

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

1st Special Session

OF THE

*One Hundred and Sixth
Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1974

Kennebec Journal
Augusta, Maine

HOUSE

Friday, March 1, 1974

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

Prayer by the Rev. Douglas Robbins of Augusta.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

Papers from the Senate

From the Senate: The following Joint Order: (S. P. 918)

WHEREAS, the telecommunications services used by state departments and agencies are expanding and are of major importance and expense to the State; and

WHEREAS, the Maine Management and Cost Survey has noted the need for effective centralized management, for the development of policies and guidelines and for continued evaluation and study of the state's telecommunications activities; now, therefore, be it

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the Legislative Council investigate the establishment of a centralized organization to provide for the management and integration of the state's telecommunications activities; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Council's study consider the need for and the best method of providing for consolidation of facilities and for continued planning and evaluation of systems in order to maximize cost effectiveness and to provide for the orderly development of statewide telecommunications; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Legislative Council report its findings, together with any proposed legislation, to the next regular session of the Legislature; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Department of Finance and Administration, along with those state agencies represented on the Maine Advisory Committee on Telecommunications and such other agencies as necessary, be respectfully directed to cooperate with the Council and provide such technical and other

assistance as the Council deems necessary; and be it further

ORDERED, that upon passage of this Order, in concurrence, copies of this Order be sent forthwith to said agencies as notice of the pending study.

Came from the Senate, read and passed.

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

Report of Committee Ought to Pass in New Draft

Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Repealing Certain Laws Relating to Games of Chance" (S. P. 718) (L. D. 2130) reporting "Ought to pass" in New Draft (S. P. 911) (L. D. 2521) under same title.

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

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence and the New Draft read once. Senate Amendment "A" (S-365) was read by the Clerk and adopted in concurrence and the New Draft assigned for second reading the next legislative day.

House Reports of Committees Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Greenlaw from Committee on Marine Resources on Bill "An Act to Initiate Issuance of Nonresident Marine Sports Fishing Licenses" (H. P. 1849) (L. D. 2342) reporting "Ought not to pass"

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

Leave to Withdraw Covered by Other Legislation

Mr. Curtis from Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act Relating to Certain Bureaus in the Department of Finance and Administration" (H. P. 1865) (L. D. 2359) reporting Leave to withdraw as covered by other legislation.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Ought to Pass Printed Bills

Mr. Farnham from Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act Relating to State Purchases" (H. P. 1999) (L. D. 2539) (Pursuant to Joint Order H. P. 1966) reporting "Ought to pass"

Same gentleman from same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act to Allow a Governor-elect an Additional Four Weeks for Submission of the Budget" (H. P. 2000) (L. D. 2540) reported pursuant to Joint Order (H. P. 1966)

Reports were read and accepted, the Bills read once and assigned for second reading the next legislative day.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act to Establish a Pilot Rural Housing Rehabilitation Program" (H. P. 1814) (L. D. 2303) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-720).

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. SPEERS of Kennebec
CLIFFORD of Androscoggin
— of the Senate.

Mrs. GOODWIN of Bath
NAJARIAN of Portland

Messrs. SILVERMAN of Calais
COONEY of Sabattus
BUSTIN of Augusta
STILLINGS of Berwick
GAHAGAN of Caribou
CROMMETT of Millinocket
CURTIS of Orono

— of the House.

Minority report of the same Committee on same Bill reporting "Ought not to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. WYMAN of Washington
— of the Senate.

Mr. FARNHAM of Hampden
— of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Curtis of Orono, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted.

The Bill was read once. Committee Amendment "A" (H-720) was read by the Clerk and adopted and the Bill

assigned for second reading the next legislative day.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act Providing for the Biweekly Payment of Wages to State Employees" (H. P. 2001) (L. D. 2541) reported pursuant to Joint Order (H. P. 1966) reporting "Ought not to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. SPEERS of Kennebec
WYMAN of Washington
— of the Senate.

Messrs. STILLINGS of Berwick
GAHAGAN of Caribou
SILVERMAN of Calais
BUSTIN of Augusta

Mrs. GOODWIN of Bath
— of the House.

Minority report on same Bill reporting "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. CLIFFORD of Androscoggin
— of the Senate.

Mrs. NAJARIAN of Portland
Messrs. FARNHAM of Hampden
CROMMETT of Millinocket
COONEY of Sabattus
CURTIS of Orono

— of the House.

Reports were read.

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

Mr. FARNHAM: Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the minority report and would speak briefly to my motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Farnham, moves the acceptance of the Minority "Ought to pass" Report.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. FARNHAM: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is a bill which could save the state as much as \$300,000 a year by changing the present payroll system from the one of weekly payroll to a biweekly payroll. It could be worked in a number of ways. One half of the state employees could be paid one period and the other half another period. It has the effect of reducing the amount of time used by the

computer, thus making the computer available for other state work. And more time is needed in the computer section, so thus you could avoid purchase of very expensive machinery.

It also means that the staff that prepares payrolls in all the various departments of the state and in the outlying locations, it would cut that staff in two and also the payroll division staff within the State House in two.

Overall, it is estimated that this program could save the state at least \$300,000 a year. I therefore hope you will approve acceptance of the Minority "Ought to pass" Report.

I am sure you will be told some time or another that there are 6,000 state employees whose take-home pay is less than \$100 a week and that they couldn't exist for two weeks at a time. And I want to assure you that I think that is an insult to think that all our dedicated state employees cannot manage their lives for more than seven days at a time.

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: For the last part of Mr. Farnham's argument, I would hope that you would not support his motion. Because the very people who are earning the lesser amounts of money in the state, and I will accept his figure of 6,000 at a hundred dollars a week or a hundred and thirty or forty dollars a week in salary, to try to stretch that over a two-week period is inexcusable for this House to even consider to accept.

I would ask the House not to accept this motion for the minority report, because it certainly wouldn't be beneficial to these people. It would be an extreme hardship to try to stretch a hundred or a hundred and forty dollars a week into a two-week period.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: If I can preface this with a little background information, pages two and three of the House Calendar today include several items from the State Government Committee which perhaps you would like to have explained.

The item on page 2, which is a leave to withdraw covered by other legislation, was the initial bill which we had here a week ago and which the State Government Committee, realizing that the particular debate that we are now conducting would be somewhat controversial, asked to have it sent back. What we did was divide that original bill into three separate documents; two of them were accepted by the House this morning under the "Ought to pass" items on page 2, and now we are debating the third item which is somewhat controversial.

At the public hearing, this was frequently the case, no one from the Maine Management and Cost Survey showed up. However, their report indicates that the establishment of a biweekly payroll would provide for an annual savings of \$60,000 in data processing and \$140,000 in reduction in personnel. Testifying on behalf of the legislation was Mr. Williams, the Commissioner of the Department of Finance and Administration. He indicated that the savings, in his opinion, would be somewhat closer to \$38,000, and he said he would need three additional employees, which would be a cost of \$18,000, for a net savings of \$20,000, so I am not quite sure what the savings would be.

Most everybody seems to agree that there would certainly be some savings, so now we are down to the policy issue of whether or not the people who work for the state and are paid by the state should be paid on a weekly or biweekly basis. I have heard from a few of them that they would prefer to have a weekly, the present system, and I have also heard from some that they don't really care, that they are now in the process of using credit cards and in the process of having their pay check deposited directly into the banks so that it really doesn't make too much difference to them whether they get paid on a weekly or biweekly basis.

We were also told in the public hearing, and I thought this was very interesting, that Maine is the only state in the country which has a weekly payroll, that the federal government and all other states have a biweekly payroll.

If anybody had any information to the contrary to that, why it was not presented at the public hearing, and I certainly would be interested in it. But at any rate, it sounds like we are about the last place to go to a biweekly payroll and this would be a substantial cost savings. And I would agree with the gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Farnham, that our employees certainly are able to budget their expenditures to the point where they would be able to handle this biweekly payroll.

Thereupon, the Minority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted, the Bill read once and assigned for second reading tomorrow.

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am somewhat confused. Wasn't there a division asked on that?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would answer in the negative.

