Mr. Donaghy from the Committee on Business Legislation reporting same on Bill "An Act Relating to when Merger or Consolidation of Corporations Becomes Effective" (H. P. 1209) (L. D. 1561)

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

Leave to Withdraw

Mrs. Baker from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Relating to Compensation Upon Retirement of Judges of the District Court and Active Retired Judges" (H. P. 250) (L. D. 331) reporting Leave to Withdraw.

Mr. LaCharite from the Committee on Education reporting same on Bill "An Act Appropriating Funds for a Community College in York County under the State University System" (H. P. 511) (L. D. 676)

Mr. Tyndale from the Committee on Education reporting same on Bill "An Act to Appropriate \$278,000 to Establish a 2 - year Community College in York County" (H. P. 1237) (L. D. 1622)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Consent Calendar

First Day

(S. P. 3) (L. D. 30) Bill "An Act to Provide Hospital Administrators under the Department of Mental Health and Corrections" — Committee on Health and Institutional Services reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-89).

(S. P. 236) (L. D. 687) Bill "An Act Amending the Municipal Industrial and Recreational Obligations Act" — Committee on State Government reporting "Ought to pass"

(H. P. 395) (L. D. 524) Bill "An Act Relating to Savings Banks Investing in Service Corporations" — Committee on Business Legislation reporting "Ought to pass"

(H. P. 557) (L. D. 767) Bill "An Act Relating to Schooling of Indian Children" — Committee on Education reporting "Ought to pass"

(H. P. 855) (L. D. 1142) Bill "An Act to Increase Penalties for Certain Sea and Shore Fisheries Laws" — Committee on Marine Resources reporting "Ought to pass"

(H. P. 1235) (L. D. 1606) Bill "An Act Relating to the Immunity Provisions of the Unfair Trade Practices Act" — Committee on Business Legislation reporting "Ought to pass"

No objection having been noted, were assigned to the Consent Calendar's Second Day list.

Consent Calendar

Second Day

(S. P. 94) (L. D. 240) Bill, "An Act Relating to the Builder's and Supplier's Lien Law" (C. "A" S-87)

(S. P. 104) (L. D. 249) Bill "An Act Establishing by Statute the Division of Eye Care for Services to the Blind and the Visually Handicapped" (C. "A" S-88)

No objection having been noted, were passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

(H. P. 346) (L. D. 461) Bill "An Act Relating to Boundaries of Ocean Park Game and Bird Sanctuary" (C. "A" H-272)

On the request of Mr. Good of Westfield, was removed from the Consent Calendar.

The Report was read and accepted and the Bill read once. Committee Amendment "A" (H-272) was read by the Clerk and adopted and the Bill assigned for second reading tomorrow.

(S. P. 203) (L. D. 548) Bill "An Act to Permit Residents of Adjoining Counties to Serve as Assistant County Attorney in Oxford County"

(S. P. 217) (L. D. 633) Bill, "An Act Changing Name of Administrative Hearing Office to Administrative Court"

(S. P. 226) (L. D. 661) Bill "An Act Providing for Judicial Review from Decisions of the Banking Commissioner" (C. "A" S-86)

(S. P. 319) (L. D. 986) Bill "An Act Authorizing Use of the Name 'Maine Association for Children with Learning Disabilities' "

(S. P. 491) (L. D. 1556) Bill "An Act to Clarify Municipal Home Rule Procedures"

(H. P. 1302) (L. D. 1696) Bill "An Act Changing the Name of U.M.P.G. Alumni Association"

No objection having been noted, were passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: Will the Sergeant-at-Arms kindly escort the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson, to the rostrum?

Thereupon, Mr. Simpson of Standish assumed the Chair as Speaker pro tem and Speaker Hewes retired from the Hall.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act Relating to Memberships on Maine School Building Authority" (S. P. 593) (L. D. 1874)

Bill "An Act Requiring the Ramping of Curbs at Crosswalks for Physically Handicapped and Elderly Persons" (S. P. 585) (L. D. 1797) (S. "A" S-91)

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

Second Reader Indefinitely Postponed

Bill "An Act Relating to the Appointment of Clerks of the Judi-

cial Courts" (S. P. 456) (L. D. 1428)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Second reading and read the second time.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This afternoon I am supporting a bill of the gentleman from Bath, Ms. Goodwin. It has to do with adding sex to the list of those persons covered under the Human Rights Law. That being so, I guess that I am entitled to change my mind too.

This is another bill to tamper with county government. At the present time, the clerks of court are elected by the people. This bill would have them appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. In 1965, I sponsored exactly the same bill and it passed. The very next session it was repealed and I was not too unhappy. In the intervening two years, I saw the errors of my ways. I was being instrumental in weakening county government and taking it a little bit further away from the people.

Yesterday, we were going a bit too fast. This was one of several divided reports that was not even discussed. Today I have caught it in time and before we get into another fiasco like I did several years ago, I now move that this bill and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed and when the vote is taken, I request the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, that this Bill and all its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross has requested a roll call. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of all the members present. All those in favor of 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 pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Norway, Mr. Henley.

Mr. HENLEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think perhaps I would be a little bit lame if I did not oppose the motion of my very good friend from Bath, Mr. Ross. I voted for the appointment of the clerk of courts several years ago and I opposed changing it back to elective two years later. I did not see any error of my ways in that, whether my friend Mr. Ross did or not. I still insist that it is entirely a technical administrative job. It is not a job that has to do with the establishment of policies and, consequently, in this day and age, when it is so expensive to be elected to any office, to me it is a bit ridiculous that we have so many of these offices which were originally created as an honor to be carried on at the expense of the taxpayers as well as the person to be elected.

I believe that the choice — that brief time when our clerks of court were appointed the choices were very well made. They were chosen carefully. They required a lot of recommendation; I know because I was right in the middle of it, and several of those same clerks that were appointed have gone on and served very efficiently and since then, believe it or not, become elected into the same job.

I think that probably we have been very fortunate in this state with a lot of our elective offices and jobs like that and surprisingly so, because we know of perhaps a good many people with very fine personalities that possibly could make a very good speech before an audience, who might not have very good administrative background for the complications involved nowadays in the clerk of courts job.

I think that possibly my friend, Mr. Ross, knows one of the reasons why that reverted to elective. It was purely and simply a matter of politics. The politics of — I might say some of the areas lost

a good vote getter that a good many times was on their ticket. The politicians didn't like it because they lost some of these vote getters. They wanted them on the ticket. Because of the escalating cost of all of our political jobs, running for office, it seems to me that it is time that we were a little bit more sensible in our government. It seems to me that it is time that we made these purely specialist, technical jobs where they should be, appointive under a strict line of probably competition with the people that know the competency.

It seems to me that the courts themselves, the Chief Justice or the judges and our prosecuting system should be much more aware of a person's eligibility when they apply for those jobs than the electorate. I feel that we should more or less concern ourselves with electing the people who represent us in the changing and making of laws and policies and not just those just purely administrative jobs. Consequently, I do not imagine it will make too much difference, but I am not going to support this motion to indefinite postponement. I am certainly for this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalburt.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I was appointed chairman of the subcommittee on County Government within the Research Committee, and I might say that at the outset it is rather difficult to get in between two very dear friends, and I speak of the gentleman from Norway, Mr. Henley, and the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross.

There is a bill that has been sponsored by the chairman of the County Government Committee, which would have the Superior and Supreme Court measure a program taken over by the state. I met with the Maine Judicial Council and the very question that both Mr. Ross and Mr. Henley brought about was discussed. In that the court would like — and I must say that they would like to have the program go back where it was — it was

agreed to present the bill and leave the situation of the clerk of courts where it is, at least for the next ensuing two years. I think we might be wise to do that and if the bill for the takeover by the state of the Supreme and Superior Court passes and it works out so that it would be to the advantage to have the program changed, I think that would be the time to do it. In the meantime, I think it might be best if we leave it as it is, at least for the ensuing two years.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore.

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I feel I would like to go along with the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, for the simple reason we should make up our minds here at Augusta whether we want county form of government or we don't want county form of government. If we keep taking away, and it won't take too much longer to, if we keep taking away, we are not going to have any county form of government. We will be just like the Province of New Brunswick, everything will be handled from Augusta, same as it is over there from Fredericton. We won't even have our own tax laws or anything else.

We here a few years back, several years back, we lost our clerk of courts and we the Aroostook County Republican Committee and Democrat Committee, we both nominated a member to run. And as it happened, the Republican was elected. We probably have got one of the finest there is in the state and we want it to continue that way. We don't want someone to tell us we have got to take someone else.

I think the people should vote on this. It is good, as Mr. Henley said, it is good on our ballot, to have it on both parties, Democrat and Republican. Here just a short few days ago we voted to try to have a four-year term for sheriff, which would take him off the ballot, I do not agree with this. And I hope this morning you will go along with the gentleman from

Bath, Mr. Ross, and indefinitely postpone this bill.

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

Mr. KELLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wish to support Mr. Ross's motion for indefinite postponement. I have a lot more confidence in the people of my county than I do have in the courts, which seem to have a great deal of authority that is not always appreciated by the people.

The SPEAKER pro tem: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, that this Bill "An Act Relating to the Appointment of Clerks of the Judicial Courts," Senate Paper 456, L. D. 1428, be indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Albert, Ault, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Berube, Binnette, Birt, Bither, Boudreau, Bragdon, Brawn, Briggs, Brown, Bunker, Bustin, Cameron, Carey, Carrier, Carter, Chick, Chonko, Churchill, Clark, Conley, Connolly, Cooney, Cote, Cressey, Crommett, Curran, Davis, Deshaies, Donaghy, Drigotas, Dudley, Dyar, Evans, Farley, Farrington, Faucher, Fecteau, Ferris, Finemore, Flynn, Fraser, Gahagan, Garsoe, Gauthier, Genest, Good, Greenlaw, Hamblen, Hancock, Haskell, Herick, Hobbins, Hoffses, Huber, Hunter, Immonen, Jackson, Jacques, Jalbert, Kelleher, Kelley, Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Kilroy, LaCharite, LaPointe, LeBlanc, Lewis, E.; Littlefield, Lynch, MacLeod, Maddox, Maxwell, McCormick, McHenry, McMahon, McNally, Merrill, Morin, L.; Morton, Murchison, O'Brien, Palmer, Parks, Peterson, Ricker Rolde, Rollins, Ross, Santoro, Shaw, Shute, Smith, S.; Soulas, Sproul, Stillings, Strout, Tanguay, Theriault, Tierney, Trask, Trumbull, Tyndale, Walker, Webber, Wheeler, Willard, Wood, M. E.

NAY — Baker, Cottrell, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Dam, Emery, D. F.; Farnham, Goodwin, H.; Goodwin,

K.; Henley, Lawry, Lewis, J.; Mahany, Martin, McKernan, Mills, Morin, V.; Murray, Najarian, Norris, Perkins, Pratt, Smith, D. M.; Susi, Talbot, White, Whitzell.

ABSENT — Dow, Dunleavy, Dunn, Hodgdon, Knight, McTeague, Mulkern, Pontbriand, Sheltre, Silverman, Simpson, L. E.

Yes, 112; No, 26; Absent, 11.

The **SPEAKER**: One hundred twelve having voted in the affirmative and 26 having voted in the negative, with eleven being absent, the motion to indefinitely postpone does prevail.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore.

Mr. **FINEMORE**: Mr. Speaker, I move we reconsider our action whereby we indefinitely postponed L. D. 1428 and hope you will all vote against me.

The **SPEAKER** pro tem: The gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore, moves the House reconsider its action whereby it indefinitely postponed this Bill. All in favor of reconsideration will say yes; those opposed will say no.

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

Sent up for concurrence.

Bill "An Act Relating to Sudden Infant Death" (S. P. 514) (L. D. 1621)

Bill "An Act to Enable the Department of Environmental Protection to Study the Groundwater Problem of the State" (H. P. 817) (L. D. 1110)

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

Second Reader Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act to Amend Definitions in Ambulance Service Licensing (S. P. 591) (L. D. 1863)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Second Reading and read the second time.

(On motion of Mr. Martin of Eagle Lake, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Monday, April 30.)

