

# MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the  
**LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY**  
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library  
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied  
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

**Legislative Record**

OF THE

**One Hundred and Seventh Legislature**

(First Special Session)

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

**1976**

KENNEBEC JOURNAL  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

## HOUSE

Monday, March 15, 1976

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

Prayer by Father Gilmond Boucher of Lincoln.

The members stood at attention during the playing of the National Anthem by the Old Orchard Beach High School Band.

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

## Papers from the Senate

From the Senate: The following Joint Resolution: (S. P. 752)

Joint Resolution Requesting Information Concerning the Proposed Reductions at Loring Air Force Base

WHEREAS, the arts of economics and of politics are often inextricably entwined; and

WHEREAS, often terms such as "cost effectiveness" and "cost-to-benefit ratio" do not fully reflect the underlying reality of a situation; and

WHEREAS, the decision to institute extensive reductions at Loring Air Force Base of necessity originated in some part of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government; and

WHEREAS, the decision to institute this and other Air Force base reductions could have a significant effect on presidential primary elections to be held this year; and

WHEREAS, it is of vital concern to the Legislature of this State to know that the decision to make reductions at Loring Air Force Base, with the grave economic consequences to Aroostook County and to Maine which accompany that decision, was not made because of political considerations on the part of anyone in the Executive Branch of the Federal Government; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That We, the Members of the 107th Legislature, now assembled in special session, do hereby urge and request the Members of the Maine Congressional Delegation to ask the Department of Defense to provide them with detailed information as to where and how the decision to make reductions at Loring Air Force Base originated, and as to the complete reasons why this decision was made; and be it further

RESOLVED: That duly attested copies of this Resolution be immediately transmitted to the Members of the Maine Congressional Delegation with our thanks for their prompt attention to this important matter.

Came from the Senate, under suspension of the rules read and adopted.

In the House, the Resolution was read and adopted in concurrence.

From the Senate: Bill "An Act to Temporarily Suspend Statutory Provisions for Constituents Service Allowance" (S. P. 750) (L. D. 2304) (Approved for Introduction by a Majority of the Committee on Reference of Bills pursuant to Joint Order, S. P. 635, as amended)

Came from the Senate, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs and ordered printed.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Kauffman.

Mr. KAUFFMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes

the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Najarian.

Mrs. NAJARIAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would support that motion, because of my knowledge, I don't believe it had six votes on the Reference of Bills Committee to be admitted.

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

Bill "An Act to Correct Errors and Inconsistencies in the Laws of Maine" (Emergency) (S. P. 751) (L. D. 2305)

Came from Senate, referred to the Committee on Judiciary and ordered printed.

In the House, referred to the Committee on Judiciary in concurrence.

## Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Permit a Manufacturer of Alcoholic Beverages to be a Stockholder in a Corporation which is a Licensee" (H. P. 1892) (L. D. 2072) which was Passed to be Enacted in the House on March 5, 1976. (Motion to Reconsider Enactment Failed)

Came from the Senate with enactment reconsidered and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-932) as amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-430), thereto, in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mr. Maxwell of Jay, the House voted to recede and concur.

## Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Relating to the Initiative and Referendum Processes" (Emergency) (H. P. 2027) (L. D. 2203) which was Passed to be Engrossed as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-954) in the House on March 9, 1976.

Came from the Senate, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-954) and Senate Amendment "A" (S-426) in non-concurrence.

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur.

## Orders

Mr. Lynch of Livermore Falls presented the following Joint Order and moved its passage: (H. P. 2189)

WHEREAS, The Legislature has learned of the Outstanding Achievement and Exceptional Accomplishment of Daniel Simoneau of Livermore Falls High School who won the U. S. Nordic Junior National Ski Championship for the 7.5 Kilometer Cross Country Race at Deadwood, S. D.

We the Members of the House of Representatives and Senate do hereby Order that our congratulations and acknowledgement be extended; and further

Order and direct, while duly assembled in session at the Capitol in Augusta, under the Constitution and Laws of the State of Maine, that this official expression of pride be sent forthwith on behalf of the Legislature and the people of the State of Maine.

