

# 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

**SENATE**

Friday, January 4, 1974

Senate called to order by the President.

Prayer by the Rev. Thomas Duffy of Hallowell.

Reading of the Journal of yesterday.

**Papers from the House**  
**Non-concurrent Matter**

Joint Order (S. P. 796) relative to Newspapers.

In the Senate January 2, 1974, Read and Passed.

Comes from the House, Read and Passed as Amended by House Amendment "A" (H-622), in non-concurrence.

Thereupon, the Senate voted to Recede and Concur.

**Senate Papers**  
**Judiciary**

Mr. Berry of Cumberland presented, Bill, "An Act Relating to Costs and Expenses of Investigation and Prosecution of Crimes." (S. P. 812)

Which was referred to the Committee on Judiciary and Ordered Printed.

Sent down for concurrence.

**Taxation**

Mr. Cox of Penobscot presented, Bill, "An Act to Exempt Cigarettes under the Unfair Sales Act." (S. P. 811)

Which was referred to the Committee on Taxation and Ordered Printed.

Sent down for concurrence.

**Committee Reports**  
**Leave to Withdraw**

Mr. Joly for the Committee on Legal Affairs on, Resolve, in Favor of Archelas Duchesneau of Sabattus for Damage by Moose. (S. P. 726) (L. D. 2138)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

Which report was Read and Accepted.  
 Sent down for concurrence.

**Ought to Pass**

Mr. Joly for the Committee on Legal Affairs on, Bill, "An Act Changing Name of Maine Tuberculosis and Health Association." (S. P. 716) (L. D. 2128)

Reported that the same Ought to Pass.

Mr. Joly for the Committee on Legal Affairs on, Bill, "An Act Relating to

Name of the Better Business Bureau of Maine, Inc." (S. P. 719) (L. D. 2131)

Reported that the same Ought to Pass.

Mr. Joly for the Committee on Legal Affairs on, Bill, "An Act Relating to Change of Name of The Right to Life Committee." (S. P. 725) (L. D. 2137)

Reported that the same Ought to Pass.

Mr. Tanous for the Committee on Judiciary on, Bill, "An Act Relating to Breaking and Entering, and Larceny of, Trailers and Semitrailers." (S. P. 712) (L. D. 2124)

Reported that the same Ought to Pass.

Mr. Tanous for the Committee on Judiciary on, Bill, "An Act Relating to Threatening Communications." (S. P. 779) (L. D. 2235)

Reported that the same Ought to Pass.

Mr. Speers for the Committee on State Government on, Bill, "An Act Relating to Investment of State Funds and Revenue Sharing Funds in Interest Bearing Accounts." (S. P. 721) (L. D. 2133)

Reported that the same Ought to Pass.

Mr. Wyman for the Committee on State Government on, Bill, "An Act Relating to Guardianship of Incapacitated Adults in Need of Protective Service." (S. P. 773) (L. D. 2220)

Reported that the same Ought to Pass.

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

**Divided Report**

The Majority of the Committee on Judiciary on, Bill, "An Act to Require District Attorneys to Prosecute all Criminal Cases before the District Courts." (S. P. 711) (L. D. 2123)

Reported that the same Ought Not to Pass.

Signed:

Senator:

TANOUS of Penobscot

Representatives:

WHEELER of Portland

GAUTHIER of Sanford

BAKER of Orrington

PERKINS

of South Portland

CARRIER of Westbrook

WHITE of Guilford

McKERNAN of Bangor

KILROY of Portland

DUNLEAVY

of Presque Isle

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported that the same Ought to Pass.

Signed:

Senator:

SPEERS of Kennebec

Which reports were Read.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Speers.

Mr. SPEERS: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: This particular bill was introduced because of a very specific problem that has arisen. I think that all of us assume that the county attorneys in the various counties of the state prosecute all of the criminal cases which come within their jurisdiction. I think with the passage of the full-time district attorney bill that we also assume that the district attorneys will therefore prosecute all of the criminal cases which come within their jurisdiction.