Second Reader Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act Relating to Payment of Patients at Certain State Institutions as Employees under Fair Labor Standards Act" (S. P. 167) (L. D. 422)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Second Reading and read the second time.

(On motion of Mr. Haskell of Houlton, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Monday, April 30.)

The **SPEAKER** pro tem: The Chair would appoint the gentleman from Parsonsfield, Mr. Pratt and the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Hewes, to escort the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Kauffman to the governor's office to be sworn in.

Enactor Indefinitely Postponed

An Act Providing Funds for Director of the State Crime Laboratory (S. P. 446) (L. D. 1413)

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

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

Mr. **JALBERT**: Mr. Speaker, I move this bill and all its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The **SPEAKER** pro tem: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, moves that this Bill and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

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

Mr. **NORRIS**: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would hope that you wouldn't indefinitely postpone this bill this morning. It had a good hearing before the Appropriations Committee and it has to do with a professional from the FBI that the federal government will pay for the first three quarters of the biennium. And this is just simply money to keep him on the job for the last quarter. He won't come

to work unless he gets a contract for two years. He is going to investigate the crime lab and he is going to investigate locations, and he is going to try to help us settle this problem that has been with us for several years. So I would hope that you would go against this indefinite postponement this morning.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am known to have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Norris, as a first termmer on the Appropriations Committee. I admire his frankness and his wit. I was talking with him and the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Carey, just before the session. Before I informed him what my reaction would be this morning, because I had stated what I had intended to do. I didn't want to have the report come out with just spending the money for a divided report, but I stated what I would do at the proper time. And he said, you know, this man here is a good man, and so I naturally said, what do you mean he is a good man? Have we already hired him? Well, we probably will, he is an FBI agent. So I respect the gentleman's honesty from Brewer.

We don't even have a crime laboratory and yet we thought some of hiring the director of the laboratory, and he is a former FBI man, and it's going to be for three quarters of the biennium, but after that we are picking up the tab and the whole tab. We have got law enforcement coming out of our ears. I don't mind law enforcement but sometimes when I look under my pillow, I would like to avoid it a little bit.

Now, this just means that we are picking up another job, this just means that we can't get somebody over there, that we are overloaded with help that could fill this job. This just means an extra item of \$25,000 that will appear on the budget two years from now. It is just another job; it is just another plush job; it is just another \$25,000. And on the heels of this will come

a \$4 million item to build a crime laboratory.

When the vote is taken, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. MILLS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: A point of information, Mr. Speaker. I would like to know if we are voting for a director here on this bill, where we have not got a crime laboratory to put him into?

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

Mr. NORRIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I will try to answer that. As I understand the bill, you are voting — the federal government now, under a grant, will pay for the first three quarters of the biennium. This man will come to investigate the feasibility, investigate locations for the crime lab. It may turn out that we won't have to spend the million or two or three million dollars for the new crime lab if we can hire this man to investigate.

Now, he has not been hired, and from what I understand, he is not going to be hired unless the state will agree to contract with him for two years. The federal government will pay the first three quarters and the state would pay the last quarter. So we are not hiring him without a crime lab, we are hiring him to investigate and find out if it is feasible and possible and where we would put the crime lab.

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

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: If we are going to have some investigations, I suggest we name a committee of three members of this House. We can always investigate where we are going to put a crime laboratory if we are going to have one. It won't cost us one darn cent.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would go further in answering the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Mills. I think the gentleman from Brewer did a very fine job in answering the question. I would just like to suggest that if we give this fellow a job, paid for the first three quarters by the federal government, then we paid the \$25,000 by the state to investigate whether or not we should or should not have a crime lab of a million, or two or three or four million bananas, I would like to know what is in the minds of the people as to just what his report would be anyway.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Gauthier.

Mr. GAUTHIER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to get more information on this. How did this bill come out of committee? I would like to know what the vote is on this.

Thereupon, the Report was read by the Clerk.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I did not attend the Executive meeting of the committee. I was called and told the bills we took up. I stated to the clerk of the committee that I did not want to be alone or did not want to discuss it or sign a minority report "ought to pass." I stated the day before yesterday on the floor of the House that at the appropriate time I would make a motion against this bill because I was against it.

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

Mr. HENLEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I shall oppose this bill, not perhaps on the basis of this bill itself, but I do not believe that we in the State of Maine can afford an expensive multimillion dollar crime laboratory. I don't believe that a lot of states with our background, a limited number of people and financial standing, can afford that kind of situation.

I believe that a crime lab should be possibly a bi-state or two or three states involved, possibly New Hampshire and Maine or New Hampshire, Vermont and Maine. With the vast facilities for communication, I would think that under those circumstances it would be much more feasible and then we might be able to afford it. Consequently, for that reason, I see no reason why we should spend \$25,000 to have a site located. I don't believe I should support a crime laboratory completely supported by Maine anyway.

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

Mr. HASKELL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think the principal reason that the bill came out of committee with a unanimous report was the fact that we did hear quite convincing testimony from the State Police that in many instances in investigation of crime there were very substantial time delays when they had to send material from the state to laboratories outside the state and often encountered delays in getting reports back.

I think those of you who were here in the last session will remember that we had very considerable debate on this and the suggestion that Mr. Henley referred to of a cooperative agreement among one, two or three states to set up a crime laboratory, apparently the efforts in this direction have met with no response from the neighboring states.

It was felt that perhaps with the expenditure of this amount of money we would be able to get some expert opinion as to the cost that might be involved in a crime laboratory, that we also might be able to get some expert opinion that would enable us to make a reasonable judgment at a future session of whether or not the state could afford the crime laboratory in order to meet what is a real need on the part of the law enforcement agencies of the state for assistance in the solution of crime.

The SPEAKER pro tem: A roll call has 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 those 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 pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Sproul.

Mr. SPROUL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Just for the record, I would point out that the appropriations involved on this bill is \$18,750.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I promised myself I wouldn't speak, but let me just relate to you a couple of things which I think I am concerned about. LEAA, as you know, is a federal agency and it has the habit of making grants to communities, to counties and to the state. Once those grants have been made, the state has to pick up the cost. Nowhere in this process has the legislature or the legislative bodies made an attempt to determine whether or not there ought to be a continuing program.

I am quite familiar with many federal programs. Most of the time the legislature has to match the money prior to our getting involved in the program so that we know what we are getting ourselves into. LEAA, for example, made a grant to the State Police where we purchased the old Thomas College in Waterville. I happened to be a proponent of that purchase, but I was opposed to the process that was used. My feeling was that prior to any purchase being made, that the Maine Legislature, if we are going to have to assume the responsibility of continuing the funding of this operation, ought to make the decision as to whether or not this purchase ought to take place.

I probably will change my mind at some point, but until someone can prove to me that this is not going to be a recurring cost to the State of Maine, I am going to vote for indefinite postponement of this bill, not because I am opposed to having a crime lab in this state, not because I am opposed to having a crime lab director in this state, but because I think the proper approach is one of knowing what we are getting ourselves involved in, what this legislature is committed to and where this state is going. I hope you vote for indefinite postponement today.

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

Mr. MILLS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Another point of information, Mr. Speaker. Several sessions ago we voted to put the State of Maine in the New England Police Compact. It was my understanding at that time that there would be a centralized crime laboratory established for the use of the New England states. Can anybody tell me if this has ever been put into effect?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that this Bill "An Act Providing Funds for Director of the State Crime Laboratory," Senate Paper 446, L. D. 1413, and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence. All those in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Berry, P. P.; Berube, Binnette, Bither, Boudreau, Brawn, Briggs, Bustin, Carey, Carrier, Chick, Chonko, Clark, Conley, Connolly, Cote, Cottrell, Cresssey, Crommett, Curran, Davis, Deshaies, Donaghy, Drigotas, Dudley, Dunleavy, Dunn, Evans, Farley, Farnham, Farrington, Fecteau, Ferris, Finemore, Flynn, Fraser, Gauthier, Genest, Good, Goodwin, H.; Goodwin, K.; Greenlaw, Hamblen, Henley, Herrick, Hobbins, Hoffses, Hunter, Immonen, Jackson, Jacques, Jalbert, Kelleher, Kelley, Keyte, LaCharite, LaPointe, LeBlanc,

Lewis, E.; Littlefield, Lynch, Mahany, Martin, Maxwell, McHenry, McMahon, McNally, Merrill, Morin, L.; Morin, V.; Morton, Mulkern, Murchison, Murray, Najarian, Parks, Peterson, Pontbriand, Ricker, Rolde, Rollins, Ross, Santoro, Shaw, Strout, Talbot, Tanguay, Theriault, Tierney, Tyndale, Walker, Webber, Wheeler, Whitzell, Willard, Wood, M. E.

NAY — Ault, Baker, Berry, G. W.; Birt, Bragdon, Brown, Bunker, Cameron, Carter, Churchill, Cooney, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Dam, Dyar, Emery, D. F.; Faucher, Gahagan, Garsoe, Hancock, Haskell, Huber, Kelley, R. P.; Lawry, Lewis, J.; MacLeod, Maddox, McCormick, McKernan, McTeague, Mills, Norris, O'Brien, Perkins, Shute, Smith, D. M.; Smith, S.; Soulas, Sproul, Stillings, Trask, Trumbull, White.

ABSENT — Albert, Dow, Hodgdon, Kilroy, Knight, Palmer, Pratt, Sheltra, Silverman, Simpson, L. E.; Susi.

Yes, 96; No, 42; Absent, 11.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Ninety-six having voted in the affirmative and forty-two in the negative, with eleven being absent, the motion to indefinitely postpone does prevail.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I now move we reconsider our action whereby we indefinitely postponed this bill and I hope everybody votes against me.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, moves that we reconsider our action whereby this bill was indefinitely postponed. All in favor will say yes; those opposed will say no.

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

Sent up for concurrence.

At this point, Mr. Pratt of Parsonsfield, reported they had performed the duty with which they were charged and that Mr. Kauffman of Kittery had taken and subscribed the oaths of office necessary to qualify him to enter upon his official duties.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair would recognize the gentleman

from Kittery, Mr. Frank Kauffman, and I would like to introduce you to the members of the House and would assign you to seat 145. (Applause — members rising)

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act Increasing Nonresident Hunting License Fee (H. P. 188) (L. D. 265)

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.

Enactor

Tabled and Assigned

An Act Providing Funds for Development of an International Conference Center on Peaks Island (S. P. 381) (L. D. 1127)

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

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bar Harbor, Mr. MacLeod.

Mr. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I do not want to debate this enactor here this morning. However, I would like, just for a matter of information and my own information, to discuss it very briefly.

There is a move I understand in the Greater Portland area. It started in the 105th, to construct a massive conference center on Peaks Island, which I admire them for and I think it is a wonderful project. However, I feel here this morning that the foot is in the door possibly for future funding by the State of Maine. If I am wrong, I would like it brought to my attention. You have on your desk a very nice information sheet from two days ago that the gentlelady from Portland, Representative Boudreau, distributed for your information and it is very well done — I hope you have all taken time to read it — for the immediate future, as I understand it, the area which encompasses 167 acres of ocean front property on Peaks Island. They have a youth

project planned for the next two years which this \$20,000 would fund — various cleanups and closing manholes and different things from the fort and the surrounding property.

I think this is very admirable and I think that it's fine to give employment to children or students in the summer. The federal government is doing it and I see no reason maybe why the State of Maine shouldn't help to get this property cleaned up. However, I would like to have you all realize that possibly someday you may be staring at an appropriation much larger than \$20,000.

Brought out in the information article is the fact that visiting newsmen from all over the world come and find Peaks Island an admirable spot to gather in the summertime. This is fine. When I asked back in the 105th what this proposal was down there, they told me that it would be a complex, sort of a conference center where very high-level types of seminars could be held. You would have your motel rooms, you would have your tennis courts, your swimming pool and all this. This is fine. We do have an admirable motel association and group in the State of Maine and local people in the business, so I just wanted to get a little plug in here at the moment and a few thoughts before the House and the legislature.

We are picking up things more and more every day where the State of Maine becomes involved in the beginning in a very very easy manner — \$20,000 doesn't look like much. The bill, if you will read it, has less to say. It is just a development of a conference center on Peaks Island.

At this time, if anybody would like to answer any of my criticisms or remarks, I would appreciate it from some of the Portland delegation or members of the Finance Committee.