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

Mr. Wilfong of Stow presented the following Joint Order and moved its passage: (H. P. 2191)

WHEREAS, The Legislature has learned of the Outstanding Achievement and Exceptional Accomplishment of the

Boys' Ski Team of Fryeburg Academy and its Coach, Greg Cunningham State Class B Champions

We the Members of the House of Representatives and Senate do hereby Order that our congratulations and acknowledgement be extended; and further

Order and direct, while duly assembled in session at the Capitol in Augusta, under the Constitution and Laws of the State of Maine, that this official expression of pride be sent forthwith on behalf of the Legislature and the people of the State of Maine.

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

Mr. Wilfong of Stow presented the following Joint Order and moved its passage: (H. P. 2192)

WHEREAS, The Legislature has learned of the Outstanding Achievement and Exceptional Accomplishment of the Boys' Basketball Team of Fryeburg Academy and its Coach, Harry True State Class C Champions

We the Members of the House of Representatives and Senate do hereby Order that our congratulations and acknowledgement be extended; and further

Order and direct, while duly assembled in session at the Capitol in Augusta, under the Constitution and Laws of the State of Maine, that this official expression of pride be sent forthwith on behalf of the Legislature and the people of the State of Maine.

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

Mr. Wilfong of Stow presented the following Joint Order and moved its passage: (H. P. 2193)

WHEREAS, The Legislature has learned of the Outstanding Achievement and Exceptional Accomplishment of the Girls' Ski Team of Fryeburg Academy and its Coach, John Atwood State Class B Champions

We the Members of the House of Representatives and Senate do hereby Order that our congratulations and acknowledgement be extended; and further

Order and direct, while duly assembled in session at the Capitol in Augusta, under the Constitution and Laws of the State of Maine, that this official expression of pride be sent forthwith on behalf of the Legislature and the people of the State of Maine.

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

Mr. Greenlaw of Stonington presented the following Joint Resolution and moved its adoption: (H. P. 2195)

## IN MEMORIAM

Having Learned of the Death of Hon. Raymond L. Teel of Frenchboro Member of the 90th and 91st Legislatures

The Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine do hereby extend their sincere heartfelt condolences and sympathy to the bereaved family and friends of the deceased; and further

While duly assembled in session at the State Capitol in Augusta under the Constitution and Laws of the State of Maine, do herein direct that this official expression of sorrow be forthwith sent to the family of the deceased on behalf of the

Legislature and the people of the State of Maine.

The Resolution was read and adopted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Gray of Rockland presented the following Joint Resolution and moved its adoption: (H. P. 2196)

#### IN MEMORIAM

Having Learned of the Death of Honorable Elbert L. Starrett of Warren Who Was A Former Member of the Maine Legislature and for Many Years a Selectman of the Town of Warren

The Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine do hereby extend their sincere heartfelt condolences and sympathy to the bereaved family and friends of the deceased; and further

While duly assembled in session at the State Capitol in Augusta under the Constitution and Laws of the State of Maine, do herein direct that this official expression of sorrow be forthwith sent to the family of the deceased on behalf of the Legislature and the people of the State of Maine.

The Resolution was read and adopted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Usher of Westbrook presented the following Joint Resolution and moved its adoption: (H. P. 2197) (Cosponsor: Mr. Laffin of Westbrook)

#### IN MEMORIAM

Having Learned of the Death of Donald E. Leighton of Westbrook District Fire Chief for the Past 11 Years and a Professional and Dedicated Firefighter

The Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine do hereby extend their sincere heartfelt condolences and sympathy to the bereaved family and friends of the deceased; and further

While duly assembled in session at the State Capitol in Augusta under the Constitution and Laws of the State of Maine, do herein direct that this official expression of sorrow be forthwith sent to the family of the deceased on behalf of the Legislature and the people of the State of Maine.

The Resolution was read.

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

Mr. USHER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Donald Leighton was a great man. He was a public servant for 25 years. Chief Leighton served as Secretary-Treasurer of the Cumberland County Firemen's Association and the Maine State Fire Chiefs Association. He was a veteran of the Korean War.

Don loved the firefighting profession. He helped many young men through the long and hard training to be a good firefighter. I can remember about 15 years ago when I went to my first house fire as a new member. Don was there to guide us through. Don Leighton will always be remembered.