At the hearing yesterday before the Committee on Judiciary we had one county attorney present who made the point that all of the judges of whom he was aware insisted upon having one of the county attorneys or one of their assistants present at every criminal trial in their courtroom to prosecute the cases that actually went to trial and where the defendant had an attorney in his defense. He agreed with this proposition. Such however is not always the case. There have been instances where the district court judge has requested that the county attorney be present to prosecute a particular criminal case and not because he has not been able to appear, not because he has not had the manpower to send to the particular district court, but rather, because of a personality conflict between one county attorney and a particular district judge, the county attorney has refused to appear to prosecute the criminal case. This leaves it to the complaining witness, usually a police officer, to actually conduct the prosecution in the trial.

I think that we can all agree that the prosecuting attorneys should be the ones, the district attorneys or the county attorneys, should be the ones to actually prosecute these cases. The one concern

on the part of the majority members of the committee was that there would not be enough manpower to actually cover all of the particular cases. Well, if that is so, it is so at the present time as well as it would be under the new district attorney prosecutorial system. I think that in the vast majority of cases it is working out that all of the cases are being prosecuted by the present county attorneys, but in one or two instances it has happened that the judge has requested the county attorney to be present to prosecute and the county attorney has refused. And under the present status of the law there is nothing that the judge can do, because the present status of the law simply requires the county attorney to prosecute all criminal cases before the superior court and not before the district court. What this bill would do is require the county attorneys to prosecute before the district courts as well as before the superior court.

Perhaps this came out of committee a little bit too quickly because I think there could be some amendments which may clarify some of the concern on part of the majority of the members. One of the amendments that I would say could be helpful would be to specify that the district attorney would be the one to prosecute at all cases which actually come to trial, so that he wouldn't have to be present in the district court at all times, but he would have to be the one to prosecute actual trials.

Perhaps we could go even a little bit further and specify that he would have to be present to prosecute before the trial when requested by the presiding judge, so that if the judge felt that a minor case did not have to be actually prosecuted by the district attorney, it could be allowed that another officer could prosecute. But if a judge felt that the district attorney should be the one to prosecute that case, then he would at least have the power in the law to require the district attorney to be present to prosecute the case.

If those amendments are needed, I would be happy to put them on at the stage of a second reader. Therefore, Mr. President, I move the adoption of the Minority Ought to Pass Report.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Kennebec, Senator Speers, now moves that the Senate accept the Minority

Ought to Pass Report of the Committee.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Tanous.

Mr. TANOUS: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: Yesterday I guess most chairmen received a request from the President of this body to attempt to expeditiously get some bills out of committee, which we did. As you will notice, we have three bills on today's calendar. In fact, all three of them are Senator Speers' bills. We voted Ought Not to Pass on two of them and a majority Ought Not to Pass on the other one, but we didn't flip a coin to see which one we would let him have.

The committee spent a couple of hours in session yesterday. We finished our session rather early, the public session, and we went into executive session immediately after. We left the doors open so anybody who wanted to come in was welcome but, in any event, we discussed this very seriously.

Senator Speers mentioned some points he feels he can clarify in the bill. That is true. But I am sure this section of the law was given a lot of thought when it was written up, and we gave it some thought yesterday as well. I just can't see using the district attorney or his assistant in prosecuting a speeding case or a stop sign case and all sorts of misdemeanors in district court. The judges have always handled these quite well. It is utilizing manpower where I feel it could be better used elsewhere.

It is true we had a county attorney present from Androscoggin County, Mr. Delahanty, and he is the type of individual that provides services, or his department of the county attorney system provides services, for the district court any time that they are requested, and most counties do this on their own.

Incidentally, this applies to the new law which won't be effective until next year. This would not apply to the present county attorney system. This would only apply to the D.A. system when it comes into effect next year. So maybe it ought to be tried under the new system before we make a change.