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

Mr. HASKELL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The gentleman from Bar Harbor wanted some information.

Basically, the Appropriations Committee, because of the fact that at the hearing was a rather strong representation from the group from Portland that they are interested in continuing this project and that apparently it is the hopes that they have of eventually developing something substantial here, still seem to have quite a good bit of support in the Portland area, we felt that probably the proper course would be to put the bill out on the floor of the House and get the reaction of the members of the House to it.

It is a bill that the committee doesn't have any strong feelings about. We simply thought that it should be given an opportunity for floor debate.

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

Mr. CAREY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I move indefinite postponement of the bill and all accompanying papers.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Carrier.

Mr. CARRIER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This small token they are asking of \$20,000 to do something on Peaks Island, I think has great value. I want to clear up right now that I am the owner of some property on Peaks Island which is of little value. I am not worried too much about that. As a matter of fact, my interest in the program is limited.

But I think if those of you who have visited the Island of Casco Bay, Peaks Island, you will find that is an island where a great amount of people reside year round. They are interested in all the youth programs. They have a senior citizen center down there. It is not anything too extravagant but the programs are very effective.

This particular section that they are talking about at one time was owned by the United States Government. It is a development that they want to do. I do not think it would be of any personal interest or personal gain to any

certain individual. I think it would be more of a cultural center than anything else.

I truly believe that yesterday or the day before if we could afford to send a bill out in here for \$60 million with no definite guidelines as to how it is going to be used, it seems to me that it would be a wise move today to think about these people of this state — they are still people of this state even though they do live on the island — and I think it would be a wise move to let them promote something cultural which will be available to all the people of this state and not only of Portland or Peaks Island or surrounding areas. I sincerely hope that you do not vote for the indefinite postponement and let the bill go to the Appropriations Table and see what happens from there.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bar Harbor, Mr. MacLeod.

Mr. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would direct a question to the Representative from Westbrook, Mr. Carrier. The \$20,000, I understand, is for the cleanup of the property to get started. Does the City of Portland plan to finance this conference center in later years from contributing funds from Portland or are they coming back to the Maine Legislature and asking for a bond issue to build the conference center?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Bar Harbor poses a question through the Chair to body who would care to answer it.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Carrier.

Mr. CARRIER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I cannot definitely say what the City of Portland or anybody else intends to do. I think the question is loaded and I don't intend to claim that I know such an answer. I really don't. I am not an outward proponent of this measure. I just happen to have some interest, which I think should be of the interest of this state. If it has no value, I know where it should go and if it has value, well just stick with it, that is all.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Yarmouth, Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON: Mr. Speaker, I move this be tabled for one day.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore.

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker, I move it be tabled for two days.

Thereupon, Mr. Norris of Brewer requested a vote on the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tem: A vote has been requested. The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore, that this matter be tabled pending the motion of Mr. Carey of Waterville to indefinitely postpone and specially assigned for Monday, April 30. All in favor of tabling will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

66 having voted in the affirmative and 59 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

An Act to Prohibit Interlocking Directorates in Banking Institutions (S. P. 575) (L. D. 1766)

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

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

Mr. NORRIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would move postponement for this bill and all its accompanying papers. I am more concerned every session and as time goes on of the erosion of the capitalistic system. I think this is a direct step towards socialism. I am not concerned with the individual banks, the people concerned. It is just the question of this approach on government. I do not see how this legislature can tell any corporation who they can have on their board of directors if the man is qualified and is voted on by that board. I think this bill is just a bunch of poppycock. I would ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Milo, Mr. Trask.

Mr. TRASK: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hope you do not go along

with the motion to indefinitely postpone this bill. This bill has been before the legislature either two or three times in an effort to accomplish this, and at this session, hopefully we have worked out a compromise putting in a grandfather clause of three years to allow an orderly transition. I hope you will oppose the motion to indefinitely postpone.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bar Harbor, Mr. MacLeod.

Mr. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would concur with Representative Trask. I think you will find today as you go throughout the State of Maine, in the banking business like everything else there are conglomerates that have started branch banking in every town in our state.

Now what you are finding today is the larger men withholding the stock in these big companies. They are in the smaller banks and they are buying up stock in these small banks and you have these interlocking directorates. I almost call it a conflict of interests as it exists, from the big to the small. Right now I am not absolutely certain of my facts, but about 75 percent of your banking is tied up today in very few banks in the State of Maine.

Your Business Legislation Committee heard this bill, they have worked out a good bill and I would request that you support it this morning.

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Certainly there is a need for this type of legislation on the state level as well as federal. I would like to call your attention to a clause in the Clayton Anti-trust Pact which says that no person may serve on the board of two corporations if by the nature of their business they are competitive. On the federal level this is being used to a greater extent because of the consolidation taking place throughout the nation.

The Federal Trade Commission within the last couple of weeks

challenged the gentleman serving on the board of Chrysler Corporation and General Electric. We normally think of General Electric as a manufacturer of electrical equipment and Chrysler is a manufacturer of cars. The Federal Trade Commission challenged this interlocking director on the basis that both manufacture air conditioning and it might be a threat to lessening of competition. For five years now, General Electric has to notify the Federal Trade Commission who they are going to appoint as directors on their board. And the same applies to Chrysler Corporation. And the gentlemen involved for the next five years has to notify them of any offers that he is considering accepting on the boards of any corporation. There is a growing interest on the federal level. It is going to grow even greater, and certainly we ought to be progressive enough in the state to recognize that interlocking directorships are a threat.

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

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There was a compromise worked out on this with the banks themselves. This definitely is a protection to the public and to the smaller banks and savings institutions, and at the same time, keeping the public from being locked out as far as money is concerned through big deals and big business.

I hope we will not go along with the motion of the gentleman from Brewer. I don't believe he attended his hearings any more than — I noted lately that there aren't very many of the Appropriations Committee attending their meetings and they come in here and tell us they have a unanimous report. I wonder how many people have actually heard these bills that they are signing out unanimously.

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

Mr. NORRIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In answer to the gentleman, Mr. Donaghy, I have

attended most every hearing of the finance and administration, and I have tried to do my work diligently and correctly. I do make a mistake once in a while, just the same as the good gentleman from Lubec does, which apparently he has done in this bill if he was at this hearing; because it says here it should be noted that either by intention or as a result of poor drafting that the prohibitions contained in this legislation and in this grandfather clause do not apply equally across the board. There is no prohibition against the following interlocks: savings bank trustee and advisory committee of national banks; savings bank officers serving as directors or officers of other financial institutions, using this phrase in its broadest sense; advisory committee of savings banks with everything; director of trust companies, member of advisory committees of trust companies with advisory committees of savings banks and national banks; managing board members and officers of credit unions with boards of savings and loan associations; federal credit unions, national banks, and bank holding companies; holding company board member and a board member of any financial institution which is not state chartered.

B. The grandfather clause is both inconsistent with the lifetime grandfather clause enacted in 1971 with respect to interlocking savings and loan association managing officials, Title 9, Section 1661, and also in its application to some but not all of the newly barred interlocks. No help in the grandfather clause to persons — a person who is a savings bank trustee and director of a bank holding company; a person who is a director of a trust company and a credit union; person who is an advisory committee member of a national bank and an advisory committee member of a trust company; person who is a director of a trust company and a director of a federal savings and loan association.

C. The grandfather clause as proposed suspends the state residuary requirement for existing

savings bank trustees for three years.

I submit if this bill isn't any good today, it isn't any good three years from now.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Morton.

Mr. MORTON: Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Just a couple of brief statements. Interlocking directorates have historically been the tool of big corporations, control entire segments of our economy. This same principle certainly applies to the five or six large banks doing business — banks and holding companies, doing business here in the State of Maine.

Now, the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Norris, has just given you a beautiful example of how to kill a bill with a lot of very carefully designed — and sometime I will ask him who wrote that speech for him — the carefully designed rhetoric. What he is doing is saying that it does not go far enough. He is saying that this bill isn't good enough, we ought to have a lot stronger bill. Well, I submit to you ladies and gentlemen, he doesn't want any control of interlocking directorates, he wants to let these big corporations run rampant in the banking business. I certainly hope that you will not go along with this motion to indefinitely postpone.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Durham, Mr. Tierney.

Mr. TIERNEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise to concur with the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Donaghy, and the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Morton.

The Committee on Business Legislation worked long and hard on this particular bill; indeed, we held it well over a month while we were soliciting the advice of many groups. We spoke to the banks, both large and small, both commercial and noncommercial. We spoke to the consumers, and we spoke to the banking commission. All agreed that this compromise matter was fair to all.

I certainly would hope that we would try to stop this attempt to defeat the unanimous committee report on this bill and defeat the motion to indefinitely postpone.

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is not the last of this sort of discussion. I have three bills that have gone in, all related with this same general area, the concentration of banking within the State of Maine. You have seen an example of it this morning.

Over 80 percent of the commercial banking in the State of Maine is concentrated now in a half a dozen hands. The bill as originally introduced under L. D. 827 was changed at the direction of the bank holding corporations. The amendment that was submitted was to accomplish the desires of the bank holding corporations.

I have no objection to the directors of the parent corporation having directors with their subsidiary banks. I do not think it is prudent, I would not do it myself. I think it is very unwise for directors of the bank holding corporations to be sitting on the boards of other subsidiaries other than banks. I think they are exposing themselves to a conflict of interest. The court suits that are growing out of conflicts of interests throughout the nation, there is an ever increasing number.

I do feel that directors of commercial banks should not sit on the boards of savings banks and I think they shouldn't sit on credit unions because the changes that are going to come in the banking field in the near future are going to make it practically impossible for any person to serve on the boards of two competing institutions. And they will be competing institutions. They will be meeting head-on in a way in which they have not met in the past. This is going to be a new ball game, and I think you ought to be prepared for legislation.

Mr. Norris of Brewer was granted permission to speak a third time.

Mr. NORRIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a matter of fact, I didn't have any prepared speech. I did have this information on this bill and it did not come from the First National Bank in Farmington, I can assure the good gentleman across the aisle.

My only reason, and I had no intentions of going into this, was to show Mr. Donaghy from Lubec that even though you sit on a committee and hear the hearing, you still can be half asleep.

The SPEAKER pro tem: A roll call has 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 those 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 pro tem: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Norris, that L. D. 1766 and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Berry, G. W.; Bither, Crommett, Curran, Dudley, Dunn, Dyar, Emery, D. F.; McCormick, McCormick, Norris, Shute, Soulas, Whitzell.

NAY — Albert, Ault, Baker, Berry, P. P.; Berube, Binnette, Birt, Boudreau, Bragdon, Brawn, Briggs, Brown, Bunker, Bustin, Cameron, Carter, Chick, Chonko, Churchill, Clark, Conley, Connolly, Cooney, Cote, Cottrell, Cressey, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Davis, Deshaies, Donaghy, Drigotas, Dunlevy, Evans, Farley, Farnham, Farrington, Fecteau, Ferris, Finemore, Flynn, Fraser, Gahagan, Garsoe, Gauthier, Genest, Good, Goodwin, H.; Goodwin, K.; Greenlaw, Hamblen, Hancock, Henley, Herrick, Hobbins, Hoffses, Huber, Hunter, Immonen, Jackson, Jacques, Kauffman, Kelleher, Kelley, Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Kilroy, LaCharite, LaPointe,

Lawry, LeBlanc, Lewis, E.; Littlefield, Lynch, MacLeod, Maddox, Mahany, Martin, McHenry, McKernan, McMahon, McNally, McTeague, Merrill, Mills, Morin, L.; Morin, V.; Morton, Mulkern, Murchison, Murray, Najarian, O'Brien, Palmer, Parks, Perkins, Peterson, Pontbriand, Pratt, Ricker, Rolde, Rollins, Ross, Shaw, Smith, D. M.; Smith, S.; Sproul, Stillings, Strout, Talbot, Theriault, Tierney, Trask, Trumbull, Tyndale, Walker, Webber, Wheeler, White, Willard, Wood, M. E.

ABSENT — Carey, Carrier, Dam, Dow, Faucher, Haskell, Hodgdon, Jalbert, Knight, Lewis, J.; Maxwell, Santoro, Sheltra, Silverman, Simpson, L. E.; Susi, Tanguay.