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that we reconsider our action, because I certainly got up and spoke against the bill. I move that the House reconsider our action where this bill was passed for its second reader, if that's the correct motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Kelleher, moves the House reconsider its action whereby this matter had its first reading.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose that motion. I am sure that I don't want to cut the gentleman off from any further debate, but we are here in the House on a Friday, and it is important that we stay here and debate the issues as they come up. Those of us who are on the proponent side presented our opinions, and we certainly would be happy to welcome anybody else's opinion, but we should not keep going back and forth and reconsidering.

There will be further consideration of this document in this body next week. I think that is the proper time to debate it again if the people want to bring forth more facts.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes

the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Kelleher.

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, out of due respect for my colleague from Orono, I certainly would stand up and give him the opportunity for reconsideration had he taken the same position that I had.

I certainly would hope this House would do so, and then we could do what we should be doing with this bill in the order that should have been taken.

Thereupon, Mr. Farnham of Hampden requested a vote on reconsideration.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Farnham, that the House reconsider its action whereby this bill was given its first reading. All in favor of reconsideration will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

68 having voted in the affirmative and 27 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

The SPEAKER: The pending question now is on reconsideration whereby the Minority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted.

The SPEAKER: The pending question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Kelleher, that the House reconsider its action whereby it accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report. All in favor of reconsideration will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

60 having voted in the affirmative and 34 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

The SPEAKER: The pending question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Farnham, that the House accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

Thereupon, Mr. Palmer of Nobleboro requested a roll call vote.

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

present having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I suppose this applies to legislators as well as all state employees.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nobleboro, Mr. Palmer.

Mr. PALMER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I feel this is one good Longley recommendation. It would save this state about \$300,000, and I think we should consider it in that light.

This is certainly not a new proposal. It is done in practically every state in the United States and most businesses. I find it difficult to believe that our state employees can't manage their own affairs well enough to plan their financial affairs two weeks in advance, and I am sure if they can't, we will find some way in the legislature to plan their lives for two weeks sometime, either now or later.

I certainly hope that we can go ahead and pass this proposal.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would pose a question to the gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Farnham. Yesterday, while we were discussing this particular legislation off the floor, he indicated something about private employers having to pay weekly. I wonder if he would discuss that for us.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Farnham, who may answer if he wishes.

The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. FARNHAM: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It is true that the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin and I did discuss this. Mr. Martin spoke very much in favor of the bill, and I am rather surprised. All other employees in the state, except those who are exempt from the wage hour law, such as professional, administrative,

executive and outside salesmen are paid weekly. The others are generally paid monthly.

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

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have very mixed emotions on this. I think there are many of our state employees who could well get along two weeks and budget their accounts. But I think perhaps there should be a little bit more debate and discussion, or at least some time to contact some of these state employees that might have difficulty. Or perhaps the bill should be divided so that you have certain classifications that are paid weekly and others that are paid biweekly. I certainly want to save the state money, but on the other hand, I think some of our state employees should be given priority consideration.

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

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The gentleman from Nobleboro, Mr. Palmer, has mentioned that it was in the Longley Report and it would save the state some money. Probably we should go along with it. But yesterday I debated the bill here on the gasoline tax that would have saved the state some money and it wouldn't have been a hardship to anyone, but they went against it. Therefore, I am going to go against this motion to accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report.

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

Mr. MILLS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Several sessions back we went through this same maneuvering that it go on a two-week basis. The hardship that was created through the various departments necessitated the change back to the weekly plan.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think some of us are looking forward to a pay increase bill, which we hope will be forthcoming from the appropriate committee at the

appropriate time. We are hoping to be able to vote for that and maybe even make it retroactive so we can pay our state employees a decent wage.

The bill that we have before us right now is not going to cost the state employee a single penny. It is going to save the state some money and may be the sort of thing that if we do we will be able to provide for an increase in pay or retroactive pay increase for our own state employees. If we are able to vote this kind of cost saving now, we will have more money to distribute in pay increases.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Berwick, Mr. Goodwin.

Mr. GOODWIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would just like to pose a question to the gentleman from Orono, Mr. Curtis. I have heard a lot that this is going to save the state money, \$300,000, et cetera, I would like to have somebody explain how it is going to save money.

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

Mr. FARNHAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to suggest to the gentleman from South Berwick, Mr. Goodwin, look at page 33 in the Maine Management and Cost Survey Report, and the savings are spelled out in detail.

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

Mr. BUSTIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The gentleman from South Berwick can look at page 33 if he likes. However, he should be aware that there is by no means a unanimous agreement that those figures are correct. In fact, in committee hearings, when we were talking in terms of \$200,000 — Mr. Palmer from Nobleboro just threw it up there another \$100,000 without any trouble at all — the Commissioner of Finance and Administration initially said that there might be a savings of \$12,000.

A matter of savings has also come into play here on the argument of the gentleman from Orono, Mr. Curtis, who said that if we pass biweekly pay, we are

going to be able to pay the pay increase retroactive. Now, that is almost a pretty good deal, because I am the sponsor of the retroactive pay increase, and if he has any authority whatsoever, he may be able to influence my vote if he has any authority to make that kind of a bargain at all. But I am having trouble even getting somebody to talk about that bill in the Appropriations Committee, so I don't know how he can say that if this bill passes there is going to be money to distribute for retroactive pay increase.

There is a significant factor here that you all should consider, and that is that 70 percent of the state employees make around the vicinity of \$100 a week, gross, take home pay that is less than a hundred dollars a week. Mr. Palmer obviously doesn't feel there is any problem with people having to budget that amount of money over a two-week period. Those of us who had to do that kind of thing in the past can certainly say there is a real problem when you get to the Wednesday of the second week. You have a real problem sometimes making ends meet.

As Mr. Farnham reluctantly admitted to you, all the major industries in this state pay weekly. We pay weekly now in state employment. The Cost Management Survey team comes in, makes a sweeping recommendation without any problems and says, "Go ahead and pay biweekly." Well in State Government Committee a number of us said, "If we really want to save some money, why don't we just pay monthly? If we really want to get into the spirit of true cost savings, why don't we make one annual payment on the basis of merit for the previous year's work?"

You can push this kind of argument to an absurd extreme. The fact of the matter is — I see the majority leader thinks that is a pretty good idea — the fact of the matter is, we now pay weekly, and there is no compelling reason to change that system. There is extreme difference of opinion on how much money this would cost, and it is a tremendous impact on the lives of at least 70 percent of the state work force.

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am sure all of the state employees are vitally interested in getting as much pay increase as they can. And I think if they were to go to a biweekly payroll, the State Treasurer would have an opportunity to invest almost overnight the delay in the first week of the two-weeks' pay. And I think in the course of a year you really have about 26 weeks' payroll money to invest, and I am sure the savings could be passed on to the employees in an increase that would not cost the state any extra money.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Chelsea, Mr. Shaw.

Mr. SHAW: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I can remember back a few years ago when they did have a biweekly payroll in the State of Maine. They had a study and they decided it would be better for the people in the State of Maine to pay weekly. The legislature was paid biweekly up until a couple of years ago, then we got on the computer and they switched us to a weekly payroll too.

I have heard this won't cost the employees anything. They asked the State Treasurer how much he would realize on this involuntary loan by state employees, and his estimate was in the neighborhood of \$49,000. I think this is probably the most money we are going to get out of this. I don't believe we will really save any money. We won't fire one single person. We will just pile other reports onto the computer to get something that we don't need, and I think we are swiping \$50,000 from state employees.

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

Mr. McNALLY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am concerned about this thing because all your lower paid employees of the state I know from down in Hancock County at least, going along with those employed in the Highway, are all people with a large family. To say they could save half that money for the following week, such things are not so. Human nature isn't like that, and they wouldn't save enough for the second week. I can see many times people with families, when there is

a sickness that happens, and now adays when you go into a hospital, if you don't have insurance or anything, you have got to have the cash or you aren't going to get treated. No doctor, now, except in very rare cases, comes to the house. This pay as you go system is being maintained almost everywhere now.

You go to the supermarkets, you have no more charge accounts. It is only the little small grocer in the little small towns that ever have any kind of a charge account. If some of these families have company come in and they need extra food or anything, and they have got to wait for the second week pay, it is going to be a hardship to them. I cannot see it. I think it is an awful poor way for any management survey to save money by taking it out of the poor fellow.