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

Mr. Greenlaw of Stonington presented the following Joint Order and moved its passage: (H. P. 2198) (Cosponsors: Mrs. Post of Owls Head, Mr. Jackson of Yarmouth)

WHEREAS, The Legislature has learned of the Outstanding Achievement and Exceptional Accomplishment of Spencer Apollonio who Served the State of

Maine for 10 Years in the Department of Sea and Shore Fisheries and Marine Resources as Marine Resource Scientist, State Oceanographer, and Commissioner

We the Members of the House of Representatives and Senate do hereby Order that our congratulations and acknowledgement be extended; and further

Order and direct, while duly assembled in session at the Capitol in Augusta, under the Constitution and Laws of the State of Maine, that this official expression of pride be sent forthwith on behalf of the Legislature and the people of the State of Maine.

The Order was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Greenlaw.

Mr. GREENLAW: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: Before we adopt this Joint Resolution, I trust you will allow me the opportunity to comment very briefly about Spencer Apollonio.

As you all know, Spencer was not reappointed as Commissioner of Marine Resources, after having served in that post for three and a half years.

Many of us who have particular interest in the fisheries have had the privilege of working with him during that tenure. We all have admired his ability, talents and devotion which he brought to the critically important job of managing Maine's fisheries. His presence and his counsel are sorely missed at a time when the opportunity for Maine and the country to manage the fisheries more effectively and to harvest a great share of the ocean's resources looms on the horizon.

You might all be interested to know that Spencer has a teaching fellowship at his alma mater, Bowdoin College.

It does seem fitting and appropriate that this Legislature express its gratitude to a person who has served the State of Maine so well for 10 years as a brilliant marine scientist and oceanographer, as well as a very capable administrator of the Department of Marine Resources. One can only hope that his departure from state service will not be a long or lasting one.

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

Mr. Birt of East Millinocket presented the following Joint Order and moved its passage: (H. P. 2199) (Cosponsor: Mr. McMahon of Kennebunk)

WHEREAS, The Legislature has learned of the Outstanding Achievement and Exceptional Accomplishment of William J. Rogers of Kennebunk Department Commander of the Maine American Legion, National Vice Commander and the First Maine Legionnaire to be a Candidate for National Commander of the American Legion

We the Members of the House of Representatives and Senate do hereby Order that our congratulations and acknowledgement be extended; and further

Order and direct, while duly assembled in session at the Capitol in Augusta, under the Constitution and Laws of the State of Maine, that this official expression of pride be sent forthwith on behalf of the Legislature and the people of the State of Maine.

The Order was read.

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

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In this

bicentennial year, it is very interesting to have a potential candidate for National Commander of American Legion coming from Maine.

Bill Rogers was born and brought up in Lewiston. Presently, he is a resident of Kennebunk. His mother, at one time, worked for the legislature in various capacities and also worked for the state.

Bill's family is a family that I have been very close to because some of them did live in my home, and this is why I had a particular interest in him. I know that all of us extend to him best wishes and hope that he will be successful in his endeavor to be elected National Commander of the American Legion.

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

On Motion of Mr. Albert of Limetstone, it was

ORDERED, that Richard Carey of Waterville be excused March 15th, 16th and 17th for personal reasons.

AND BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that Albert Cote of Lewiston be excused March 15th and 16th for personal reasons.

#### House Reports of Committees Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Fraser from the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act to Amend the Law Relating to the Registration of Pickup Trucks" (Emergency) (H. P. 1840) (L. D. 2005) reporting "Ought Not to Pass"

Was placed in the Legislative Files without further action pursuant to Joint Rule 17-A.

#### Leave to Withdraw

Mr. Fraser from the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act to Regulate Vehicles Transporting Combustible, Flammable or Hazardous Materials" (H. P. 1967) (L. D. 2156) reporting "Leave to Withdraw"

Report was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Windham, Mr. Peterson.

Mr. PETERSON: Mr. Speaker, may I pose a question through the Chair to the sponsor or member of the committee that reported this out "leave to withdraw," the reason for the bill being reported as such, please?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Windham, Mr. Peterson, has posed a question through the Chair to anyone who may care to answer.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hinds.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The Chairman of the Transportation Committee came to me and told me that the thing was a fairly complicated subject and he thought many departments should be enforcing some of these laws now. The Transportation Committee wanted to study this and would be putting in a study order to do so. That is why I agreed to the "leave to withdraw" report.