Yes, 13; No, 120; Absent, 17.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Thirteen having voted in the affirmative, and one hundred twenty having voted in the negative, with seventeen being absent, the motion does not prevail.

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

An Act Amending Fee Schedule for Registered Nurses (H. P. 710) (L. D. 916)

An Act to Repeal the Law Providing for Town Workhouses and Houses of Correction (H. P. 1121) (L. D. 1459)

An Act Relating to Permanent Motor Vehicle Operators License Numbers. (H. P. 914) (L. D. 1214) (C. "A" H-235)

An Act Amending the Law Relating to the Provision of Housing and Meals to State Employees (H. P. 1021) (L. D. 1344) (H-183)

An Act Relating to Management of Endowment Funds of Educational Organizations. (S. P. 285) (L. D. 832) (C. "A" S-75) (H. "A" H-269)

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.

Orders of the Day

On motion of Mr. Birt of East Millinocket, the House voted to take from the table the first tabled and unassigned matter:

Resolution Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Reducing Residence Requirement for Voting to Thirty Days (H. P. 9) (L. D. 9)

Tabled — March 12, by Mr. Birt of East Millinocket.

Pending — Passage to be enacted.

On motion of Mr. Ross of Bath, under suspension of the rules, the House reconsidered its action whereby the Resolution was passed to be engrossed.

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

House Amendment "A" (H-281) was read by the Clerk.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I presented a bill as a constitutional amendment to have the residency requirement before you could register to be 30 days for all persons both in state and moving into the state from out of state. Presently, our law says that within the state it is three months and when moving into the state it is six months. However, during the last presidential election the Supreme court said that a person moving into the state could register immediately. Nevertheless, our residents still had to wait three months. This seemed unfair and I was told that the court probably would approve 30 days for all persons.

We sent this matter to our Supreme court and received a ruling back from them and were told that our state 30 days was too long. The United States Supreme Court would only approve a time limit in keeping with the individual states difficulty in the registration process. Here in Maine the boards of registration are in session for different lengths of time according to the size of the city. The longest time is 9 days, not including

weekends. If we had the weekends and a day or two to come and go on, we arrive at this number 15 days. And our experts believe that this will satisfy all of the courts. I now move that this amendment be adopted.

Thereupon, House Amendment "A" was adopted.

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

On motion of Mr. Finemore of Bridgewater, the House voted to take from the table the second tabled and unassigned matter:

Resolution Designating a Certain Bridge Across the Androscoggin River as the "Veterans Memorial Bridge" (S. P. 329) (L. D. 1033)

Tabled — April 24, by Mr. Finemore of Bridgewater.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston to recede and concur.

On motion of Mr. Finemore of Bridgewater, the House voted to recede.

Mr. Ross of Bath offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" (H-282) was read by the Clerk.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We requested that the other body join us in a Committee of Conference to see whether or not we could come to some sort of compromise, but they refused to do this. Consequently, today we can do one of two things. We can give into them and call it just the Veterans Bridge or we can name it something else, and there is a third thing, we could do nothing and be stubborn and adhere, thus the bridge would have no name.

Now, they in their discussion kept talking about the veterans specifically of Viet Nam. And they are going to have their names inscribed and all of that. But nowhere in the Veterans Memorial Bridge did I see the word Viet Nam. So if that is the purpose, and since we now have 22 plain Veterans Bridges. I would suggest that we name this the Viet Nam

Veterans Memorial Bridge. I move the adoption of the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jacques.

Mr. JACQUES: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I don't know if Mr. Ross read the bill or not. But if he reads the bill it certainly does say Viet Nam. But I don't think that we want to be reminded of Viet Nam all the time when we go across that bridge or when the police officer makes out accident reports that the name Viet Nam will appear on every police report. Can you imagine having six or seven words just designating where the accident happened.

Now, I was reminded of this a few days ago, that police do make their reports on automobile accidents. We have quite a few there. I don't know if any of you gentlemen have been through there, but I think we have an average of one a day in that area at the present time. And I certainly do not go along with this amendment. I think that we should leave it at the Veterans Memorial Bridge. And it is designated as being the 23 members that did die and we also have a young man that did receive the Congressional Medal of Honor. I certainly hope that you do not go along with the amendment that Mr. Ross has presented. I would move for the indefinite postponement of the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mrs. Berube.

Mrs. BERUBE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Perhaps we should leave the Viet Nam words in so that it can never happen again in our history and be reminded of this as we cross that Viet Nam Bridge.

Mr. Ross of Bath requested a roll call vote.

The SPEAKER pro tem: A roll call has 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 those 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 pro tem: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jacques, that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Briggs, Carter, Conley, Connolly, Crommett, Fraser, Genest, Goodwin, H.; Hamblen, Huber, Jacques, LaPointe, Maxwell, McTeague, Rollins, Soulas, Strout, Talbot, Tierney, Whitzell.

NAY — Albert, Ault, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Berube, Binnette, Birt, Bither, Boudreau, Bragdon, Brawn, Brown, Bunker, Bustin, Carey, Carrier, Chick, Chonko, Churchill, Clark, Cooney, Cote, Cottrell, Cressey, Curran, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Davis, Deshaies, Donaghy, Drigotas, Dunlevy, Dunn, Dyar, Emery, D. F.; Evans, Farley, Farnham, Farrington, Faucher, Fecteau, Ferris, Fine-more, Flynn, Gahagan, Garsoe, Gauthier, Good, Goodwin, K.; Hancock, Haskell, Henley, Herrick, Hobbins, Hoffses, Hunter, Immonen, Jackson, Jalbert, Kauffman, Kelleher, Kelley, Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Kilroy, LaCharite, Lawry, LeBlanc, Lewis, E.; Lewis, J.; Littlefield, Lynch, MacLeod, Maddox, Mahany, Martin, McCormick, McHenry, McKernan, McMahon, McNally, Merrill, Mills, Morin, L.; Morin, V.; Morton, Mulkern, Murchison, Murray, Najarian, Norris, O'Brien, Palmer, Parks, Perkins, Peterson, Pontbriand, Pratt, Ricker, Rolde, Ross, Santoro, Shaw, Shute, Smith, D. M.; Smith, S.; Sproul, Stillings, Susi, Tanguay, Theriault, Trask, Trumbull, Tyndale, Walker, Webber, Wheeler, White, Willard, Wood, M. E.

ABSENT — Cameron, Dam, Dow, Dudley, Greenlaw, Hodgdon, Knight, Sheltra, Silverman, Simpson, L. E.

Yes, 20; No, 119; Absent, 11.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Twenty having voted in the affirmative and one hundred nineteen in the negative, with eleven being absent, the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

Thereupon, House Amendment "A" was adopted.

The Resolution was passed to be engrossed as amended in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Lapointe.

Mr. LaPOINTE: Mr. Speaker, is the House in possession of L. D. 1810?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The answer is in the affirmative. Bill An Act Designating a Commemorative Day in Remembrance of Martin Luther King, Jr., House Paper 1440, L. D. 1810, is in the possession of the House.

On motion of the same gentleman, the House reconsidered its action whereby this Bill was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The chair recognizes the same gentleman.

Mr. LaPOINTE: Mr. Speaker, I move we reconsider our action whereby we indefinitely postponed House Amendment "A".

The SPEAKER pro tem: Mr. LaPointe of Portland moves that the House reconsider its action whereby House Amendment "A" was indefinitely postponed. Is there objection?

The Chair hears objection. The Chair will order a vote.

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

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

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like an explanation of what this amendment was before we vote on it.

Thereupon, the Amendment was read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Connolly.

Mr. CONNOLLY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the

House: In response to the remarks or the question posed by Mr. Cote, I would just like to explain that when this bill first went to committee, it was a bill that would have set aside January 15 as a state holiday in honor of Martin Luther King, being that Martin Luther King represents a lot of things to a lot of people, but particularly the black people in their struggle.

When that bill came out of the committee, it was reported out in a new draft, 7 to 6 "ought to pass". What the new draft did was say that January 15 could be a day or "may" be a day of commemoration. What this amendment does it says that January 15th "shall" be a day of commemoration. To my way of thinking, it seems like an adequate compromise.

If the amendment passes, January 15 will not be a holiday but again, it shall be a day of commemoration in honor of Martin Luther King and black people and their struggle for freedom.

I would hope that you would reconsider so that we can put this amendment on the bill.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. LaPointe, that the House reconsider its action whereby House Amendment "A" was indefinitely postponed. All in favor of reconsideration will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

Mr. Connolly of Portland requested a roll call vote.

The SPEAKER pro tem: A roll call has 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 those 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 pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Lapointe.

Mr. LaPOINTE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the

House: I would ask you to give thorough consideration to this amendment in passing it this morning. It just seems that this week we have passed on another holiday whereby we created a legal holiday for Christopher Columbus. I think it would only be appropriate that we pass this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Connolly.

Mr. CONNOLLY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am sorry to keep rising on this bill. It seems by the first vote on the division that this bill — the amendment — is going to fail. But I do not hear anybody rising to speak against it. So if you folks are going to vote against this bill, why don't you stand up and say why you are opposed to it.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. LaPointe, that the House reconsider its action whereby House Amendment "A" was indefinitely postponed. All in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Albert, Berry, P. P.; Boudreau, Brown, Bustin, Chonko, Clark, Conley, Connolly, Cottrell, Curran, Drigotas, Dunleavy, Farley, Fecteau, Flynn, Genest, Goodwin, H.; Goodwin, K.; Hobbins, Huber, Jacques, Kelleher, Kilroy, LaPointe, LeBlanc, Lynch, Mahany, Martin, Maxwell, McKernan, McMahon, McTeague, Morin, V.; Mulkern, Murray, Najarian, Norris, O'Brien, Peterson, Pontbriand, Rolde, Santoro, Smith, D. M.; Smith, S.; Soulas, Talbot, Tierney, Trumbull, Tyndale, Wheeler, Whitzell.

NAY — Ault, Berry, G. W.; Berube, Binnette, Birt, Bither, Bragdon, Brawn, Briggs, Bunker, Cameron, Carey, Carrier, Carter, Chick, Churchill, Cooney, Cote, Cressey, Crommett, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Davis, Deshaies, Donaghy, Dunn, Dyar, Emery, D. F.; Evans, Farnham, Farrington, Faucher, Ferris, Finemore, Fraser, Gahagan, Garsoe, Gauthier, Good, Hamblen, Hancock, Haskell, Henley, Herrick, Hoffses, Hunter, Immonen, Jackson, Kauffman, Kelley,

Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, LaCharite, Lawry, Lewis, E.; Lewis, J.; Littlefield, MacLeod, Maddox, McCormick, McHenry, McNally, Merrill, Mills, Morin, L.; Morton, Murchison, Palmer, Parks, Perkins, Pratt, Ricker, Rollins, Ross, Shaw, Shute, Sproul, Stillings, Strout, Susi, Tanguay, Theriault, Trask, Walker, Webber, White, Willard, Wood, M. E.

ABSENT — Baker, Barnes, Dam, Dow, Dudley, Greenlaw, Hodgdon, Knight, Sheltra, Silverman, Simpson, L. E.

Yes, 53; No, 87; Absent, 10.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Fifty-three having voted in the affirmative and eighty-seven in the negative, with ten being absent, the motion does not prevail.

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

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

Bill "An Act Relating to Use of Studded Tires on Motor Vehicles" (S. P. 79) (L. D. 196).

Tabled — April 24, by Mr. Ault of Wayne.

Pending — Passage to be enacted.

On motion of Mr. Ault of Wayne, under suspension of the rules, the House reconsidered its action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed.

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

House Amendment "A" (H-280) was read by the Clerk.

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

Mr. AULT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: First off, I want to commend Mr. Silsby for his very clear and concise interpretation of the Statement of Fact. Secondly, I want to say I have no argument with the Department of Transportation when they tell us that studded snow tires are detrimental to the surface of our roadways. I am sure their data could show this to be the case. We have been using studded snow tires in Maine for some five or six years and I do not believe

an emergency suddenly exists that we have to take them off the roads this summer.