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

Mr. TALBOT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I guess I find somewhere along here that it might be a good idea. When the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Bustin, pointed to the fact that 70 percent of these people are earning approximately a hundred dollars a week gross, I think it would tend to bring a hardship to all of those people, especially during this period of time when we now have to pay generally, in a majority, have to pay cash for oil. I think this would be a hardship when somebody has to budget not only their food money but their oil money. And when somebody comes around to Wednesday, as Mr. Bustin has pointed out, comes around to Wednesday of that second week and their oil is low, I think that can create a very difficult hardship.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against the measure.

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

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to correct one statement that has been made a couple of times. And the previous speaker has picked it up from a speaker who had made the statement before him.

At the present time, and I just got this information from the State Employees

Association, 74 per cent of the state employees are in Range 11 or below, which would mean that they would have a gross income of \$135 or less, and in some cases a net income of \$100 or less. The inference has been that they are receiving a gross income of less than \$100. And if this were true, they would be in many cases down to or below almost the minimum wage level. My understanding is, and I know it is accurate, that 74 percent are at or below Range 11, which is \$135 per week.

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

Mr. DAM: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In reference to the statement made by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Talbot, I believe that last week in the paper it was spelled out quite clearly what the terms of getting oil was as far as credit regulations went. I think I read it correctly, and if not, I am sure that someone will correct me, that the oil dealers can not change their credit terms, that they must use the same credit terms they used in 1972. So if you paid your bill monthly in 1972 you would still pay it monthly now. And if you paid it at the end of the heating season you can still pay it that way now. As far as not having money to get oil, and again basing it on my own community, I am sure the people would have no problem, because all they do is call up the fuel allocation office, and they call up the Health and Welfare; and Health and Welfare calls the town and says to deliver 100 gallons of oil at 11 o'clock at night. They pay \$10 more for the delivery charge, but the state pays that, so the people have no problem with oil.

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

Mr. BINNETTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise here this morning with mixed feelings in regards to that bill.

After hearing my colleague here from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt, state there are over 70 percent of the people who are working for the state who are living on a very small, low income, I think it is a shame to try to take away the pay from them, due to the fact if they get paid once

every other week, they are going to have a hard time to get groceries. I know the cost of living has gone up such a scale it is almost impossible to keep up with it. Your wages have not come up with it. Therefore, I feel that we should not take it out on the little fellow.

If they had a division in that bill that would separate people who are getting a good income, I know, I am sure there are a lot of people working for the state who are getting really a good income, they could stand it, but the little fellow can't do it.

Now, as far as Mr. Farnham is concerned in regard to this cost saving, I believe a great deal in that cost saving. But if you are going to believe in cost savings and try to take it out of the little fellow, that is not right. Let's follow the cost savings, and out of here is where it can be handled.

I therefore believe that we should not take it away from the little fellow, and therefore, I am going to support the motion to not take it away from him.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from China, Mr. Farrington.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I don't think there is any question in anybody's mind about the possibility of saving. However, even though the concept is right, why couldn't the administration or why couldn't this House demand that we stagger the payments within one week? That saving, as far as administrative costs, computer costs, and so forth, would take care of this problem.

I would not go along with paying every two weeks and having the employee suffer, especially at the pay scale that he is at now.

As far as administrative savings go, I don't see any reason in the world why they couldn't pay on Wednesday morning, and on Friday for the other group. This would give the same savings as it would if they paid every two weeks.

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

Mrs. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think we are being very insulting to our state employees to insinuate that they couldn't use their money wisely enough

to have their paycheck spread over two weeks. This is not going to take one penny away from them. And I really think that they have good judgment, and that they would know how to use their money wisely. And we should not be so insulting.

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

MR. CARRIER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think it is about time that we realize this morning that we are on a subject which will affect the lives of individuals within this state. And I truly believe that going on a biweekly payment is not in their best interests. I say this fully realizing the administrative costs that can be promoted or that are said to be a savings to the state, and I realize that this is probably true. But on the other hand, I think of this subject as one that the people who are making more wages, that they have to meet their obligations. It is very natural and very easy to get involved into credit cards, to buy on credit, to get mortgages at a high rate of interest, and to commit yourself way over the payments that you can meet. And I don't insinuate to say that that is what the people, the state employees are doing, because I think all of us are subject to the same temptations of overburdening ourselves with payments.

But the main thing that I want to use as an example this morning, for those of you that don't know, is the fact that the banking system is now using a new approach. If you have a house mortgage, and we will say that it is due the first of the month or the fifth of the month, you have ten days to pay it. And if you don't pay within that ten days, they charge you five per cent of the monthly payment. On today's market there are many people in this House I assume, and especially outside, all of us of lower income who pay \$100 or \$150 a month mortgage. And that means for those people an extra five, six, or seven dollar penalty every month. Because, comes the first of the month, if they need their check to buy food with, they will let the mortgage go. And by the time they get it on the fifteenth of the month, then they

will be overdue and charged a five per cent penalty.

Now, this is what I am concerned about. I don't think that I am directly affected by this line of penalties — it is called penalties or charges or something — and I don't say this to downgrade the banks, but I am just saying this, that this is a fact when you borrow money today under all conditions.

I think that these people need their money; they need it every week. They need it to buy their food. They need it to maintain their credit. And today anybody with a family I am sure needs credit. So I think that we should get out of this punky focus of trying to save \$300,000 to the state.

A week ago here, we had an order here to eliminate half of a commission which we don't need, and it is as phony as it could ever be. If we had gotten rid of that we would have saved \$125,000. But I don't think we should do it at the expense of the people in this case. I think that they work today, and they should get paid at the end of the week when this is the agreement. I don't think they should have to wait for a month or two months or two weeks.

I believe that the difference between salaried employees and people that are paid by the week is the fact that salaried employees, out of their gross pay, I believe that the fringe benefits such as the insurance and everything else, and I might not be right, but I know outside businesses have a way for their salaried employees, their Blue Cross and their medical expenses and all that, that is paid by the company. So they have more out of their check, the person that has to pay all this medical payments, let's say, to maintain their Blue Cross and other insurances.

So I, therefore, don't believe that this is in the best interest of the people. And I think that if we want to save \$300,000 there are other ways. And if you want some good suggestions, catch me on the right here and I will tell you so.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Solon, Mr. Faucher.

MR. FAUCHER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I happen to be the sponsor of this bill. I was asked to sponsor the bill, but I am not going to

twist any arms. Today I want you to vote your feelings. I am going to vote for the bill, because I asked most of the state employees in my district how they felt about this, and they didn't mind. But I am not going to twist any arms. I am going to let you vote the way you feel.

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

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would thank Mr. Birt for bringing in accurate figures. This 74 percent indicates that this is a problem for many of our state employees. We are not talking about the gross of \$134 a week, we are talking about the take-home pay, which is close to \$100 a week. And if you happen to have an automobile accident or sickness or some emergency like this, you are not going to have much left for — that you have to take care of — you are not going to have much left for food. Because if any of you have gone to the grocers lately, \$50 won't bring out many paper bags from the take-out counter. I just hope that you will go along with helping these people rather than worrying about the float the state will have as a result of having half of the biweekly payroll to use for another week. This may be good cost management; it may be good business, but I don't think that we should be using our state employees' money in business.

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

Mr. SOULAS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have heard it stated here that there is 60 percent, or 70 percent, or whatever it is, in regards to the employees take-home pay.

I had one of the gentlemen go out and make me some figures, and he brought me back this figure. There is at present 6,490 employees that take home less than \$100 a week. So actually, what you are doing is you are really in a sense going to take away their purchasing power if you do put these people in a position where they have to charge items. If you have to charge something then you lose the privilege of shopping around. Because the money has got to be there. So I think it is possible, it is true, that the state

probably will save money, but at the expense of the employees who are going to have to pay for it.

And I always remember when I was rather young one phrase my father always said to me. And he said, "The money on the wood always made the food taste good."

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

Mr. MILLS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It has been cited here this morning on what could be done with this money that was withheld from the working people of the state. Now, I have a question for anybody who would care to answer it and it is this. If this state money is invested in a New York banking house and a large amount of interest is created by using the money that belongs rightfully to the working persons of the state, does the interest that comes back from that investment go into the pay envelope of the worker?