Thereupon, the Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Morton from the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act to Help Maintain the Purchasing Power of Participants in the Elderly Tax and Rent Refund Program by Tying Refunds to the Consumer Price Index" (H. P. 1839) (L. D. 2004) reporting "Leave to Withdraw"

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

**Tabled and Assigned**

Mrs. Clark from the Committee on Business Legislation on Bill "An Act to Require Home Health Care Coverage to be Offered in all Health Care Policies and Contracts" (H. P. 2088) (L. D. 2247) reporting "Leave to Withdraw" Report was read.

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

Mr. DeVANE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: One or more members on the Committee on Business Legislation, I am sure inadvertently their feelings were misunderstood in terms of this bill being reported out "leave to withdraw," so I would move at this time that this bill be recommitted.

Mrs. Kany of Waterville requested a vote.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Waterville, Mrs. Kany.

Mrs. KANY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: During the regular session, I was the cosponsor of a bill which was similar to this. The Committee on Business Legislation at that time decided to study this matter over the summer and fall and then offered the particular bill which was given a "leave to withdraw" now by the committee.

The bill really does not have much in it as far as offering home health care coverage, particularly home health aides were eliminated and other cost-saving measures and also it really doesn't offer that much more home health coverage.

In addition, there is a question on the constitutionality of this particular bill. So I really hope that you will go along with giving it a "leave to withdraw."

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

Mr. DeVANE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The motion to recommit was made because the feeling of one or more members of the committee, to put it as prudently as one might, I assume were misunderstood. For that reason I make the motion. The question upon which the division will be taken is not the constitutionality of the bill or the form of the original draft or the study from the Committee on Business Legislation, but simply whether all members of that committee will have an opportunity to address directly through the committee's chair whether or not the bill should be given "leave to withdraw."

I would not speak on the merits or the lack of merit in the bill, but simply to give all members of that committee an opportunity to take a position on it.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Theriault of Rumford, tabled pending acceptance of the Committee Report and specially assigned for Wednesday, March 17.

**Ought to Pass in New Draft  
New Draft Printed**

Mr. Webber from the Committee on Marine Resources on Bill "An Act Establishing a Program Under the Department of Marine Resources of Installation of Anti-Green Crab Fencing in Clam Growing Areas Seriously Affected by Green Crab Predation" (H. P. 1975) (L. D. 2164) reporting "Ought to Pass" in New Draft under New Title Bill "An Act to Establish a Program to Protect the Clam Fishery From Green Crab Predation" (Emergency) (H. P. 2200) (L. D. 2303) Report was read and accepted, The New

Draft read once and assigned for second reading tomorrow.

**Divided Report**

Majority Report of the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act to Extend the Exemption for Self-Employed Sternmen on Lobster Fishing Boats from Coverage under the Employment Security and Workmen's Compensation Laws" (H. P. 1890) (L. D. 2070) reporting "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-979)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. ROBERTS of York  
McNALLY of Hancock  
— of the Senate.

Mrs. CHONKO of Topsham  
Mrs. TARR of Bridgton  
Messrs. SPROWL of Hope  
SNOW of Falmouth  
TEAGUE of Fairfield  
FLANAGAN of Portland  
PEARSON of Old Town  
LAFFIN of Westbrook  
— of the House.

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting "Ought Not to Pass" on the same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. PRAY of Penobscot  
— of the Senate.  
Messrs. TIERNEY of Durham  
MARTIN of St. Agatha  
— of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Greenlaw of Stonington, the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report was accepted and the Bill read once. Committee Amendment "A" (H-979) was read by the Clerk and adopted and the Bill assigned for second reading tomorrow.

**Divided Report**

Majority Report of the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act Regarding the Rights of Students at the University of Maine in the University Bargaining Process" (H. P. 1966) (L. D. 2155) reporting "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-977)

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. ROBERTS of York  
— of the Senate.  
Messrs. SPROWL of Hope  
MARTIN of St. Agatha  
TIERNEY of Durham  
FLANAGAN of Portland  
SNOW of Falmouth  
LAFFIN of Westbrook  
TEAGUE of Fairfield  
CHONKO of Topsham  
— of the House.