The reason I say this is, there are a number of people who bought studded snow tires last Fall and put enough miles on in this winter that they would not be effective in the snows of next winter and so they planned on using them through this summer as long as they were safe and then would replace them in the Fall. When this legislation is passed, quite probably they will not buy studded snow tires next Fall but will buy the conventional winter tire. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to direct a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Ault. I am just a little bit confused. I gather that the beginning date is October 1. What is the end date now with these various amendments, when will we have to substitute in the Spring?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Casco, Mr. Hancock, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Ault, who may answer if he so desires. The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. AULT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I understand that the latest amendment we adopted, maintains they should be taken off May 31.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Whitzell.

Mr. WHITZELL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is the type of debate — these studded tires by the way are usually snow tires. Snow tires are recommended to be removed from the automobile during the summer months anyway. A studded snow tire is even more dangerous because of the fact that the heat that is created by the increased friction on the snow tire dislodges those studs and causes them to act as a projectile. They will travel at a speed greater than

a .22 bullet and on a high speed highway. I think they are clearly dangerous. These cars that have studded tires surely should have them removed from the car by May 30 of this year. I think the emergency exists now.

They do damage the road, but I don't think that is the only thing that they do. They are an unsafe tire. Many many snow tires that are studded are recapped tires. Anybody that drives the Interstate has seen patches of rubber all along the road where these tires peel and blow out. They cause an unsafe condition to exist. The fact that they are studded, the fact that they are snow tires and the fact that they generate too much heat, all these things are safety hazards to the drivers and to the other people on those interstate highways.

Fine to drive around the city with them, possibly it is fine on a second car, but we have to think about the safety of all the people in Maine and the people in Maine are now traveling more than they ever have and the speeds on the highways are posted higher than they ever have been. If these tires were ever unsafe, they are more unsafe now than ever.

I don't believe that we are talking about an unusual hardship in asking someone to take studded snow tires off their car during summer months. You can buy a good recapped tire for \$9.95 at almost any tire outlet. It is not a great financial burden and it may save a man's life.

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

Mr. AULT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In reply to Mr. Whitzell, I am in agreement that probably we should take these studded snow tires off the cars in the summer but I just don't believe that we have to do it suddenly this summer and make some people throw the tires away before their use is all gone.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Farnham.

Mr. FARNHAM: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hope that you don't go

along with the motion of Mr. Ault. I hate to do this. I have to agree with Mr. Whitzell and I would remind any of you that a pair of pliers and one hour will take all the studs out of your tires and then you will not have .22 bullets flying back at the windshield that is following you.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is one time that I stand before you and think I can speak with some authority, and that is about tires. I have been a tire distributor for some 20 years, and I have been in the tire business 40 years as of last year. I started in 1932. Now if there is anybody in this House that is an authority on tires, I really would consider it to be myself. I do not know of a single soul that ever got hit by a tire stud out of a tire. First of all, you would be violating the law if you did because it specifically states in the motor vehicle laws how far you shall stay behind an automobile and they just will not come out and when they come out they are worn out.

For the benefit of you people who don't know what you are talking about, and that includes some I have observed this morning, you can go down and look at my car—it is parked by the wheelchair entrance — and my studded tires are on there and by another two weeks there are not going to be any studs in them, they are going to be all worn out. There will be other people who don't travel as much as I do who should be extended this courtesy of letting them wear the tires out, at least along with this amendment.

I do run a lot, I cover a lot of miles with my car. I wear a car out about every year and for that reason I would probably wear my studs out in another couple of weeks. But I can think of a lot of people that drive very little and they would need until this fall to wear these tires out.

Frankly, I think there is no need to have studded tires taken off your car.

Someone just wants to put a bill into the legislature so they have got their name on a bill. I think that is why you get this type of legislation. I can see why the State of Connecticut wants to do away with them because they have a lot of toll houses where people stop and pay the toll on the Merritt Turnpike, the Charter Road bridge and many other cases.

In these particular spots the man with studs on stops a little bit quicker and it has caused a few backend accidents of which the insurance companies want to do away with. But we haven't had that problem in the State of Maine — the people in these backend accidents by the man's stopping — and it has never been proven to me or anyone else in this House that they stave the road up with studded tires. As a matter of fact, if they did, they would have been done away with long ago. That is absolutely phony.

I run a shop that has had a blacktop yard for some 15 years. I paid \$6,000 to have it put in and my customers have been traveling over it in great numbers. They spin their wheels, the young people do in my dooryard and they haven't loosened the blacktop any and they haven't worn it out. I am on a corner, the intersection of 155 and 2 and it's obtuse angle, this intersection, so everybody crosses my dooryard, all the big trucks, the buses, school buses and so forth. I find no wear on the dooryard after 15 years. The blacktop it not going to wear out, it is going to be there when I am gone. So for once I think I can stand before you and speak with a voice of authority. Other times I have been here I just made accusations of what I have observed or what I have learned out of a newspaper or what I have learned from somebody else. But this knowledge about tires, I have learned that pretty much first hand.

Now, I hope you will go along with the amendment extending it to these poor people at least until October. But if you were using good judgment, you wouldn't even have a tire studded bill. You would say it is phony and throw it out because it does not hurt the road a

bit. They don't fly out and kill people. As a matter of fact, they wear out. And this is as sound as that and I can prove it to you if you want to take the time like I told you to walk down to the wheelchair entrance and look at my own automobile. In two weeks, there won't be any there.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I will certainly go along with the philosophy that the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, is an authority. I know he uses studs; I am wondering if he sells them.

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

Mr. McNALLY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I guess I am the gullible one that was in that Transportation Committee. And I saw what they alleged. You have to take for gospel whatever that the Transportation Department submits to you. Actual proof of photographs of where the road was worn and also actual pieces taken out of it where the studded tires had worn a slot right in the road itself, and that was the reason for the bill. I am an ignorant fellow also on studded tires because I have never been fortunate enough to have money enough to pay for putting studs in my tires and I get along without them anyway. Period.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Whitzell.

Mr. WHITZELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Being refuted as an expert in tires, I might suggest two things to the gentleman from Enfield. One, if he believes that all the studs are still in his tire, I wish he would take count. I know that they don't last through the summer months because I have run several sets of tires on my small car, now, that is a light-weight, foreign car that is on the second year, if I run them through the summer, there are not enough studs to make it effective. Secondly, anyone that says a stud

will not penetrate the tar or tear up the road bed can ask any woman here over the last two years when spiked heels were in, do spiked heels damage the road beds. And I think that anybody who will realize the number of pounds per square inch that could be effected on a road bed through the stud in a relatively small area coming in contacts with the roads, I am sure that you will not disagree and I may not be an expert but I do know that. It is simple physics that you cannot put a lot of weight in a very small spot. Spiked heels were dangerous, snow tire studs are also dangerous. It isn't so much that they are studded tires period. It is the fact that they are studded snow tires; they do generate more heat. And I would like the gentleman from Enfield to answer the question, does a snow tire generate more heat than a normal road tire?

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In answer to the gentleman's question, the snow tire by virtue has more rubber on it and less ventilation and does create a little more heat. But heat does not hurt the highway, the sun is what puts heat on the highway, not the tires. Any coarse treaded tire, the coarser the tread the more heat and the more friction there is to the road, but it doesn't hurt the road, it hurts the tire, the tire wears faster and that is why you have fine, cut-thread tires, so the air can get in as ventilation and make them wear longer.

While I am on my feet, I don't believe there is much damage caused to the highway by spike heels. I am a little scared of spiked heels myself, but I am not afraid of them hurting the highway. By the same token, I know that these spikes don't hurt the highway, not in the State of Maine, I am sure they don't, no more than they hurt my driveway. But I tell you what, if you do any driving — you see, what you are talking about here is, you are really talking how much do you drive. Do you drive 1,000 miles a year

or do you drive 50,000 miles a year? Studded tires probably won't last over eight or ten thousand miles by virtue of their structure. But a fine treaded tire, the average priced ones will get you around 20,000 miles.

However, I sell tires today that are made of steel that we guarantee 40,000 miles. So it depends on what you want to buy. And most people don't know anything about tires as well as studs, and well as studded tires. So I will enlighten you a little about that seeing as I am on my feet and in business — I may as well get a plug for my own business.

You can buy tires any price you want to pay. For instance, they come in about eight or ten different categories. If you come in and talked to me and you come in looking for something cheap, I might as well sell you a cheap tire as the next guy. But if you come in and say Mr. Dudley, I'm looking for something good for my car, then you are going to have to pay a little more money. By the same token though, it turns out to be cheaper in the end because you get that much more mileage. Personally, for \$50 I can sell you an all steel tire that will get you 40,000 miles and this tire will be worthwhile. However, some members of the House I can even do better than that for.

Bear in mind that you are going to talk about friction on the highway. Your steel tire will run hotter than your conventional tire, I am sure it does because it has steel in it like the studs in the tire. If you are going to start putting tires off the road because they create friction, then you better look around. The best tires on the road are made of steel. They do run hotter but I don't think the heat is what damages the road, the sun is what heats the road. In the winter time what staves up the road is Jack Frost, as we call him back home. He gets under the road and lifts it up, great junks of it. But the snow tread tires don't do it, I can promise you.

In other words, I wasn't going to oppose the bill for snow tread tires. I thought it was too minute.

But I think it is getting kind of nit picking when you try to tell them that they have to take them off this time of year. They at least ought to be left until they are worn out and then buy another set of tires.

I am reminded by a sign in Penobscot county that a man that sells gravestones has out front. He has got a big gravestone out front of his place, he sells gravestones. It says drive carefully, I can wait. Well, I can wait for their business, I can wait until their tires are worn out and sell them when their tires are worn out. I don't have to have you drive them into my place now and buy tires when they don't need them. Most people where I come from are from modest means and they are working hard for the dollars they get and I don't want to be one to force them to buy tires when they really don't need it, even though I would be the benefitor. Anybody likes to have you drive people into their business for service. And I am probably no doubt like that. I enjoy seeing a long line waiting. But I am still considerate of their pocketbook to some extent. And I don't want to make people buy something that is unnecessary.

I really would think that you would be showing good judgment if you would kill the whole bill. You don't need to do it but in this case that is not before us, right now it is this amendment, and you would be showing extremely good judgment if you extended it and let these poor people wear the tires out. I am quite long winded, so I hope someone else doesn't ask another question so I will take another half an hour to answer it.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Union, Mrs. McCormick.

Mrs. McCORMICK: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: When Mr. Whitzell made the reference between women's high heels and studded tires I just couldn't sit still any longer. The time when the spike heel was out and women were punching holes in not only the tar pavement but carpets in kitchens and

everything else, we got into a few discussions on just how much weight they put on one of those spike heels. And I am not being an engineer or remembering the formula, but had it quoted to me many times, a woman weighing only 100 pounds, if you took per square inch of weight by the pounds and so forth, she came out to weigh as much as that car does and that car is spreading it out over a lot more territory.

And I would also like to say, I have listened to the debate on this bill and I certainly go along with Mr. Ault's amendment. I would like to see this wait until next year.

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hate to prolong this thing. But I am intrigued by Mr. Whitzell's comment that these studs become projectiles. Apparently there is a desire on the part of some members of the House to extend the use of snow studded tires so that they can be worn out.

Now I would like to ask the experts of the House if a tire is used to the extent that it is being worn out, do these studs then become a greater hazard because there is less rubber left on the tire to hold the stud and do they become a hazard on the highway?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Livermore Falls, Mr. Lynch, poses a question to anybody who may answer if they so desire.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Corinth, Mr. Strout.

Mr. STROUT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: One thing that I can answer, Mr. Lynch, for the past 14 years I have put on 40,000 miles or more a year. I tried studded tires for two years, and I am going to recommend to him that studded tires were not a benefit to me. These studded tires after fifteen or twenty thousand miles will start popping out.

Mr. Dudley has said that the studded tires, the studs will not come out. I used them two years and they came out of my tires and I also believed it was hazardous

for me, especially along in April, if you run them any later. You have problems with tires being out of balance. When your tires get worn to a certain extent they will puncture the tire, and the stud will go in and you will start having tire failure.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Murray.

Mr. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would also like to answer Mr. Lynch's question by one piece of evidence that I have. Last week I went to the garage to replace a headlight that was out in my car. When the gentleman took it out and looked at it and shook it, he said, well there is a stud in there that went through and there was the little hole where the stud came off someone's tire. So I do think that once in a while these studs come out and do fly toward the car behind you.