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Farnham, that the House accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report on Bill An Act Providing for the Biweekly Payment of Wages to State Employees," House Paper 2001, L.D. 2541. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Baker, Bither, Chick, Crommett, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Dam, Farley, Farnham, Faucher, Hoffses, Huber, Jackson, Lawry, Lewis, E.; Lewis, J.; Lynch, Maddox, McKernan, Morin, V.; Morton, Najarian, Palmer, Perkins, Pratt, Rollins, Smith, D. M.; Snowe, Wheeler, White, Willard, The Speaker.

NAY — Albert, Ault, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Berube, Binnette, Birt, Boudreau, Bragdon, Brawn, Briggs, Brown, Bustin, Cameron, Carrier, Carter, Chonko, Churchill, Clark, Connolly, Cooney, Cote, Cottrell, Cressey, Curran, Davis, Deshaies, Donaghy, Dow, Drigotas, Dudley, Dunleavy, Dunn, Dyar, Emery, D. F.; Evans, Farrington, Finemore, Flynn, Fraser, Garsoe, Gauthier, Genest, Good, Goodwin, H.; Goodwin, K.; Greenlaw, Hamblen, Hancock, Herrick, Hobbs, Hunter, Immonen, Jacques, Kauffman,

Kelleher, Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Kilroy, Knight, LeBlanc, Littlefield, MacLeod, Mahany, Martin, Maxwell, McCormick, McHenry, McMahon, McNally, McTeague, Merrill, Mills, Morin, L.; Mulkern, Murchison, Murray, Parks, Peterson, Ricker, Rolde, Ross, Shaw, Shute, Silverman, Simpson, L. E.; Soulas, Sproul, Stillings, Susi, Talbot, Tanguy, Theriault, Tierney, Trask, Twitchell, Walker, Whitzell, Wood, M. E.

ABSENT — Bunker, Carey, Conley, Fecteau, Ferris, Gahagan, Jalbert, Kelley, LaCharite, LaPointe, Norris, O'Brien, Pontbriand, Santoro, Sheltra, Smith, S.; Strout, Trumbull, Tyndale, Webber.

Yes, 31; No, 99; Absent, 20.

The SPEAKER: Thirty-one having voted in the affirmative and ninety-nine in the negative, with twenty being absent, the motion does not prevail.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Kelleher of Bangor, the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Consent Calendar

Second Day

(S. P. 856) (L. D. 2425) Bill "An Act Amending the Responsibility of the State Planning Office" (C. "A" S-362)

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

Second Reader

Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act Relating to School Buses" (S. P. 722) (L. D. 2134) (C. "A" S-349) (S. "B" S-366)

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

(On motion of Mr. Simpson of Standish, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Tuesday, March 5.)

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act to Transfer the Chief Medical Examiner to the Department of the Attorney General" (S. P. 917) (L. D. 2529)

Was 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 Relating to Dams and Reservoirs" (S. P. 916) (L. D. 2527)

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

(On motion of Mr. Simpson of Standish, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Tuesday, March 5.)

Bill "An Act to Collect the Tax on Insurance Premiums Quarterly" (H. P. 1873) (L. D. 2372) (C. "A" H-715)

Bill "An Act Relating to Fees Charged by the Department of Public Safety" (H. P. 1989) (L. D. 2533)

Bill "An Act Amending the Insurance Laws" (H. P. 1990) (L. D. 2534)

Bill "An Act Relating to Standards for Selection of State Auditor and Duties of the Office" (H. P. 1996) (L. D. 2538)

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 Increase the Cigarette Tax and Provide Funds for Catastrophic Medical Expense" (H. P. 1991) (L. D. 2535)

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 Tuesday, March 5.)

Finally Passed

Constitutional Amendment

Resolution Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Clarify Validity of Municipal Industrial Parks (S. P. 884) (L. D. 2472)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being a Constitutional Amendment and a two-thirds vote of the House being necessary, a total was taken.

Thereupon, Mr. Simpson of Standish requested a roll call vote.

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 present having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

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

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question through the Chair. I thought a constitutional amendment only took a two-thirds vote of those voting.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would answer in the affirmative.

The pending question is final passage. This being a Constitutional Amendment, a two thirds vote of the entire elected membership of the House is necessary. All those in favor of this Resolution being finally passed will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Albert, Ault, Baker, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Berube, Binnette, Birt, Bither, Boudreau, Bragdon, Brawn, Briggs, Brown, Bunker, Bustin, Cameron, Carey, Carter, Chick, Chonko, Churchill, Clark, Connolly, Cote, Cottrell, Cressey, Crommett, Curran, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Dam, Davis, Deshaies, Dow, Drigotas, Dudley, Dunleavy, Dyar, Emery, D. F.; Farnham, Farrington, Faucher, Fecteau, Ferris, Finemore, Flynn, Fraser, Garsoe, Gauthier, Genest, Good, Goodwin, H.; Goodwin, K.; Greenlaw, Hamblen, Hancock, Herrick, Huber, Hunter, Jackson, Jacques, Kauffman, Kelleher, Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Kilroy, Knight, Lawry, LeBlanc, Lewis, E.; Lewis, J.; Littlefield, Lynch, MacLeod, Maddox, Mahany, Martin, Maxwell, McCormick, McHenry, McKernan, McMahon, McNally, McTeague, Merrill, Mills, Morin, L.; Morin, V.; Morton, Mulkern, Murchison, Murray, Palmer, Parks, Perkins, Pontbriand, Ricker, Rolde, Rollins, Shaw, Shute, Silverman, Simpson, L. E.; Snowe, Soulas, Sproul, Stillings, Susi, Talbot, Tanguay, Theriault, Tierney, Twitchell, Walker, Wheeler, Whitzell, Willard, Wood, M. E.; The Speaker.

NAY — Donaghy, Dunn.

ABSENT — Carrier, Conley, Cooney, Evans, Farley, Gahagan, Hobbins, Hoffses, Immonen, Jalbert, Kelley, LaCharite, LaPointe, Najarian, Norris, O'Brien, Peterson, Pratt, Ross, Santoro, Sheltra, Smith, D. M.; Smith, S.; Strout, Trask, Trumbull, Tyndale, Webber, White.

Yes, 119; No, 2; Absent, 29.

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

Thereupon, the Resolution was finally passed, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Emergency Measure

Resolve Authorizing the Town of Bingham to Remove Sand Bars at Confluence of Austin Stream and Kennebec River. (S. P. 720) (L. D. 2132) (C. "A" S-337)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Briggs.

Mr. BRIGGS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise this morning with a great deal of concern. I thought it might be fairly easy, just fire off a blast of .00 buck from my 12-gauge shotgun and get it over with as easily as that, but I find it is a little bit more difficult than that. However, I am really on the horns of a dilemma.

I have discussed this important matter with the gentleman from Solon, Mr. Faucher, and I find him to be the finest kind of a gentleman to talk with. On the other hand, as they say, or however or but, all of these things that send everyone racing for the clearing after they get the tent taken down, it is necessary for me to point out that a number of years ago the bulldozing of rivers and streams in this state were placed under the jurisdiction of the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife. This was thought to be the most responsible agency to deal with those laws.

The Department of Fisheries and Wildlife was not able, after hearing, to

satisfy the requirements of the Town of Bingham, so they have requested that they be able to bulldoze their channel more extensively than has been requested.

I have two substantial problems with this from my personal point of view. The first is that I don't believe in bulldozing rivers and streams in this state, and I do not support it. I think there are other measures which would be more effective. I must point out, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen, that it is necessary for man to do his utmost to live in harmony with nature, and in not doing so, he is going to find this kind of circumstance or similar problematical things arising all the time over the years, and this, of course, has not been done in the case of the Austin Stream. This doesn't make their problem any the less serious, however.

My second cause of concern is that it is not constitutional under the Equal Protection Clause of the Constitution of the United States and also under the Constitution of our State of Maine to make a special law or resolve which circumvents the general law. In other words, which is merely an end run around a law that we already have allowing one municipality or one person or one company or one something or other to exempt this law merely by that fact. Therefore, I felt it was necessary from my point of view for me personally to take this time that I have taken to speak on this subject.