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "B" (H-978) on the same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. McNALLY of Hancock  
PRAY of Penobscot  
— of the Senate.  
Mrs. TARR of Bridgton  
Mr. PEARSON of Old Town  
— of the House.

Reports were read.

Mr. Tierney of Durham moved the House accept the Majority "Ought to Pass Report."

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Bridgton, Mrs. Tarr.

Mrs. TARR: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and

Gentlemen of the House: I hope you won't accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report with Committee Amendment "A" this morning. This Committee Amendment "A" would allow the students at the University of Maine, the trustees would appoint three students broadly representing the campuses to meet with the bargaining agent and during negotiations, at least meet with them three times, to be informed of the negotiations that are being bargained for.

Well, I can't go along with this. This is setting a precedent, I believe, for students or for anyone, for that matter, to be involved in a third party situation with negotiations, even though they are supposed to observe the rules of confidentiality. So, if they are negotiating and then after negotiations they come out and they meet with these three students and tell them what has been bargained away or what they are going to have to bargain away, these three students can't, under this bill, and shouldn't go tell it to anybody. They can't get the feelings of the negotiating team across to the students. I really don't see any purpose in this. I would move indefinite postponement of Committee Amendment "A".

The SPEAKER: The pending motion would not be in order. The pending motion would in fact be acceptance of the Majority Report. The motion to indefinitely postpone would have to deal with the bill and all of its papers, including Report "A" and "B".

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Bridgton, Mrs. Tarr.

Mrs. TARR: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Well, I don't want to do that. Can I go on to Committee Amendment "B".

The SPEAKER: What the gentlewoman could do is suggest that Committee Amendment "A" not be accepted and then Committee Amendment "B" then could be offered.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Bridgton, Mrs. Tarr.

Mrs. TARR: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I will move that Committee Amendment "A" not be accepted and that Committee Amendment "B" be accepted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Madison, Mrs. Berry.

Mrs. BERRY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: A question. Is there any, at this point, could the difference between the two amendments be explained?

The SPEAKER: The answer is they could be explained if anyone should so desire.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Madison, Mrs. Berry.

Mrs. BERRY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: At this point, could the difference between the two amendments be explained?

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Madison, Mrs. Berry, poses a question through the Chair to any member who may answer if they so desire.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Falmouth, Mr. Snow.

Mr. SNOW: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The difference between the two amendments is quite simple. Amendment "A" permits the students to confer with the trustees before negotiations begin and occasionally during the negotiations.

Amendment "B", which the gentlewoman from Bridgton is talking

about, permits the students to talk with the trustees only before negotiations start.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Bridgton, Mrs. Tarr.

Mrs. TARR: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Just to follow that a little bit further on Committee Amendment "B", I realize the concern of these students. I talked to them last week when they were here Wednesday. Many of them came up to me and said, you know, what is the matter with you, you are the only holdout on this collective bargaining bill. I talked with them, I can appreciate their concerns. I know the situation at the University of Maine and I know the bargaining process may be detrimental to these students and I sincerely do recognize their concerns. With Committee Amendment "B", this would allow the students to talk with the management team before negotiations start. They could outline their concerns. They could say to them, these are the areas that we feel strongly about, we don't want to see you bargain these areas away. I feel that this is fine. I think the students should have a pipeline to the management team. I think they are concerned and rightly so. I think that is as far as it should go. Once these concerns are outlined to the university, then this is where the responsibility ends. I don't think you can expect the teams to come out and say, okay students, this is what we are going to do and how do you feel about this?

If there are any other questions on Committee Amendment "B", I would be happy to try to answer them.

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

Mr. SPROWL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The gentlelady from Bridgton and I sit on the same committee, the Labor Committee, and it is very seldom that we disagree. This morning, we apparently do, so I would like to take just a few minutes of your time to give the reasons why I think you should support Committee Amendment "A".