Mr. Dudley of Enfield was granted permission to speak for a third time.

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I will try not to address the House for a third time, but I want to answer a few accusations. Number one, the man that got his headlight knocked out by a stud would be a very rare case. I suspect it would happen once in a million times. He was obviously violating the laws, motor vehicle laws, because they tell you how far you can drive behind a car. Now, Mr. Lynch from Livermore Falls asked the question about them wearing out. Putting them on the road is very similar to taking a piece of metal and holding it on a grindstone. When you get it all ground off there is nothing left to fly. It is pretty much gone. There would be such a small piece that it would be smaller than the brimstone on an old wooden match. When you get done grinding it off the highway, there is nothing left to fly, it is all gone anyway.

Now, you can take them out. You misunderstood me by saying that they wouldn't come out. Under very extreme conditions — I can go out here and back up against a tree and spin them hard enough

on a granite wall or get stuck in a gravel pit in a hurry, spin them kind of hard, I suppose you could knock out a few. But, you will not get them out of there by any fair means, I mean, driving on a highway you won't get them out; you won't get them out by any fair means. If you want to leave a place in a hurry sometime and you really goosed her, you might knock some out, but you won't get them out by any fair means. This is what I want to point out.

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

A vote of the House was taken.

80 having voted in the affirmative and 33 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

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

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

Bill "An Act to Create Hospital Administrative District No. 4 in Piscataquis, Somerset and Penobscot Counties" (H. P. 515) (L. D. 681)

Tabled—April 24, by Mrs. White of Guilford.

Pending—Passage to be enacted.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentle lady from Guilford, Mrs. White.

Mrs. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: Because there is another town or actually a plantation that wants in on this proposed hospital district and which needs an amendment and there are other complications which we need to work on, I would appreciate it very much if some kind person would table this bill for two more legislative days.

On motion of Mr. Birt of East Millinocket, tabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for Monday, April 30.

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

Bill "An Act Increasing License Fee for Nurserymen" (H. P. 1019) (L. D. 1342)

Tabled—April 24, by Mr. Garsoe of Cumberland.

Pending—Passage to be enacted.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Webber.

Mr. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill was mine but due to some problems that have arisen recently, I now move indefinite postponement of this bill and all its accompanying papers.

Thereupon, the Bill was indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

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

Bill "An Act to Authorize Eleven New Regions and Central Aroostook County for Vocational Education" (S. P. 110) (L. L. 255)

Tabled—April 24, by Mr. Haskell of Houlton.

Pending—Motion of Mr. Shute of Stockton Springs to reconsider adoption of Committee Amendment "A" (S-56).

Thereupon, the House reconsidered its action whereby Committee Amendment "A" was adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Stockton Springs, Mr. Shute.

Mr. SHUTE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Several days ago I offered House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" and then there was some discussion on what the motion would be. I believe the Clerk has the Committee Amendment and if she has, I would now offer House Amendment "A" under filing number H-242 to Committee Amendment "A" and move its adoption.

House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" (H-242) was read by the Clerk and adopted.

Mr. LaCharité of Brunswick offered House Amendment "B" to Committee Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "B" to Committee Amendment "A" (H-287) was read by the Clerk and adopted.

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

Mr. HASKELL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This piece of legislation I feel is very significant. There have been a series of amendments offered this morning that I am sure are confusing to those in the House who haven't been following the course of this piece of legislation closely. I feel that it should be given close scrutiny by everybody in the House.

Now, unfortunately, the particular area that I live in—this piece of legislation, with the amendments that are now on it, seems to have a very serious effect in that the school administrators that will have to administer this question doubt very seriously whether it is workable as it applies to our situation which basically is one fairly large sized town surrounded by 27 small towns. The Board that would administer and determine the budget and other policies of the board would have to be made up of all of the towns and the budget would have to be approved in some manner by all of the towns.

Now, there is another feature of this bill that I think everyone in the House should be aware of. These districts are mandated. Now, those of you who have been here for several sessions, I am sure, are aware of the fact that we never have been willing to mandate school administrative districts. We are now looking at a piece of legislation in the vocational education field that does mandate the districts.

Now, I am sure there is a general feeling among all of us that we do wish to encourage the growth of constructive vocational education. I think we also do recognize the problems that are involved when we attempt to make combinations of communities that can participate in a good vocational education program.

I am in a position where the school administrator of the community that I represent is not satisfied with the amendments that are on the bill and whether or not

their dissatisfaction with the amendments is sufficient for them to actively oppose the passage of the whole bill or not will have to be determined by taking this series of amendments home over the weekend and allowing them to examine them in some detail.

I would suggest that all of you should follow a like course because if you do go along with the mandation of these vocational districts, it would mean that your community would be locked into this system even though your community might not wish to participate. So there is a very serious question involved here, one that I think deserves serious attention and constructive answers. The amendments that we have at this juncture may not be the final answer. I would suggest that perhaps it might be wise for this bill to be tabled for two additional legislative days to allow more study of the effect of the amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. LaCharite.

Mr. LaCHARITE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: What I would like to do is explain this bill because it is an important bill and probably, as some of us have already done, by just reading the amendments and trying to get this bill to look right, it is quite confusing. I would like to go through the bill completely with the House Amendment "A", House Amendment "B", House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" and House Amendment "B" to Committee Amendment "A" all included in this brief summary.

L. D. 255 amends Section 2356-A of Title 20 under which the 13 regional technical vocational centers have been organized. This act completes the delivery system of vocational education at the high school level and will make it possible for juniors and seniors to train in specific vocational education occupations in order that each might have a salable skill upon graduation.

The act creates through mandation, as has been stated, 11 new regions for vocational education

which will bring opportunities to 40 per cent of the high school population not now being served by the existing regional technical vocational centers.

It is equally urgent that this 40 per cent, some 25,000 students, be granted comparable opportunities. Eleven new vocational education regions will be administered by a cooperative board made up of representatives chosen within the local area. The size of such a board and the distribution of the membership among units in accordance to population and the methods of sharing costs among the units is determined by agreement at the local level. The municipal officers of each unit will be invited to the joint meeting and shall be heard on the issues of cooperative board membership and the methods of sharing costs among the units. If any unit feels that the terms of the cooperative board agreement are unfair it may appeal to the state board of education for a review of the decision.

The annual budget, as finally approved by the cooperative board, shall be submitted to the legislative body of each unit within the region, which will permit the vocational regional school budget to be voted on in the same manner that the regular school budget is voted on in your municipalities now.

The bill requires the cooperative board to have a referendum vote in each municipality if it deems advisable to issue bonds or notes for the construction of regional technical vocational facilities. The majority of the votes rule whether construction will take place in a region.

The cooperative board is responsible for arranging for the transportation of students to the vocational education programs within the region. State aid for the transportation shall be computed and paid to the cooperative board, treating the regional center as a single administrative unit. In the 13 existing regional technical vocational centers the sending schools will be responsible for providing transportation to the voca-

tional education programs. Co-operative board is also authorized to submit particular questions to the citizens in a referendum to reach decisions concerning new programs and other issues affecting the vocational education program in the region.

In recent years Maine has made a serious commitment to provide more vocational education in its secondary schools. Much has been done to meet this commitment in the period since the passage of Section 2356-A of Title 20. In an effort to reach as many students as possible, the state established 13 regional technical vocational centers in the denser population areas so vocational education programs are accessible for approximately 60 per cent of the high school population, or about 40,000 students, so it is equally urgent that the other 40 per cent, or some 25,000 students, have the same opportunities. This is why it is urgent that L. D. 255 is passed and signed into law and I should mention that surveys have been conducted during the last year which demonstrate that these students want such opportunities; in fact, more than half would pursue vocational education training if programs were available to them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that Committee Amendment "A" with amendment House Amendment "B", House Amendment "A" be adopted and after that, I would hope that after this bill having had its two several readings, it be passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate in nonconcurrency.

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

Mr. BRAWN: Mr. Speaker, I move that this be tabled for two legislative days.

Mr. Briggs of Caribou requested a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oakland, Mr. Brawn, that L. D. 255 be tabled pending the adoption of Committee Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "A" and House Amendment "B" thereto and specially assigned for

Monday, April 30. All those in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

67 having voted in the affirmative and 30 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

(Off Record Remarks)

At this point, Speaker Hewes returned to the rostrum.

SPEAKER HEWES: The Chair thanks the gentleman and commends him for a fine job.

Thereupon, the Sergeant-at-Arms escorted Mr. Simpson to his seat on the floor, amid the applause of the House, and Speaker Hewes resumed the Chair.

Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Before the item was tabled I intended to speak on this matter. After I was finished with the vocational school program in my area and in other areas on a post secondary level, I presented the first piece of legislation that involved itself with vocational education on a high school level and I would suggest that this measure — I can appreciate the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. LaCharite's explanation of it as well as I certainly can appreciate the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Haskell's explanation of it.

I would not want the vocational programs in any way harmed and I do hope that you will afford yourself of the bill and the amendments so you will be fully prepared for the ensuing debate on this very important program.

Mr. Briggs of Caribou was granted unanimous consent to address the House:

Mr. BRIGGS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As long as everyone seems to be taking this manner to get into the act, I suppose I may as well also. But I would desist if you request that I do so.

I would like to make it clear that some of the opposition to this bill is actually not opposition

really because of the amendments, it is opposition because they would like to kill the bill. Now, the people in my city happen to be particularly anxious to advance their program of vocational technical education. I happen to be particularly anxious to help and encourage them to do so.

So ultimately, if it develops that there is something in this bill which the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Haskell, or the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Bither, cannot stomach or tolerate, I hope we will be able to make an amendment which will remove the Town of Houlton from the bill entirely so that we can proceed and advance the cause of vocational technical education in the remaining towns.

I certainly hope that we will be able to have the bill prevail and send it along in good order.

Mr. Bither of Houlton was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. BITHER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to correct the statement and impression that the gentleman from Caribou just made, that I and probably Mr. Haskell, too, but myself especially — want to kill this bill. There is no intention at all. I would like to tell this gentleman that this bill came out of committee with a unanimous report. I made a study of it and I am probably the culprit that started the whole thing and started the idea in his mind that I was against it, but I am not against it. There are certain things in there that I did not favor and I certainly hope that we do work this thing out and that the 11 regions involved, if it is satisfactory, we come back here Monday and we pass this bill.

I certainly don't want to kill the bill. I don't believe anyone in this House wants to kill the bill and I am sorry that the gentleman from Caribou even mentioned such a thing.

(Off Record Remarks)

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

Resolution Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Providing for Regulation of Municipal Borrowing by the Legislature (S. P. 586) (L. D. 1804)

Tabled — April 24, by Mr. Simpson of Standish.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer House Amendment "A" to L. D. 1804 found under filing number 283, move its adoption and would speak to it briefly.

House Amendment "A" (H-283) was read by the Clerk.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The matter under consideration is that of changing the Constitution to provide for regulation of municipal borrowing by the legislature rather than by the present constitutional 7½ percent debt limit.

The amendment is offered to solve a problem that we didn't realize existed in the committee regarding quasi-municipal corporations which operate in more than one municipality. It would seem to be more appropriate that that kind of quasi-municipal corporation be governed by special legislation rather than by general law.

I think probably this topic will be one of a greater debate at the enactment stage when the constitutional amendment requires a two-thirds vote for passage. But this is just an explanation of this amendment.

Thereupon, House Amendment "A" was adopted, 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:

Resolution Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Providing for Election of the Members of Executive Council (S. P. 508) (L. D. 1620)

Tabled — April 25 by Mr. Simpson of Standish.

Pending — Motion by Mr. Ross of Bath to reconsider acceptance of Committee Report, Leave to withdraw.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Since this bill may well be needed when we discuss the Executive Council and any proposed package reorganization plan and the timing of the constructive action of these subjects is not known and since today we took off of the unassigned calendar two items, I would suggest that somebody table this item unassigned.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We have another bill that is exactly like this, I understand. We have got about 20 bills that deal with the Executive Council. We have a package bill, we have 55,000 bills that we can do this with.