I feel that it is an obligation on my part because of the study and the concern that I have had for it for me to request the indefinite postponement of this resolve. However, I am going to follow that by saying that I do not solicit your support, so I hope you will vote however your conscience seems to indicate that you should.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Briggs to indefinitely postpone this matter.

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

Mr. SOULAS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Today I must take issue with my very good friend, the gentleman from Caribou, Mr.

Briggs. As chairman of the Public Utilities Committee who heard and acted on this bill, I address you in their behalf.

In L. D. 2132 we are talking about life and property in the Town of Bingham, people who pay taxes to that town. To give you some history and background on this, Austin Stream and this is a stream of some 12 miles in length and falls over 700 feet in that 12 miles. So over the years this created a natural gorge coming down into Bingham in a flat land area, which is Bingham and Moscow, which, as you know, lie at the foot of a 120-foot high Wyman dam and a lake that is 18 miles long in back of it. So water has always been a problem at Bingham, and Austin Stream hasn't helped it any over the years. Through the years Bingham has appropriated money to dredge or stabilize the stream bed, if you will, of Austin Stream to prevent it from overflowing. They have done this by the means of using old ox carts in the old days at low water time and scooping out the stream bed and building high banks on either side, and constructing what they call bunters, that is, a crib work of logs and putting big stones in there to prevent flooding when the ice comes down the stream in the springtime. This has been a necessity and they have done this over the years.

In 1954 the Town appropriated \$10,000 at its town meeting to do what they hoped would be a permanent job. Well, this \$10,000 lasted for 20 years, or until the 1970 Legislature passed the law which prevented bulldozing in streams, and gave the enforcement of this law to the Inland Fish and Game Department. Consequently, since 1970 Bingham has been prevented from stabilizing the stream bed and preventing flooding.

Now, since that time, the flooding has been so serious that the people have taken chisels and tried to break through, in their own homes, in their cellars to drain the water. Because this stream drains 91 miles and it is important that they try to keep the stream from flooding over, especially in the winter time.

What happens, and what has happened since 1970 when the town was prevented from doing any work in this stream, is that the stream has built up

obstructions, and what happens at this time of year is that the water and ice cakes adhere to the sand at the bottom of the stream bed and build up, so that when spring comes this anchor ice holds and builds the rest of the ice in back of it and the water, trying to find some way to get around this obstruction, creeps over the surrounding area, and just last December, without any ice in this stream, they suffered again some severe flooding of the low lands. For instance, it wiped out a whole area where the water system goes across the stream near Austin Stream, and they have already had to appropriate money in a special meeting to fill in this area with gravel and restore the banks.

Now, since 1970 the officials of Bingham have been in conversation with Mr. Marsh and his people at the Inland Fish and Game Department, and they have asked them for permission to dredge this stream to prevent further flooding. Last summer they were granted permission for 100 feet, no more, in the area.

So actually what we are doing in this bill, we are amending the bill and trying to get a longer distance and for a regulated time.

Now, in regards to the opinion offered by the Attorney General. I have seen the opinion, and I am unconvinced by his opinion that this bill, L. D. 2132, is not needed by the Town of Bingham. His explanation of the law as it relates to the Bingham situation bears no resemblance. In his opinion, for instance, was cited a situation in a court case law where the Town of Scarborough passed an ordinance prohibiting someone other than the citizens of the Town of Scarborough and inkeepers and hotel owners from digging clams in that town.

Now, I can't see the correlation at all. And in my conversation we are actually in a sense also talking an emergency. And if I recall, if any emergency does exist, to my knowledge it supersedes any law.

Now, the Town of Bingham isn't trying to bulldoze the State of Maine into changing a law or circumventing a law. They are just seeking protection for the taxpayers in the community so they can stop this flooding.

Just as recently as February 5th, the State Civil Defense Director; the Corps of Engineers. United States Army; U.S. Soil and Water Conservation people; the Maine Soil and Water Conservation; the Somerset County Soil and Water Conservation Service; Maine Department of Transportation, who is concerned about the condition of the bridge over 201 that crosses Austin Stream; people from the Scott Paper Company who own the land; the Kennebec Valley Conservation Association; the Maine Fish and Game Department, with several representatives from the biologists division and from the warden division; the Bingham and Moscow Chamber of Commerce; the planning board; the selectmen; and representatives from the news media all agreed at this meeting that they would try to do something to help Bingham. They have gone as far as to get the federal government with federal people to appropriate approximately \$43,000 which would help them in planning a long-range planning for the solution.

Maybe it looks like this bill calls for an exception to the bulldozing law, but we do say that Bingham is an exception in this case; and these people have come to us, to this legislature, asking for this exception. All we are asking is to extend the footage for a three-year period, which was all agreed by all the people I spoke of earlier. So I do hope you will vote against the indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Briggs.

Mr. BRIGGS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I take very little exception with anything that has just been said by the previous gentleman, the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Soulas. I do feel, however, that the action is unconstitutional and when I took oath in this office that I hold, as I stand here before you I swore to uphold the Constitution of the United States and of this state and that is the reason or a good part of the reason for the purpose of my rising.

I would like to say again I do not solicit your support, and I would like you to

vote in whatever way you feel is in the best interest of the citizens and of good legislation for the state. I withdraw my request for a roll call, Mr. Speaker, in order that this can move along.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Briggs, withdraws his request for a roll call.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Dyar.

Mr. DYAR: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have deep respect for the convictions of the gentleman from Caribou, but I hope this morning you will vote against his motion to indefinitely postpone this bill.

He has mentioned the Equal Protection Clause of the United States Constitution in this matter. It would seem to me if we don't allow the passage of this bill that we are violating the same concept, that we are not giving the people of Bingham protection of the Equal Protection Clause of the Constitution.

Even this morning the Director of Civil Defense has requested that a Coast Guard cutter come up the Kennebec River to Hallowell to break up the ice. I am quite sure on this matter alone that the people of Bingham do not have that same equal protection. Because that Coast Guard cutter can not go up into Bingham and go into Austin Stream and cut that ice out to prevent the problems caused at flood time.

So I certainly hope this morning that you will vote against the motion of the gentleman from Caribou, and pass this resolve so that the people in the town of Bingham can be protected from so-called Mother Nature's ravish down Austin Stream.

Thereupon, Mr. Briggs of Caribou, withdrew his motion to indefinitely postpone.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on final passage of Resolve Authorizing the Town of Bingham to Remove Sand Bars at Confluence of Austin Stream and Kennebec River, Senate Paper 720, L. D. 2132. This being an emergency measure, it requires a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House. All in favor of this Resolve being finally passed will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

109 having voted in the affirmative and 11 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

Thereupon, the Resolve was finally passed, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Order Out of Order

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

ORDERED, that John Conley, Donna Gagne, Frances Denticco and Janice Frechette of Biddeford be appointed Honorary Pages for today.

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

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act to Provide Financial Assistance to Nonprofit Nursing Homes (H. P. 1766) (L. D. 2234) (C. "A" H-701)

An Act Relating to Fees Administered by the Department of Environmental Protection (H. P. 1862) (L. D. 2356) (C. "A" H-697)

An Act to Regulate Procedures for Obtaining Short-term Permits for Motor Trucks (H. P. 1970) (L. D. 2510) (S. "A" S-364)

An Act Establishing a State Register of Critical Areas (H. P. 1977) (L. D. 2518)

Finally Passed

Resolve to Reimburse A. D. Soucy Co. of Fort Kent for Redemption of Cigarette Stamps (H. P. 1922) (L. D. 2460)

Resolve to Reimburse Reid's Confectionery Company of Houlton for Redemption of Cigarette Stamps (H. P. 1923) (L. D. 2461)

Resolve Designating a Certain Man-made Lake in Berwick as "Lake Hatfield" (H. P. 1924) (L. D. 2457)

Resolve Reimbursing the Town of Wade for Welfare Expenditures in Behalf of a Nonsettled State Case (H. P. 1932) (L. D. 2465)

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

Order Out of Order

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

ORDERED, the Senate concurring,

that the Joint Standing Committee on Transportation be directed to report out a bill authorizing hitchhiking for the duration of the emergency crisis. (H. P. 2002)

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

Orders of the Day

The Chair laid before the House the first item of Unfinished Business:

Bill "An Act Relating to Citizenship and Residency Requirements for Employment in the State's Classified Service" (S. P. 909) (L. D. 2516)

Tabled—February 27, by Mr. Simpson of Standish.