Last year, the Maine Legislature gave collective bargaining rights to employees of the University of Maine. L. D. 2155, which we are discussing this morning, Committee Amendment "A" is an amendment to that law which would provide a strictly limited role for representatives of the university students in this newly established collective bargaining process. This proposal is substantially similar to legislation already enacted in Montana and Oregon.

L. D. 2155, Committee Amendment "A" would allow three students, chosen by the trustees, to meet and confer with both sides prior to negotiations. It would allow these students to meet occasionally with the administration bargaining team during the course of negotiations to learn what is under discussion and to provide reactions from the student perspective, would require that the students be bound by the same rules of bargaining confidentially, and so on and so forth, as if they were participants and restate the role of the university in considering the interest of students in the negotiations.

This proposed amendment is in response to the students' concern that issues of significant and direct impact on them and their life at the University of Maine will be among the subjects of the bargaining and would, without this amendment, be decided without their input or even their knowledge.

Faculty office hours, for example, would

almost certainly be a subject for negotiation as a working condition, as would class size, number of courses taught or something like the allocation of campus parking spaces. In these and many other cases, particularly including the involvement of students in the university policy-making committees, the decisions made will clearly have a major impact on the students' lives as well as their role in the university community.

More specifically, the L. D. would require the university trustees to appoint three students broadly representative of the various campuses in the university system to meet and confer with both sides prior — I reiterate — prior to the bargaining, who may then meet with the university bargaining team occasionally during the negotiation period to find out what is under discussion and to provide their reactions.

It would be emphasized here that under Committee "A" the students would not sit in on negotiations, would have no vote and no direct control over the program. The purpose is simply to allow students an opportunity to provide an informed input while the decisions are being made.

In summary, it is clear that collective bargaining will change the way the university is run from the present array of committees, policies and administrative decisions, almost all of which involve students and student input, to a new more clear-cut labor and management arrangement. It is the purpose of this bill that in the transition to the new system this important element of the old, the involvement of students and important decisions affecting their lives be preserved.

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

Mr. JACKSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have three questions I would like definitions on. We talk about currently enrolled students. I would assume this would cover graduate students, it would cover evening students, all students. I would like that confirmed.

The other thing is, we talk about "broadly representative" instead of saying representative, we say broadly. I wonder what the exact meaning of this is? Does this again cover all spectrums of students, graduate as well as all campus?

Then, the one that probably gives me the most problem is the question of "reasonable intervals" down in paragraph B of the amendment and what is a reasonable interval and who decides what a reasonable interval is?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Yarmouth, Mr. Jackson, has posed a series of questions to any member who may answer if they so desire.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Durham, Mr. Tierney.

Mr. TIERNEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The answer to the good gentleman's question, number one is, yes. The answer to the second question is yes, and the answer to his third question is the bargaining unit.

Mrs. Tarr of Bridgton was granted permission to speak a third time.

Mrs. TARR: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: When you get into allowing students to take part in a bargaining process, to my knowledge there is no provision in any other type of labor negotiations that stipulates while these negotiations are going on or at regular intervals they would go out to;

three people, whether they are from a university or if you are negotiating with any contractors or whatever and explain to them what is happening in the bargaining process. This just does not happen and this is third party intervention.

Now, I do understand these students' concerns, and I feel that this Committee Amendment "B" gives them the opportunity to go to the trustees, they can come in with not demands, I don't mean demands, but I mean an area of concerns. For example, they could say, we don't want you to bargain away the library hours. We feel this is a priority, we want the library hours to stay open and so forth, or the labs. I can see areas of concern for these students, that they don't want things bargained away so that salaries can be increased, for one thing. I don't think that it is making, as Mr. Sprowl, said, any clear-cut reasoning and addition to labor negotiations.

Now, if I just might continue, I think there are problems here that we may not be realizing. If you go to these three students while negotiations are going on and they are unhappy with this, they are really opposed to this, what is their alternative? What can they do? If they want to break the rules of confidentiality, they can go back to their campuses and say, look, they are just going to bargain away football, basketball, all the sports and this we aren't going to stand for.

In a magazine from the Education Commission of the States, I would just like to read this little bit. At other institutions — this is regarding collective bargaining — throughout the United States, and two states, Montana and Oregon, have it but they haven't used it yet, the universities and other institutions, students have sought injunctions against striking faculty, threatened mass boycotts to force closure of bargaining during an impasse, filed breach of contract suits and otherwise brought pressure to bear on the collective bargaining process.