The problems that came up or were revealed yesterday were that in many areas, such as perhaps Penobscot, you would have to perhaps hire more assistants to cover the outlying courts of Lin-

coln and Millinocket. Usually in the county seat, like Cumberland perhaps or the larger counties, the county attorney's office covers the district courts, but in the outlying areas it is difficult. I do know as a matter of practice that most district court judges, in fact — I hate to use the word "all" — but most district court judges, when there is a serious case that comes up, they continue it and ask the county attorney to come in on it. But they certainly don't on speeding cases, the stop sign cases, and other minor cases. This bill would mandate that they appear and prosecute all of these cases, and I just can't see the advantage of it, both, as I say, as a practical matter and as a financial matter. So I would ask that this bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Penobscot, Senator Tanous, now moves that Item 6-9, Legislative Document 2123, be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Brennan.

Mr. BRENNAN: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I happen to be on that distinguished Committee on Judiciary, though my name doesn't appear on the report. I want you to know that I was diligently before Senator Hichens' committee presenting my bill on drug advertising, trying to save some money for the consumers of this state, and Senator Tanous, of course, was trying to move this session along, which I am in agreement with. He got the bill out quite quickly and it is O.K., my name doesn't appear, however, I will be glad to offer my views.

I happen to agree with Senator Speers. I think it is probably in the best interest of justice in this state for a prosecutor to be available when a case is to be prosecuted. I think it is very difficult for a judge to act as judge and prosecutor. I sort of feel the defendants don't think they are getting a fair shake like that. On the other hand, I don't think the state gets a fair shake if the prosecutor isn't available. So for better justice, both for the defendant, for the prosecution and for the State of Maine, I think a prosecutor should be available.

So I would support this bill at this time, and I appreciate we may run into a logistics problem of having sufficient as-

sistants to cover this, but I think we could work that out.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Speers.

Mr. SPEERS: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: The Senator from Penobscot, Senator Tanous, mentioned that he is in agreement that the judges can request the county attorney to be present when he feels that the state should have their own prosecutor present at the trial. And I tried to indicate in my remarks that I feel the judges should have the power, if they feel that the county attorney should be present, to mandate that the county attorney be present to prosecute the case. In 99 cases out of 100, the county attorneys agree and comply with the wishes of the district court judges at the present time, but in that one case out of 100 that the county attorney simply refuses to perform what I think we can all agree should be his duty, that is what this law is trying to get at, and to give the judge the power to command the county attorney to be present to prosecute that case.

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

Mr. TANOUS: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: One final point on this: It seems to me that if these individuals, the county attorneys, are going to be elected to office, then they are responsible to the people and not to the judges of the court. So they should be answerable to the people, and if they don't do their job adequately and properly, then the opponent running against that individual certainly can make that known in an election. I think it is a matter of conscience of the individual seeking public office, and I don't feel that another individual ought to have the authority of ordering another individual, one appointed and the other elected. I think the county attorney or D.A. is responsible to the people and not to the judge of a court.

The PRESIDENT: The pending motion before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Tanous, that Bill, "An Act to Require District Attorneys to Prosecute all Criminal Cases before the District Courts", be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair will order a division. As many Senators as are in favor of the motion to indefinitely postpone this bill will please rise and remain standing until counted. Those opposed will please rise and remain standing until counted.

A division was had. 11 Senators having voted in the affirmative, and 15 Senators having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Minority Ought to Pass Report of the Committee was Accepted, the Bill Read Once and Tomorrow Assigned for Second Reading.

### Orders of the Day

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

Joint Order — Relative to Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting out a bill re referendum change relative to Chapter 118 of the Private and Special Laws of 1973. (S. P. 806)

Tabled — January 3, 1974 by Senator Brennan of Cumberland.

Pending — Motion of Senator Berry of Cumberland to indefinitely postpone.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland Senator Berry.

Mr. BERRY: Mr. President, I consulted with the people affected by this, and they feel they are perfectly willing to have this go to a time of vote when it might be a light one because the loss of a season of construction is quite important, so I will withdraw my motion.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Cumberland, Senator Berry, withdraws his motion. Is it now the pleasure of the Senate that this order receive passage?

Thereupon, the Order received Passage.

Sent down for concurrence.

### (Off Record Remarks)

On motion by Mr. Sewall of Penobscot, recessed until the sound of the bell.

### After Recess

Called to order by the President.