Pending—Passage to be enacted.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, it was discovered after this bill proceeded along in its orderly fashion that we had a little oversight with it and it needs an amendment. Specifically what the purpose of the amendment would be, it would be to provide that the standards as established by the Personnel Office, examinations would be subject to the approval of the State Personnel Board. That is the present law. And like I say, we changed it and I think that was by some mistake on the part of the Committee. So for that purpose, I would like to ask your indulgence this morning and move that the rules be suspended for the purpose of reconsidering the action by which this L.D. was passed to be engrossed.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Curtis of Orono, under suspension of the rules, the House reconsidered its action whereby this Bill was passed to be engrossed.

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

House Amendment "A" (H-718) was read by the Clerk and 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 first tabled and today assigned matter:

Bill "An Act Relating to Price Information on Prescription Drugs and

Permitting Advertising of Prescription Drug Prices" (H. P. 1964) (L. D. 2503)

Tabled—February 27, by Mr. Kelleher of Bangor

Pending—Motion of Mr. Lewis of Bristol that the House recede and concur with the Senate

The House passed the Bill to be engrossed. The Senate accepted the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report (H. P. 1793) (L. D. 2271)

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Calais, Mr. Silverman.

Mr. SILVERMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Whereas both sides are starting to come to an agreement on this bill, and there is an amendment that is supposed to be put on it but we don't have it on our desks yet, I would ask that it be tabled for two legislative days.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Simpson of Standish, retabled pending the motion of Mr. Lewis of Bristol to recede and concur and specially assigned for Tuesday, March 5.

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

Jont Order (H. P. 1997) Relative to Legislative Printing Expenses

Tabled—February 28, by Mr. Simpson of Standish

Pending—Passage

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

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

Bill "An Act to Correct an Error in the Effective Date of the Law Exempting "Trade-in" Property from the Stock in Trade Tax" (H. P. 1718) (L. D. 2111) Emergency

Tabled — February 28, by Mr. Simpson of Standish

Pending — Motion of Mr. McTeague of Brunswick that the House reconsider its action whereby it voted to recede and concur.

(The Senate passed the Bill to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-695) and House Amendment "A" (H-699) thereto and Senate Amendment "A" (S-363)

On motion of Mr. Morton of Farmington, retabled pending the motion of Mr. McTeague of Brunswick to reconsider and specially assigned for Tuesday, March 5.

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

Mr. SIMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Seated here right now just as an individual legislator and not as majority floor leader of this House, I would move that we reconsider our action whereby we passed a joint order, House Paper 2002, and I would like to debate my motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson, moves that the House reconsider our action of earlier in the day whereby we passed House Paper 2002, the Joint Order authorizing the Joint Standing Committee on Transportation to report out a bill relative to hitchhiking.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. SIMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: To be perfectly honest and candid with you, the reason that I want to reconsider this thing is that I want a roll call on it and I want to put my vote against this particular order, because I think that over the course of the last couple or three weeks that at least this corner has been chastised a good many times for delaying this session or attempting to delay this session. I think this is one of the best indications I have seen yet, and I would like to have the opportunity to just stand up and say no.

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

Mr. TALBOT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to chastise that corner again for delaying the session. I think the issue is too important for me to just go down in defeat as I did because of the other body, and I knew you wouldn't stand for that. But I think if we get right down to the nitty-gritty insofar as what has been delaying the session, I think I would like to dwell on that just for a couple of minutes.

One of the reasons that we have delayed the session for some time is

because the gentleman in the other corner presented a bill that had something to do with the ERA under state law to go out to referendum. That had a public hearing, and that was one delay.

I think one of the other delays was — I think the bill is known as the Trask No-fault Insurance Bill which is a windfall to insurance companies. Then, Mr. Speaker, I think we get down to the all important issue of reapportionment.

In the regular session, we appointed a committee to study reapportionment. They came back with a report, a good, equal, thoroughly studied report. We accepted that; we voted on it, yet we stayed here until midnight one night playing games. We did the same thing a couple days ago with reapportionment, playing games, when we knew, because of the contents of that bill, because of single-member districts, it wasn't going through. So I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have delayed this session enough. But I do, however, think that this bill is too important for me to just go down in defeat.

One of the main reasons why we are here is because this is an emergency session, because this is an energy crisis. One of the reasons why we are in an energy crisis, or the so-called energy crisis, is because politicians, et cetera, haven't taken heed in years past, and now all of a sudden we find ourselves in a crisis.

This is definitely an item that we should be concerned with. It is definitely an issue that is going to benefit to some extent the so-called little guy. I think too many times during this so-called energy crisis the little guy has suffered with turning down his heat, turning off his lights, turning down his electricity, when actually the business community hasn't done that much, not for the little guy. Big business I think is doing about the same. It is telling the little guy to turn off his lights, turn down his heat, but it really isn't giving any benefit to the little guy. This bill, this item, this issue is giving direct benefit to the so-called little guy, the guy in the streets.

You pick up your papers from yesterday morning and this morning, the day before, gasoline is tight. On the way up here, over the news media all I

heard was the fact that gasoline stations are closing all over the state. Gasoline is going to be very very tight.

We heard the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Webber, say yesterday that his supplies were cut 15 percent this month and they were going to be cut 30 percent in March. Here it is the first of March.

I would sincerely hope that you would go along with me this morning in passing this order and defeat the motion to reconsider.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am sure that if we all looked at it very candidly, there would be blame at both ends of the corner for all kinds of reasons, and I suspect we could put blame for delaying the session wherever — that whomever wanted to put it wherever they wanted to put it. And I think it just happens as to where you want to look at it at any given time. Today it is me and maybe tomorrow it is the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson. Maybe the next day it will be a member of the State Government Committee, or maybe later it will be a member of some other committee and I think this type of thing is obviously one of the considerations we have, and that is why I wanted to dwell on that.

Keep in mind that this bill has been given public hearings. Everyone knows the issue. There would be no need to have a public hearing on the bill, whatsoever. The bill could be reported out of committee and voted up or down.

I guess I have another real motive in trying to see if we can get this to the other body. We sort of expressed our views rather substantially in an attempt to try to get our views across the other body, and we had close to 100 votes. But the other body chose to disregard the issue and they did not address it and did not vote on it because of the germaneness. This order cannot be questioned on germaneness. The other body will have to vote, and I can't think of a better way to give it to them in any fashion so they can vote up or down. I would ask that you not reconsider when the vote is taken on the request of the

gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson.

(Off Record Remarks)

Mr. Mulkern of Portland was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. MULKERN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have been sitting here listening to the debate on this bill for the number of times it has come up, and I have resisted the temptation of standing up on my feet and saying anything.

As the gentleman in the corner, Mr. Martin, said, we have a bill here which we attempted to present in a certain manner, the other body chose to not accept this presentation of germaneness. I think the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Talbot, has made every attempt to present this bill in a way that it is proper to the other body.

When I came here at the beginning of this legislative session, I thought that the number one priority of this legislature, in my own opinion, was the energy crisis. I think this is what we are primarily here for; this is what the citizens of the State of Maine are primarily concerned with, and I think we should be dealing with legislation that is going to help in the energy crisis. This is one area where the State of Maine can do something.

The federal government, we have been having problems getting out fuel allocations. In a way we have no control over this, but we do have control over this particular measure. I would like to see this bill go on.

We have let a lot of bills in here that I don't think are particularly important. Perhaps some of the recommendations of the Longley Commission should have been held over for study, yet, they were allowed to go through and many of them have gone down the drain because of this. I would like to see you vote to keep this alive and bring this over to the other body. As John Martin said, the issue is thoroughly known, there is no problem about getting a bill out on hitchhiking. I would hope you would go along with this order.

Mr. Simpson of Standish requested a roll call vote.