If we are going to amend a bill, I don't see this as a problem and I don't see why we ought to spend \$5 a day to put this unassigned on the calendar. I would be opposed to putting it unassigned.

On motion of Mr. Simpson of Standish, tabled pending the motion to reconsider the acceptance of the Committee Report and tomorrow assigned.

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

Bill "An Act to Transfer the Pesticides Control Board to the Department of Environmental Protection" (H. P. 1125) (L. D. 1460)

Tabled — April 25 by Mr. Simpson of Standish.

Pending — Motion by Mr. Curtis of Orono to accept Committee Report "A."

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

Mr. COONEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: If you will look at yesterday's calendar you have three reports from the State Government Committee on this particular bill. And I would guess that there is probably something here for everybody. There certainly is a choice.

The motion that we would be dealing with immediately would be a motion to kill the bill. But you have two other alternatives you might take and I would like to explain them to you briefly so that you can make the proper choice.

The bill is a continuation of the government reorganization effort that was started some time ago and it proposes — and that, by the way, is Report "C" of the committee — it proposes to put the area pesticides control under the direct control of the Department of Environmental Protection. In other words, there would no longer be a Pesticides Control Board as there is now and the DEP would have complete control over this area. Now, of course, Report "A", which we are voting on now, is the "ought not to pass" on that original bill.

I would like to talk about Report "B" because I think it does offer us an alternative which deals effectively with this problem. Report "B" of the committee puts the Pesticides Control Board without change under the DEP. The DEP would have no power over the board and its decisions. It could operate just as it operates now. But for the purposes of budgeting, for the purposes of charting and understanding our state government, it would be in the department in which it has the same functions.

I do have the revised statutes here before me and I'd like to clarify or improve upon that point, that the function is the same. I have Title 22 dealing with the pesticides control chapter and the purpose and policy of the Board is to assure to the public the benefits to be derived from the safe, proper and scientific use of chemical pesticides while safeguarding

the public health, safety and welfare and for the further purpose of protecting the public interest in the soils, waters, forests, wildlife, agriculture and other natural resources of the state. It goes on a little bit from there. In any case, I think that you can see that this is definitely compatible with the purposes of the DEP.

There has been reservation or opposition from especially agriculturalists that they fear the DEP and what might happen in the future, the old foot in the door kind of argument. This is the reason that the Pesticides Control Board has not been abolished, that they will operate within the DEP under Report "B" and no changes would be made in this department.

I would like to tell you who is on the Pesticides Control Board. According to the law, the Commissioner of Agriculture, the Commissioner of Health and Welfare, the Forest Commissioner, the Commissioner of Inland Fisheries and Game, the Commissioner of Sea and Shore Fisheries, Chairman of the Public Utilities Commission, the Chairman of the Highway Commission, the Chairman of Water Improvement Commission or DEP. So all of these people are on the board and it goes on to say that the board shall choose its own chairman. In the past they have chosen the Commissioner of Agriculture, Mr. Dolloff. I would guess that they would continue to do that. But they could choose anyone they choose as head of the board and they would still have complete control over the area of pesticides control.

It is my hope that perhaps we might reject the "ought not to pass" report; that we might accept Report "B", which does not change the present control of pesticides. It shouldn't, I don't think, worry agriculturalists too much but does continue in the area of government reorganization to streamline our method of organizing the Executive branch of government.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Milloocket, Mr. Crommett.

Mr. CROMMETT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the

House: I would speak for Report "C". At the risk of antagonizing and boring some of the older legislators, I do wish to speak to some of the younger legislators here of the background pertaining to this bill.

I agree that I was six or eight years ahead of the times when I proposed the banning of DDT. In the 103rd Legislature I had the support of the Natural Resources Council of Maine. At that time, when it went before the Agricultural Committee, I had three bills that day. I tried to make arrangements for time and the chairman of that committee said, "No sir, your bill will be heard on time because I have 100 farmers from Aroostook County that are going to oppose your bill." I had no objection to their opposition but I would have appreciated it if the chairman had kept that to himself. Also, when I met the good lady, the wife of my friend, Mr. Everett Evans from Freedom, she immediately said, "Oh, this is the fellow that is getting in your hair." Well now, right off quick, I thought the good lady was not very observant. That, of course, was, a figure of speech. We did not succeed in the banning of DDT.

I will back up a little bit. I made some uncomplimentary remarks over the — for the radio in Gardiner and people went to Marshall Burkes and asked him to refute what I had said. These are the words he told the people who were talking to him. He said, "I cannot for Mr. Crommett is right."

In the 104th Legislature, I presented the same bill and this bill was L. D. Number 1. Both bills were written based on the bill entered in the Congress by Gaylord Nelson. Members of the committee and various members knew that the DDT was poisonous; yet, they did not know what to do with it. The Committee on Natural Resources in the 104th Legislature passed my bill out 5 to 5 "ought to pass", but, of course, that didn't do any good. In the meantime, these people who had supported me in the previous legislature prevailed upon my seatmate, a young gentleman, Mr. Carson was his name. He had the same bill and

they used it and after we got the Pesticide Control Board.

Now, so well expressed by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Talbot, the other day when he was trying to get around the reference to the other body, I would say somewhere, somehow, someplace, somebody did something that I know nothing about but evidently that is what happened.

The farmers in Aroostook County who were opposed to this bill, 90 percent of them were not using DDT. The farmers in Aroostook County cannot pronounce the technical names, the Latin names, any more than I can and all the pesticides and poisons, included were listed as effective as DDT. So it is rather ironic that they oppose something they were not using.

The Pesticides Control Board has been explained to you very nicely by my friend, Mr. Cooney. He told you exactly how the Board functioned, was made up of; but previous to this, the only thing that I know of that the Board had done was they jumped to the conclusion that DDT was not the proper thing to control Dutch Elm disease. The biologists said the only way to control that was to cut down the disease by half.

Yet, recently, I have read that there is another pesticide, some sort of chemical that they can use. And they use all these various things, pesticides, in the spraying of Spruce Budworm. They are not using that, they are using something else that is 80 percent, 90 percent effective. But you have the Pesticides Control Board made up of department heads so overworked that they cannot give their full time to this. So they hired an executive secretary that does their work. Even so, in the rules and regulations promulgated by the Pesticides Control Board, two members can veto the actions of the board. That, you will find, is in the record.

Just recently I went to see the executive secretary of the Board, and trying to be proper and know how to pronounce his name, the lady told me it was Mares, like two female horses. I met Mr. Mares and I had a good talk with him and I was referring to the

costs before our committee. Mr. Kent from Benton, a lobbyist for the grange, said this isn't going to cost anything and they were all enthused to keep this board as it is.

Now in the 104th Legislature, the Appropriations Committee granted \$43,000-plus; in the 105th \$55,000. And you look in the budget today, they request \$60,000.

Now, I maintain that the function, not the board, but the function that we have, and I accept that, the function of the board should be placed, as this bill says, transferred to the Department of Environmental Protection.

I have reams and reams of stuff on this and I intended to put some words into effect on paper so that it would be understandable. I think probably that it would be an exercise in futility because before you leave here you will find that the forces have well organized, they are going to kill the bill if they can. But, anyhow, ladies and gentlemen, I thank you for listening.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The State Government Committee, as you can easily tell, is badly divided on this entire question. One of the proposals, the bill itself, would abolish the Pesticides Control Board. It said the functions of the Department of Environmental Protection an organization for which I have the highest regard, I think is greatly overworked at the present time.

Another bill would leave the Pesticide Control Board exactly as it is, except shift it administratively to the Department of Environmental Protection. I don't see any reason for that, that appears to be changed for change sake alone. For that reason, I continue to support my pending motion with the acceptance of Report "A".

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

Mr. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House:

There was quite a lot of ado when this board was formed, and it has been in existence for quite a little while now. I can't see but what it has done a very good job. Of course, we know it costs money; it is going to cost money if we change it to another department if you do the proper work. And I believe they have. I fail to see any need of changing this board from where it is. It will cost us money to change it, and it always costs money to change. And I fail to see any need of changing this board whatsoever.

The farmers like it where it is. It is serving both the farmers and the natural resources to the best of its ability. And I have not heard any complaints against it. I feel that it should be left just exactly where it is.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Freeport, Mrs. Clark.

Mrs. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: L. D. 1460 is my bill and I would inform the people in this House that the Pesticide Control Board isn't anywhere. It does not belong to any department within state government levels. Freshman legislators soon learn when submitting somewhat controversial legislation that compromise is the name of the game. Compromise is necessary in this particular instance, in that the objectives of state government reorganization and the needs of the agricultural community will both be fulfilled by the acceptance of the State Government Committee Report "B".

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Just to remind the fine lady from Cumberland County that when the reorganization bills came in before the last session there were a number of us that made considerable compromises. And I mean considerable compromises. I think Mr. Evans is exactly right and I hope that you support his opinion here this morning.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Farnham.

Mr. FARNHAM: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: As a signer of the majority "ought not to pass" report, I would like to urge the House to go along with us. I will be very frank. The suggestion of Mr. Cooney of Sabbathus at the present times does not involve us in any great danger. But once we get the Pesticide Board over into the DEP, Lord knows what will happen to it.

Now, this is called reorganization, and all it means is shuffling from one room to the other. It doesn't reorganize anything nor does it save the state a penny. And as an old hay shaker, I think we have got to stop and consider the plight of the farmer and they are happy to leave the board standing as it is now. I hope the House will go along with this.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wish to go along with the motion of the gentleman from Orono, Mr. Curtis, to accept report "A". I believe that this board has been doing good service where it is. I am one of those who believe in living and let live. I think this is exactly what we have been doing in the past with the administration of the board. I think that this is where we want it and I hope you go along with the motion.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Orono, Mr. Curtis, to accept Report "A", "Ought not to pass" on L. D. 1460. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken. 91 having voted in the affirmative and 27 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

Sent up for concurrence.

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

Bill "An Act Prohibiting Bringing Animals Into Food Stores" (H. P. 986) (L. D. 1306)

Tabled — April 25, by Mrs. Clark of Freeport.

Pending — Motion by Mr. Birt of East Millinocket to adhere.

Mr. Birt of East Millinocket withdrew his motion to adhere.

On motion of the same gentleman, the House voted to insist.

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

Bill "An Act to Transfer the Motor Vehicle Division of the Department of the Secretary of State to the Department of Transportation" (H. P. 687) (L. D. 894)

Tabled — April 25 by Mr. Curtis of Orono.

Pending — Acceptance of either Report.

On motion of Mr. Simpson of Standish, retabled pending acceptance of either Report and specially assigned for Monday, April 30.

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

Bill "An Act to Permit Savings Banks to Invest in Obligations of the Asian Development Bank" (H. P. 1070) (L. D. 1395)

Tabled — April 25 by Mr. Kelleher of Bangor.

Pending — Passage to be enacted.

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I was a little lost yesterday concerning this bill. And this morning I made two phone calls to be exact, to my home city, to two different banks up there and asked these gentlemen, two individuals, what their opinion was on this bill. And they really didn't have any one way or the other. They didn't care about the bill one way or another. One gentleman did express an opinion that if there was any surplus to be invested they think they would at least invest in this hemisphere and not another one. I would like to have a division on the passage of this, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I would like to speak here just briefly. I am the sponsor of this bill. It is not a savings bank bill, that is it is not being pushed especially by savings banks, although, people I have talked to in savings banks approve it. All it would do is permit savings banks, as we now permit commercial banks and insurance institutions, to invest their money where they think they can get the best return for Maine investors, and if that happens to be the Asian Development Bank, then they would have that possibility.

The bank is backed by the United States Government. This particular piece of legislation is endorsed by the U. S. Treasury, by the National Governors Conference, by the Council of State Governments, and a variety of people like myself who think that we have to have a broader view of the world.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: With regard to this bill, I don't know that I have strong feelings one way or the other. However, the bill is obviously optional and allows savings banks to invest money where they want to.