### Papers from the House

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

### House Papers

Bills today received from the House requiring Reference to Committees were acted upon in concurrence except for the following:

Joint Resolution to Ratify the Equal Rights Amendment to the Federal Constitution. (H. P. 1802) (L. D. 2282)

Comes from the House, referred to the Committee on State Government and Ordered Printed.

Mr. Tanous of Penobscot then moved that the Joint Resolution be Adopted.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator has the floor.

Mr. TANOUS: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: This Resolution has had a public hearing and it has taken up much of the legislature's time, at the expense of the taxpayers. I am sure that each and every one of us have heard the arguments and the debate. There isn't a member in this body, other than Senator Henley, who has heard the same arguments and debate in the other body, who isn't aware of all of the intricacies and pros and cons of this particular Resolution. I may further add that probably we have had as much information as necessary or is available to us to make up our minds on a decision in this matter without the necessity of a public hearing and further letter writing from the constituents.

We all know that we spend in the area of ten or twelve thousand dollars a day while the legislature is in session, and this is an expensive matter for the taxpayers, and I feel that this matter has been given as much attention as it will have with or without a public hearing. So, for this reason, I would move the adoption of this resolution at this time. In fact, I might add that I am sure you agree that all of the mail you have been receiving in the last week is dated back in '72 and '73, so all of this information is old. In fact, some of it dates back as far as '71. I haven't received any new information myself, as an individual, as to whether I should change my particular position on this bill and, again, I repeat that all of the information that we have as to whether or not this should be or should not be adopted is available. Again I say, for the sake of austerity, I feel that we should vote on this at the present time.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Speers.

Mr. SPEERS: Mr. President, I move this matter be tabled and specially assigned for Wednesday, January 9.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Kennebec, Senator Speers, now moves that Item 1-5, Legislative Document 2282, be tabled and specially assigned for Wednesday next, pending the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Tanous, that the Resolution be adopted.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Katz.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Katz of Kennebec, a division was had. Nine Senators having voted in the affirmative, and 15 Senators having voted in the negative, the tabling motion did not prevail.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Katz.

Mr. KATZ: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I opposed the tabling motion because I would like this matter resolved this morning. I also oppose the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Tanous, to avoid the reference of this question to committee.

I think by and large there is a feeling in the state now that there has been agreement and that this Resolution will be referred to committee. It has been reported in the press, and I think our action here today would result in pulling the rug out from under a good many people who feel that there is going to be a public hearing.

Of course, in the interest of time, it would be great to dispose of it, but we are referring important legislation like damages due to bee hive loss, salt in public wells, and so forth and so on, and I think this is a significant piece of legislation. And although I suspect that the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Tanous, and I will end up voting the same way on the ultimate resolution, at least I suspect we might, I think reference to committee in this case is absolutely essential to keep faith.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Speers.

Mr. SPEERS: Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry: Does a motion to

refer to committee take precedence over a motion for adoption?

The PRESIDENT: The Chair would inform the Senator that a motion to adopt a resolution would take precedence over a motion to refer to committee.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Joly.

Mr. JOLY: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I think on the comparison which the good Senator from Kennebec, Senator Katz, has mentioned in this Resolution with the bee hives, I can think of a better one. That is that some of the legislation that we discussed thoroughly this last winter, such as some of the drug bills, is right back with us today, this spring, and we plan to have full hearings on them. In my mind, they are no more important than this Equal Rights. This Equal Rights Amendment is an amendment to the Constitution, and there aren't very many of those, whereas a lot of these other bills we are going to be discussing are just more statutes, of which there are thousands on the books.

It is very, very difficult to pass an amendment to the Constitution; it takes years. It takes years to do away with them once we get them on, as you will remember with the prohibition one. And I think any thought of not having hearings on this would be very repugnant to me and to many of the people in the State of Maine.

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

Mr. TANOUS: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I know that as a rule we do send matters to public hearing, bee hives or drug bills, whatever the nature may be. Nevertheless, we have had a full public hearing on this at the regular session, which session only adjourned some six months ago.