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 present having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson, that the House reconsider its action of earlier in the day whereby House Paper 2002, Joint Order relative to hitchhiking, received passage. All in favor of reconsideration will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Ault, Baker, Birt, Bither, Brawn, Cameron, Carrier, Churchill, Cote, Cressey, Crommett, Dudley, Farnham, Farrington, Faucher, Ferris, Flynn, Hamblen, Herrick, Hoffses, Hunter, Immonen, Kauffman, Kelley, R. P.; Knight, Lewis, E.; Littlefield, MacLeod, Maddox, McMahon, McNally, Merrill, Morton, Palmer, Parks, Pratt, Shaw, Sheltra, Shute, Simpson, L. E.; Snowe, Stillings, Trask, Walker, White, Willard, Wood, M. E.

NAY — Albert, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Berube, Binnette, Boudreau, Briggs, Bustin, Carey, Carter, Chick, Chonko, Clark, Connolly, Cooney, Cottrell, Curran, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Dam, Davis, Drigotas, Dunleavy, Dunn, Dyar, Emery, D. F., Farley, Finemore, Fraser, Garsoe, Genest, Goodwin, H.; Goodwin, K.; Greenlaw, Hancock, Hobbins, Huber, Jackson, Jacques, Kelleher, Keyte, Kilroy, Lawry, LeBlanc, Lewis, J.; Lynch, Mahany, Martin, Maxwell, McCormick, McHenry, McKernan, McTeague, Mills, Morin, L.; Mulkern, Murchison, Murray, Perkins, Peterson, Pontbriand, Ricker, Rolde, Rollins, Ross, Silverman, Smith, D. M.; Sproul, Talbot, Tanguay, Theriault, Tierney, Twitchell, Wheeler, Whitzell, The Speaker.

ABSENT — Bragdon, Brown, Bunker, Conley, Deshaies, Donaghy, Dow, Evans, Fecteau, Gahagan, Gauthier, Good, Jalbert, Kelley, LaCharite, LaPointe, Morin, V.; Najarian, Norris, O'Brien, Santoro, Smith, S.; Soulas,

Strout, Susi, Trumbull, Tyndale, Webber.

Yes, 47; No, 75; Absent, 28.

The SPEAKER: Forty-seven having voted in the affirmative and seventy-five in the negative, with twenty-eight being absent, the motion does not prevail.

Mr. Greenlaw of Stonington was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. GREENLAW: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This past January the gentleman from Sabattus, Mr. Cooney, introduced a joint order requesting the Legal Affairs Committee to investigate the problems of rural crime here in the State of Maine. I understand the committee has commenced their investigation and that they have already had discussions with the Maine Law Enforcement Planning and Assistance Agency.

Rural crime has been one of the concerns uppermost in the minds of Hancock County residents for some time, and recently they have taken positive action and petitioned the Maine Legislature. I have here on my desk this morning petitions which reportedly bear the names of 4,333 residents in Hancock County. These petitions were presented to me Monday by Mr. Phil Gott of Franklin, who was responsible for organizing the petition drive.

This petition deals primarily with some possible problems in the court system, and I would like to share with you the contents of the petitions, inasmuch as it is addressed to the Maine Legislature:

I read as follows: "From the concerned citizens of Hancock County to the Maine State Legislature. The undersigned citizens of Hancock County feel that the high rate of criminal activity in our county as compared to the low rate of criminal convictions in the courts constitutes a threat to the general public safety due to, one, the high rate of court dismissals; two, probation while on probation; three, lenient sentences; and four, over usage of postponements for serious crimes, such as larceny, possession of stolen property, breaking and entering, high and aggravated assault, and communicating threats.

"We believe, either the laws are too lax or the judges are too lenient. Honest citizens fear for their lives and loss of property in Hancock County. You in the legislature are asked to investigate. We the undersigned citizens want our courts monitored to see where the weakness is. Those who break the law must receive their just punishment."

It would be a mistake for us to think that the only problems with rural crime in the State of Maine are in the courts. While I intend to make the chief Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court aware of the concerns of Hancock County residents as it pertains to the court system in Hancock county, I would like to request the Legal Affairs Committee to hold a public hearing in Ellsworth at their convenience to receive testimony from these petitioning residents of Hancock County so that they know their concern has not gone unnoticed. I would hope that a public hearing would encompass matters relating to the entire criminal justice system to include courts, police, prosecutors, juvenile delinquency, and corrections. If one of the pages would come to my desk, I would like to present these petitions to the Chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Emery.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there were probably more Republicans who signed these petitions than there were Democrats, and I would appreciate it if one of the other members of the Hancock County Delegation would speak briefly to this issue.

Mr. Churchill of Orland was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wholeheartedly support the move that Mr. Greenlaw has made, and also I feel that Mr. Gott has done a very worthwhile job. It is no more than right that the citizens of Hancock County are granted this right to a hearing on such a matter.

Mr. MacLeod of Bar Harbor was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies

and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to concur with my seatmate here, Mr. Churchill. However, I do want to impose at this time that before this becomes a witchhunt after a certain judge in Hancock County or the courts, we must understand that we have gone through a period down there where we have not had a good representative person in the district county attorney's position. We had a vacancy occur down there. We had difficulty filling the chair. And I do feel that, being the county seat, with the pressure of the criminal lawyers that are in the vicinity, and nobody really doing what I consider an admirable job from the county attorney's position, has made for some of these cases which undoubtedly there have been excessive dismissals.

However, in light of the fact that we have had this overwhelming number of petitions signed, I would concur with this order. But I do want you to understand what has been going on from the other side of the coin down in the county.

Mr. McNally of Ellsworth was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. McNALLY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think that you would all recognize, with no more people than we have in Hancock County, if you have a petition for 4,000 people that there must be some reason for their thinking what they do about courts and what the decisions of the judges are, and so forth.

Now, I told Mr. Gott out here in the corridor, he wanted to know if I would sign the petition. And I said, "No, I wouldn't sign the petition." For the reason that I don't think it is the way to go. But I do think that of all the things they have ever had in the majority of the bills that is heard that this, at least, should have a hearing. And from it, it could be cleared up as to whether you should be monitoring what the judges are deciding; whether you should be saying that the judges were 70 percent wrong or anything in their decisions; whether the parole board was not doing its job, etc. If you could clear the air and the atmosphere, I think all over the state people would be glad to know what came out of this public hearing.

I personally can see people's attitude down there. Most of them don't realize the executive position of the judicial petition of the courts, and so forth, and it might be something that the Supreme Court. If they are not satisfied with the judges, perhaps politically they ought to try another party for appointing judges.

I do think it would be nice to have a hearing. I did not sign the petition for the reason that I am stating, that I thought it was the wrong way to go to correct the trouble. And that is about all I have got to say.

Mr. Churchill of Orland was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

MR. CHURCHILL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do think that this can be cleared up, a lot of this, with a hearing, because I do feel that judges are correct in many of these dismissals that they have done. But I think it is lack of communication. Many of these cases are brought in and they really have no case at all. And some of it may be due to the lack of poor training that our deputies and law enforcement officers have within the county. But it is a lack of money, as far as that goes. And I do think that many of these things can be cleared up with the hearing. And not only that, but a lot of these cases the judges are not allowed to publicize everything that goes on. This has been their practice, and I think it should continue that way. They can't print the names of all the juveniles, and things of this order, and I do think it is lack of communication right straight down the line.

Mr. Emery of Rockland was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

MR. EMERY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As you may recall, some weeks ago the gentleman from Sabattus, Mr. Cooney, did present an order before the legislature directing the Committee of Legal Affairs to study the problem of rural crime. Well, in the weeks that followed, the Legal Affairs Committee has discussed the order, and has come up with a suggested program for holding several public hearings around the State

in the more rural areas to get the feeling of the people of the State of Maine on this very important issue.

We have decided that as soon as the legislature adjourns we will hold an initial public hearing, probably in the Rockland area — I can't imagine why — and we will at that time see how popular this idea of public hearings is. We are going to invite the local police, the State Police, the sheriff's department, law enforcement officials from other parts of the state, people from Corrections and, of course, the general public. This public hearing will be advertised extensively throughout the mid-coast area. It will be held in an auditorium large enough to seat a large number of people. And we hope very sincerely that the response is great. We want ideas. We want to find out the concerns and the frustrations of the people. And we hope that from this series of hearings we are going to be able to get some definite ideas and recommendations to present to the various law enforcement agencies as well as the legislature in the next year or so.