However, I am a strong believer in looking after ourselves first and the countries on the other side of the globe afterwards. I don't know as our action on this bill this morning will reflect that situation, but I feel I shall vote against the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I guess the gentleman from Bangor and the gentleman from Fairfield and myself started this issue yesterday. After hearing that the insurance companies of this state, as well as the commercial banks, have that right, I am wondering one of two things — that we amend this particular bill so

that we make sure that they don't have that power either or secondly, that we don't broaden the power. And you can take it in whatever direction you want to go. But I think and I agree with the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, that if we have excess money, let's find someone or something in Maine that we can invest it in.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I move this lie upon the table two legislative days.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, moves that this matter be tabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for Monday, April 30. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

21 having voted in the affirmative and 91 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I move this be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, moves the indefinite postponement of this Bill and all accompany papers.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore.

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Very briefly, I have had a little bit of experience with companies that have gone into foreign countries, even in South America or Panama, insurance companies and I have followed stocks of companies that have gone into foreign countries and I found it to be a very poor move in several cases. I hope that we hold our money away from going into foreign countries and keep it right here in the good old State of Maine where it belongs and I hope you will go along with the motion to indefinitely postpone.

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

Mr. MILLS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I don't pretend to know an awful lot about this bill but I do read that title very clear, "An Act to Permit Savings Banks to Invest in Obligations of the Asian Development Bank." Under that title, I will support the indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Milo, Mr. Trask.

Mr. TRASK: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I oppose the motion to indefinitely postpone this bill. I think the worst thing about it is its title but it is permissive legislation. It permits savings banks to invest money in this venture if they so desire. They are still subject to the "prudent man" rule.

In President Nixon's 1973 budget message to the United States Congress, he called for the enactment of such legislation for the United States to take its share of the banks capital and the purpose of this is to aid and stimulate economic growth in the less developed member nations. The bank generally makes loans for long range development to the governments. The bank also provides for technical assistance for development projects. Past loans have been made for projects including industrial service and mining enterprises, agriculture, fisheries, port expansion and so forth.

Savings banks have been authorized in other states including the New England states of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island. They have been authorized to invest in this bank and I oppose the motion to indefinitely postpone.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bar Harbor, Mr. MacLeod.

Mr. MACLEOD: Mr. Speaker, may I pose a question to Representative Trask? Would he give us the background on the hearing for this bill? Was there a lot of banks or local banking institutions from the State of Maine appearing at the hearing in favor of this bill?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bar Harbor, Mr. MacLeod,

poses a question through the Chair to anyone who may care to answer if he or she wishes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Milo, Mr. Trask.

Mr. TRASK: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In answer to the gentleman from Bar Harbor, there were not a lot of people appearing at this hearing. The bank department appeared in favor of it. There were no opponents.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentle lady from Auburn, Mrs. Lewis.

Mrs. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: As I understand it, it is our money that we are putting into the savings banks and I would think we would want the best return for our saving dollar that we can get. There is nothing evil about this Asian Development Bank.

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

Mr. MILLS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: According to what we have heard here, we are dealing with the life savings of the people of the State of Maine. I am certainly not in favor of seeing their life savings invested in any foreign bank.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I will try once again to bring some facts to bear on this discussion. The Asian Development Bank is backed 100 percent by the member countries and that includes the United States government. Like I said, the U.S. Treasury is behind it. Some people from Maine who are familiar with it might be interested to know that the United States representative on the board is Artemus Weatherby who is a gentleman from Bangor, Maine, and had been involved as Deputy Secretary of the Treasury before he took that position.

This is not a fly-by-night operation. It seems to me it is a worthwhile option to give our savings banks.

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I might state to my good friend from Orono that there is a lot of things that the United federal government does that I don't approve.

Mrs. Lewis made the remark about the better interest rates for the stockholders. Let me say, I always was under the assumption the greater the risk, the bigger the profits. So if there is going to be a larger profit in investing your money, there is going to be an element of greater risk.

I am somewhat disturbed to see that this is associated in associations to some degree with the World Bank of the United Nations. I know there is a number of you people in this House who know how I feel about that great institution and our association in it. I am sure if the United States is part of the World Bank of the United Nations, we are footing most of the bills and we are sending out most of the money.

I think Mr. Bragdon made a good assumption, if there is any surplus money, let's invest it in this state; if not in this state, in this country and if not in this country, at least in this hemisphere. We have had enough involvements over in Asia or wherever they want to send this money to make it permissible for these banks to send this money and I suggest that we keep it here for a change.

I am sure that the Treasurer of the United States government is for it and there is a lot of other agencies but I think this is just a nice message for us to give them this morning that we don't agree with them and I would like you to support the indefinite postponement motion of the gentleman from Lewiston and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, we have a roll call.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Kelleher, has requested a roll call.

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

Mr. NORRIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Just briefly, I suppose that the President knows what he is talking about and I think this is trying to reverse the idea of sending bombs and men to Asia to die. So I would hope that you would vote against indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has 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 those 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 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 Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that L. D. 1395 and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Albert, Berry, P. P.; Berube, Binnette, Bither, Bragdon, Brawn, Bunker, Carey, Carter, Chick, Chonko, Churchill, Clark, Conley, Connolly, Cooney, Cote, Cressey, Crommett, Curran, Davis, Drigotas, Dudley, Dunn, Dyar, Farley, Farnham, Fecteau, Finemore, Flynn, Fraser, Genest, Good, Goodwin, H.; Greenlaw, Hancock, Haskell, Henley, Herrick, Hobbins, Hoffses, Hunter, Immonen, Jacques, Jalbert, Kelleher, Keyte, Kilroy, LaCharite, LaPointe, LeBlanc, Littlefield, MacLeod, Mahany, Martin, Maxwell, McCormick, McHenry, McMahon, McNally, McTeague, Merrill, Mills, Morin, L.; Morin, V.; Mulkern, Murchison, Murray, Parks, Peterson, Ricker, Rolde, Ross, Santoro, Shaw, Sheltre, Shute, Smith, D. M.; Soulas, Sproul, Stillings, Strout, Talbot, Theriault, Trumbull, Tyndale, Walker, Webber, Wheeler, Whitzell, Willard, Wood, M. E.

NAY — Ault, Baker, Berry, G. W.; Birt, Boudreau, Bustin, Cameron, Carrier, Cottrell, Curtis,

T. S., Jr.; Dam, Deshaies, Dunleavy, Emery, D. F.; Farrington, Faucher, Ferris, Gahagan, Garsoe, Gauthier, Goodwin, K.; Hamblen, Huber, Jackson, Kelley, Kelley, R. P.; Lawry, Lewis, E.; Lewis, J.; Lynch, Maddox, McKernan, Morton, Najarian, Norris, O'Brien, Perkins, Pontbriand, Pratt, Rollins, Smith, S.; Susi, Tanguay, Tierney, Trask, White.

ABSENT — Briggs, Brown, Donaghy, Dow, Evans, Hodgdon, Knight, Palmer, Silverman, Simpson, L. E.

Yes, 93; No, 46; Absent, 10.

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

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, I move we reconsider our action whereby this bill was indefinitely postponed and I ask you to vote against my motion.

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

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

House at Ease

Called to order by the Speaker.

(Off Record Remarks)

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

Bill "An Act Relating to Lead Poisoning Control" (H. P. 474) (L. D. 621)

Tabled — April 25 by Mr. Hoffses of Camden.

Pending — Motion by Mr. Dyar of Strong to accept Majority Report "Ought to Pass"

On motion of Mrs. McCormick of Union, retabled pending the motion of Mr. Dyar of Strong to accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report and specially assigned for Monday, April 30.

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

Bill "An Act Creating Aroostook County Commissioner Districts" (H. P. 55) (L. D. 65)

Tabled — April 25, by Mr. Martin of Eagle Lake.

Pending — Passage to be enacted.

On motion of Mr. Martin of Eagle Lake, under suspension of the rules, the House reconsidered its action of March 26 whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed.

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

House Amendment "A" (H-278) was read by the Clerk.

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

House Amendment "B" to House Amendment "A" (H-286) was read by the Clerk and adopted.

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

The Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

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

Bill "An Act Relating to Dealers in Used Personal Property" (S. P. 578) (L. D. 1769)

Tabled — April 25, by Mr. Birt of East Millinocket.

Pending — Motion by Mr. Ault of Wayne to indefinitely postpone Bill and all accompanying appers.

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

Mr. HENLEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I will try to be brief. Apparently the original bill, L. D. 537 was discussed in committee and then they produced the new bill 1769. The purpose was to bring about a situation in regard to theft of personal property, including that sold to dealers, etcetera, to sort of protect people that had property stolen.

I mentioned yesterday that we had a law that just about did that

and I checked it up and there is a reproduction of that law on your desk, which is Section 456 of Title 15 — Record of Sales of Used Merchandise. Now briefly, this states, if you have not read it, "No dealer in used personal property other than coins, stamps, scrap material, motor vehicles or bulk purchases from estates shall buy any used personal property from any person without first recording in a book kept for the purpose a description of said personal property and the name and address of the seller of such property. Said record shall be made before said sale is completed and shall be open to the inspection of any law enforcement officer or prosecuting attorney. Any dealer who fails to keep such record or refuses to show the same to any law enforcement officer or prosecuting attorney shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$200. Whoever gives a false or fictitious name to said dealer shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$200 or by imprisonment for not more than 6 months. This section shall not apply to the sale of used personal property where the gross sales price is less than \$25 or to sales between dealers or to sales on consignment."

Now I talked to the author of this new bill and there seems to be no way to amend this particular bill to get in the type of surety that was wanted in this particular bill which they wanted to do to amend this same one, 456. So the best thing to do for the time being is to let this bill die and then at some other session, if they want to change the wording a bit, they can come up with another new bill.

I move that we go along with the motion to indefinitely postpone this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Milo, Mr. Trask.

Mr. TRASK: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The committee did hear Legislative Document 535, as the gentleman from Norway, Mr. Henley, says. And then we discovered there was legislation or there was a statute covering much this same thing, but then the committee

thought it would like to strengthen this law a little because this is a real problem. This used personal property that most of us would call junk is becoming valuable here in the State of Maine. We did put some additional language in the redraft, which we felt would strengthen it, and I would oppose the motion to indefinitely postpone it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gorham, Mr. Hamblen.

Mr. HAMBLÉN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Could I quote from the Bangor Daily News?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may debate his matter including quoting from a newspaper.

Mr. HAMBLÉN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is in regards to a testimony given on antiques and it comes down to a man — a wholesaler who testified that although he paid \$4,200 for the antique collection it can be worth more than \$10,000 to a retailer. He testified he did not ask for a bill of sale from the men because it was unethical in the trade. He explained that if a dealer found out the source of supply of a customer, he might bypass the customer and go right to the source. I think what it says here is really pretty plain and evidently we need a little more legislation to stop some of these breaks and entering and theft of antiques and other merchandise.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlelady from Portland, Mrs. Boudreau.

Mrs. BOUDREAU: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: One of the things that we did add to this redraft was taking the license number of the automobile and this can be a great help in tracing the people. If they don't like the bill as written, at least someone table it and see if we can't come up with something that is acceptable.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Jay, Mr. Maxwell.

Mr. MAXWELL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Within the last month and a half, 14 cottages on the pond where I have my camp have been broken into and some very very valuable antiques taken out. I hope you don't indefinitely postpone this. I think it is a tool that maybe the officers could use. Besides that, I have contacted four dealers within my vicinity, one just last evening, and he said, "Keep it alive, if possible. I am now keeping a book and putting down the license number." And I told him that this is what this would do and he is very happy about it. So I would hope that you don't indefinitely postpone.

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

Mr. AULT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Mr. Trask has said that they tried to strengthen the law. My Lord, they certainly have. As they told you yesterday, this is going to pertain to any used personal property. I also bring your attention to the last line of the bill where it says this does not apply to dealers that sell to dealers. So if you are trying to trace antiques, you are going to lose them, lose the tracing of it as soon as one dealer transfers it to another.

I would urge you to indefinitely postpone this, as Mr. Henley has said, and come up later on with something that might be more acceptable.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. O'BRIEN: Mr. Speaker, I move this be tabled for two legislative days.

Mr. Ault of Wayne requested a vote on the motion.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the

gentleman from Portland, Mr. O'Brien, that this matter be tabled pending the motion to indefinitely postpone and specially assigned for Monday, April 30. All in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

69 having voted in the affirmative and 23 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

On motion of Mr. Birt of East Millinocket,

Adjourned until nine o'clock tomorrow morning.