Now, you talk about a fuel shortage, for instance. Here is one example during a fuel shortage where you have hundreds of people driving to Augusta for a public hearing on this matter. Here is one example. You certainly have perhaps in the area of 400 or 500 people driving to Augusta, utilizing gasoline which apparently is so precious at this time that people can hardly get it in some areas.

So you must consider the whole of the ramifications of a public hearing on this bill, and it has had a public hearing, as I said, less than a year ago.

Now, if someone can stand up here and tell me of any new information that has been divulged or revealed relative to the Equal Rights Amendment, I certainly would be the first one to agree that we should have another public hearing on this issue.

Again, I repeat, all of the information or mail that I have received in the last few weeks is material that has been published for some one or two years, and I have been furnished with this same material time and again. Now, if there are any new angles, any new arguments, any new pros and cons that can be revealed to us or that can be given to us as a result of a public hearing that would be advantageous or beneficial to us to assist us in making a decision, certainly I would be the first one to go along with the public hearing. But lacking this information, I think we have an obligation to the people of the State of Maine, that we have got to consider this one particular ratification resolution. Unless new information is made available to us, we are remiss in our obligation in delaying the session and utilizing the legislative session for a purpose that has already been covered, and that is a public hearing.

I feel strongly about this. I am in favor of this Resolution, believe me. I have received all of the information that is possible, and I have seen nothing in the last eight or nine months to convince me that I should change my position on this most important piece of legislation. I recognize it is an amendment to the Constitution of the United States and that it is a very important amendment, and I have always consistently stated that this country was founded on the fact that we do not discriminate against people, and this Resolution merely says that no one shall be discriminated against.

I know many of you feel that it is a Women's Liberation bill, but I disagree with that philosophy. My feeling is that this particular ratification is an equal rights amendment for everybody, regardless of race or sex. This is the basic foundation of our whole government. This is why people came from the

foreign lands to this country, to find the freedom that they so desired that they didn't have back in their homeland. And I feel that this Resolution should be adopted as expeditiously as possible, without delay.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Joly.

Mr. JOLY: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: One thing that has changed since we did go through this exercise last spring is that last spring the proponents of this amendment were very well organized in the State of Maine and the opponents were not. As a result, I think a lot of us did not get both sides of it as thoroughly as I have been subjected to in the last six or seven months since we adjourned.

I think the fact that of the 30 states in the country that have passed this amendment 15 of them right now are considering going back on what they did, changing their minds, would indicate to me that a lot of new information has come out. It has come to me. I do not think that today or this morning is the time to debate this, and I am not going to go into the merits of it, but I certainly think we should have a hearing on this. I think that it has been implied to the public that hearings will be held, and I think to go back on that now would be very bad.

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

Mr. TANOUS: Mr. President, I would request a roll call.

The PRESIDENT: A roll call has been requested. Under the Constitution, in order for the Chair to order a roll call, it requires the affirmative vote of at least one-fifth of those Senators present and voting.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Hancock, Senator Anderson.

Mr. ANDERSON: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I am at a loss to understand why his Excellency and the leadership allowed this controversial issue to be presented in this special session where it was killed in the regular session. The states have six more years to ratify this amendment, and so it is bewildering to me why this was let in under guise of an emergency.

To my colleagues whose good judgment maybe blinded by fear of retribution by the minority group for ratification, let me dispel your fears by saying that women in this state against ratification far outweigh those for it. This was amply proven when the Senator from Oxford, Senator Henley, who has emphatically opposed this Equal Rights Amendment, was elected to this body by an overwhelming vote.

I am not going to belabor this controversial question. You have all heard the pros and cons of this Equal Rights Amendment many times. I could go on and on quoting the Yale Law Journal and other worldwide recognized celebrities as to the ultimate chaos that would spread over this nation should this Amendment be ratified. One of these celebrities, U.S. Senator Sam Ervin, the leading opponent of ERA, has wholeheartedly agreed that effects of ratification is a definite conclusion of what the consequences would be. Apparently the goal of this minute minority is to obliterate masculinity and femininity.

The abbreviation "Ms." nauseates me. Are the so-called liberationists reluctant to have people know they are married to that despicable creature man? Or perhaps they don't want it known that they are spinsters. If I were editor of a paper, "Ms." would never find its way into print.