This is a very, very serious problem. We know it is serious in Hancock County, and certainly my area of Rockland has been one of the hardest hit during the past year or so.

I hope that you will follow the activities of the Legal Affairs Committee during the next several months. And I hope that you members of the legislature will advise the committee if you have ideas and suggestions. The number of hearings that we hold will depend solely upon the response that we get in the first two or three. We hope to hold meetings all over the State of Maine in those areas that are especially hard-hit. And we will be consulting with the Department of the Attorney General for his recommendations on where these hearings will be held.

It is not our idea to go into this series of hearings with our minds made up. We are not interested in specifically criticizing law enforcement officials or the court system or prosecuting attorneys. We are interested in finding facts. We want to find out the most common offenses. We want to find out those areas that are the hardest hit. And we hope to make some

recommendations that may at least relieve the problem in some areas.

I wish to thank the gentleman from Stonginton, Mr. Greenlaw, for these petitions. And I think that the volume of these petitions and obvious interest in Hancock County is sufficient evidence that the people around the State of Maine are very concerned with this problem. We hope that our series of hearings will, in some small way at least, aid in the solution of this growing problem.

Mr. Greenlaw of Stonington was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. GREENLAW: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to thank the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Emery, for his response to the petitions. And I would also like to thank the three gentlemen from Hancock County, Mr. Churchill, Mr. MacLeod, and Mr. McNally for their support in my request for public hearings.

I concur a hundred percent with the remarks of the gentleman from Bar Harbor, Mr. MacLeod, in that he hopes that this is not a witchhunt in the courts. This is why I requested a public hearing, because I think the problem and the concern of the people in that area is far greater than just the courts. I don't think it would be appropriate for this legislature to get involved in a monitoring system of the court system. I think that would be a gross violation of the separation of powers.

I further think, as the gentleman from Rockland has stated, that I think perhaps this is one of the most serious problems that is facing the State of Maine rural communities. Our bigger cities, such as Portland, Bangor, or Augusta, do have a sizable police force, and I think this is a situation that the 107th Legislature really is going to have to take a long hard look at, and I hope there will be some recommendations will come out of this study committee.

Mr. Mills of Eastport was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. MILLS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question through the Chair to the previous speakers on what position

the county commissioners have taken in this matter.

Mr. Cooney of Sabattus was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. COONEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I will speak very briefly. I have not spoken on this order previously. I think each of us, when it was presented, read it and saw that it did have some importance.

I was very happy to see Mr. Greenlaw's presentation of this petition this morning. And I am also very happy with the work that the Legal Affairs Committee has done, both Republicans and Democrats. I know they have done a great deal of groundwork to prepare for this series of hearings that they will go through.

It is hoped that each of us will help the committee, and that we will identify the areas in the criminal justice field where improvements can be made and where we as a legislature can assist in making those improvements. I know that in my own district, and certainly in your districts, there is concern over this issue. We are sometimes at a loss as to how to handle the problems, but this should be a method by which we can find some of the answers and indicate to the public that we are making an effort to solve the problem.

But I do want to take this opportunity to thank the Legal Affairs Committee. I think they have done an excellent job so far. And I hope that, as Mr. Greenlaw says, that the 107th will have the information before it so that we can do something very meaningful in the area of criminal justice.

Mr. Lewis of Bristol was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. LEWIS: I am directing my request to Representative Emery from Rockland, but I notice he is not in his seat at the present time. But I think that probably he will learn of my request.

I would hope that one of these proposed meetings by the Legal Affairs Committee might be held in Lincoln County, because we certainly have been subjected to similar things that

Representative Greenlaw has spoken of this morning. And I do hereby request that one of these meetings be held in Lincoln County.

Mr. Brawn of Oakland was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. BRAUN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In response to the good gentleman, Mr. Lewis, our committee does intend to come into Lincoln County. This has been one which has been discussed. And any others which want us I think we are going to try to attend.

Mr. Shute of Stockton Springs was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. SHUTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It seems this morning we are talking quite a bit on law enforcement here. I would just like to ask possibly one of the lawyers in the House if the hitchhiking order is passed, would this affect in any way the enforcement of the problems that the State Police or the Sheriffs now have or would have, in picking up suspected criminals or runaway children? I would appreciate an answer.

Mr. Parks of Presque Isle was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. PARKS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It most certainly would affect any law enforcement officer from picking up these suspected criminals.

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

Mr. JACQUES: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As most of you gentlemen know that Lewiston was fortunate to have the Maine Nordiques as our professional team for the State of Maine. I wish to make an announcement that this week the Maine Nordiques will start their tournament for the championship of the American team and Canadian team.

Tickets will be available for the Wednesday game if you people are interested to get there, and it will start at

7:30 in the Lewiston Arena. So anyone that would be interested in tickets let us know (any members of the Lewiston Delegation) and we will pick them up for you.

Mr. Dam of Skowhegan was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. DAM: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: At the conclusion of the regular session, I am sure that you will all remember that we did have containers out here in the hallway for putting in newspapers for recycling. Whether the state is still collecting the paper for recycling or not I do not know, but I would hope that they have continued that program. It was not just a one or two day shot. Because about three or four days ago there appeared an editorial in the Waterville Morning Sentinel, or Central Maine Sentinel now, in relation to an industry that is located in the town of Fairfield and the City of Waterville that straddles the line between the two, and that is Keyes Fibre Company, and they cited the emphasis of a severe shortage of newspaper for recycling. I think that this is a serious problem to them because much of their products are made by recycling newsprint. And I think that maybe right here in the legislature would be a good chance for us to start a conservation program, if we are concerned with the energy shortages that are confronting us, and this is one of them. It did cite in this editorial that the price of recyclable newsprint now was up to \$40 a ton. So it is getting up there to where it is worth something, it is worth more than throwing it away. I would hope that something could be done on the State level with this. Maybe then the citizens of the State would start following along with what we have done.

(Off Record Remarks)

Mr. Rolde of York was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. ROLDE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: On your desks yesterday you received a copy of a report signed by several members of this

body, describing a visit some of us took on our own over the long weekend of George Washington's Birthday, to the Golden Eagle Oil refinery near Quebec City. Lest you think that our visit to Quebec was entirely on business, which would be out of character for some of the gentlemen whose names are on that report, I should confess that this weekend was also the occasion of the winter carnival in Quebec and there were times when these gentlemen did participate in the festivities going on in that lovely city.

We also participated in several official ceremonies as a Maine delegation. One of these ceremonies was held in the office of the Quebec Mayor, Gilles Lamontagne. Among those present was Mr. Robert Stanfield, the leader of the Conservative Party in Canada, which would be roughly equivalent to being the principal leader of the Republican Party in this country. Mr. Stanfield was a very nice gentleman who was formerly the Premier of the Province of Nova Scotia. After a few minutes of talking with us, he exclaimed, with what I suspected was a trace of horror in his voice, "But you're all Democrats!" This was a conclusion the rest of the gathering was to reach a few minutes later after some bilingual remarks addressed to them by the gentleman from Eagle Lake, which remarks I will not repeat here in either language. Other than that I am sure you would all have been pleased at the deft manner in which the gentleman from Eagle Lake did represent our fair State at a number of official events.

The high point of our trip of course, was the visit to the refinery. And we have prepared this report, not because it was such a striking experience for us; such a fascinating experience in which we learned so much that we did want to share it with you. Maine has been wrestling with the problem of refineries for more than half a decade now and we will continue to do so for the foreseeable future. In southern York County we now have two major refinery proposals facing us. As legislators and citizens I know that we can only benefit by having as much factual background as possible to deal with these situations. And I hope you will take time, if you can, to read this report.

One final point, we do wish to thank publicly the officials of the Golden Eagle Refinery for their courtesy to us, the extraordinary amount of time they gave us, and their even more extraordinary frankness in their talks with us. We would also like to thank the Quebec Provincial Government, our counterparts, for their help in arranging our trip. The gentleman assigned to assist us was named Rene Jalbert. I am only sorry the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, isn't here for us to tell him what a charming and delightful man his cousin is.

On motion of Mr. Birt of East Millinocket,

Adjourned until Monday, March 4, at ten o'clock in the morning.