From the way I speak, you would think that I hate women; not so. I love them, and because I love them I hate to see a minority group of agitators hell-bent to wreck their homes and the family life which has made America the great nation that it is today.

I think remarks I made in this chamber in the regular session bear repeating, so I reiterate: Women are lovable, soft, indispensable creatures, provocative at times, but after all, why shouldn't they be. They are meant to be loved and not understood. God created many, many beautiful things to dress up this fabulous universe, but the creation of woman, a mother and homemaker, was his crowning glory. Shall we allow a minority group to blot out the heritage of homes and family circles? Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I ask you. Thank you.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair would inform the Senator from Hancock, Senator Anderson, that the leadership had nothing to do with bringing the Equal Rights Amendment before the special session. It was in the Governor's call, and the leadership had no option. It had to come before the body.

The Chair would apologize to the body. The motion to refer does take precedence over the motion for adoption.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Speers.

Mr. SPEERS: Mr. President, I would move that this Resolution be referred to the Committee on State Government and ordered printed in concurrence.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Kennebec, Senator Speers, now moves this Resolution be referred to the Committee on State Government and ordered printed in concurrence.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Richardson.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I am sorry that I feel obligated to speak on this, but I do simply because, as a result of a lot of parliamentary flipping and flopping here, it may be necessary for me to be recorded as having cast a vote against the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution, and I do not wish that to occur.

I am going to vote in favor of reference of this bill to committee. I think the right of a public hearing on a significant matter such as this is a fundamental principle of our representative form of government. I have supported and will continue to support the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution. I do not believe that this is the time for any grandstand theatrics.

The opponents of this legislation apparently feel sincerely and honestly that they were not fully organized during the last session and that their views were not fully presented for consideration by the members of the legislature. While I think they were very adequately presented, if these people in good conscience feel that they want a public hearing and they have a right to be heard, I think we have an obligation to guarantee that right. Therefore, I am going to vote in favor of reference of the bill and against consideration at this time.

The PRESIDENT: Is the Senate ready for the question?

Thereupon, the Bill was referred to the Committee on State Government and Ordered Printed in concurrence.

### Joint Order

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Council be authorized to employ staff to draft legislation implementing the apportionment of the House of Representatives and necessary funds shall be allocated from the Legislative Account. (H. P. 1825)

Comes from the House, Read and Passed.

Which was Read and Passed in concurrence.

### Joint Resolution

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

Joint Resolution Commending Canada on Assurance of Assistance in Meeting Industry Needs for Fuel Oil

WHEREAS, two major newsprint manufacturers situated in Maine have been operating from month to month without assurance that fuel supplies will continue in the future; and

WHEREAS, industry mills in this State which have become dependent upon Canadian sources through the years now appeal to such sources to keep the fuel oil flowing to Maine; and

WHEREAS, on Wednesday, January 2nd, by communication to the Maine Congressional delegation Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau pledged assistance, within his government's limited powers; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the One Hundred and Sixth Legislature of the State of Maine assembled in special session, that we commend the Rt. Honorable Prime Minister Trudeau and the people and Parliamentary Government of Canada and extend our gratitude for such assurance of cooperation and assistance and join them in prayerful hopes that alternative supplies of fuel oil may soon be found; and be it further

RESOLVED, that a suitable copy of

this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be immediately transmitted by the Secretary of State to the Prime Minister to convey this expression of gratitude. (H. P. 1826)

Comes from the House, Read and Adopted.

Which was Read and Adopted in concurrence.

---

The PRESIDENT: The Chair would like to take this opportunity to commend all Senators, and particularly Senate Chairmen, for the magnificent job they

did on the hearings yesterday. There were 50 odd bills that received a public hearing, and 25 of those bills were on the calendar of either the House or the Senate this morning. For the third legislative day, I think this is magnificent achievement and I want to compliment you.

---

(Off Record Remarks)

On motion by Mr. Sewall of Penobscot,  
Adjourned until Monday, January 7,  
1974 at 4:00 o'clock in the afternoon.