Now, I don't think that we want this to happen at the University of Maine. I think our students should have the right to go in and talk with them and show them their concern for their bargaining rights, not to bargain away things that the students feel will deeply affect them. But, to go any further than that, I feel is a mistake, so I would still urge you not to accept Committee Report "A".

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

Mr. LAFFIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hesitate this morning to get up to oppose my good friend, Mrs. Tarr, but I felt that this is something we can give the students, and if they abuse it, we can always take it away from them.

I don't feel that they are having any power in this. They are not demanding one side or the other, they are nothing more than spectators. The bargaining will be done by the professional labor people, the bargaining will be done by the university and their trustees and their association. All you are saying in this bill, we are giving them the right to sit in, no more and no less. And as my good friend says, they will get up and have all this rumpus at the university. Whatever the legislature gives, the legislature can take away, and if it fails, we can always take it away. But I say this, we don't know unless we give it a chance.

I am not excited over this bill one way or the other, but if the students feel that in this

day of education. I never had much education, so I don't know, but in this day they all want to be involved in different things. If that be the case, I can see no harm in going along with them and if that doesn't work out, we can always take it away from them.

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In both amendments, I am intrigued by this sentence: "In addition to its responsibilities to the public generally, the university" — and I assume by the university it means the board of trustees — "shall have the specific responsibility of considering and representing the interest and welfare of the students in any negotiations under this chapter." My question is, haven't the board of trustees been concerned with the interest and welfare of the students? Is there a need for this statement?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Livermore Falls, Mr. Lynch, has posed a question through the Chair to anyone who may care to answer.

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

Mr. DAVIES: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: While I would generally agree with the good gentleman from Livermore Falls, Mr. Lynch, that the trustees in the past have represented students' interests, the changes that we made in the law regarding collective bargaining for university employees in the regular session makes a significant change in the method the university has been operating under. Previously, there was a rather informal method of arranging the agreements which made it possible to operate the university, but now that we have placed into law what might be considered an adversary relationship between management and labor, it cuts out the students as a direct participant in this process, where in the past they have been very much involved.

Now the trustees have the responsibility of making sure that they can take a package to the legislature, to us, which they can sell to us, with a price tag on it that is within our means, and in the process, it is all too possible that they may have too little concern for students' rights and students' interests.

What this bill attempts to provide is a mechanism so students can have some input, without any control over the bargaining process, to the management, to the board of trustees, so that their interests are at least known. The trustees have no responsibility right now to do anything the students ask of them. They have to make a decision based on their own good judgment.

What this bill would do would allow students, through representatives who are chosen by the board of trustees, to be able to speak with the management team at reasonable intervals to discuss changes in the proposals that come up in collective bargaining.

If you are at all familiar with collective bargaining, especially in a university system, it is not a short duration process. It could take six or nine months, and in the process, there will be a number of changes in the positions that both sides take.

What the students are interested in is knowing what these changes are when they are about to be made so that they can give their opinions to the management team. There will be no responsibility to the

management team that they have to take these things. All it says is that they have to take them into consideration. They have to think about them and consider them.

There is no way that the students are going to be able to interfere in this process, in its legal and orderly process. All they are going to be able to do is give the management team what they think the students are going to feel on any given proposal, and once that is done, they are going to sit back and see what happens in the collective bargaining process. They are going to be bound by the rules of confidentiality, just like the management team, just like the labor team. This is a serious responsibility and I think all parties would be willing to respect this and take it in the serious nature that it is presented.

I would hope that you would not vote against this bill. I think that both sides agree that there is some mechanism that is necessary. The crucial area and the difference between the two amendments is that one of them says the process will go on during bargaining; the other says the process must cease before bargaining begins. With the complex nature of collective bargaining, I think this is a little bit unreasonable. I would urge you to support Committee Report A.

Thereupon, Mrs. Tarr of Bridgton requested a roll call vote.

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

Mrs. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would just like to ask what the term is of these students, or is a new group of three brought out every time there is something to do with collective bargaining?

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Auburn, Mrs. Lewis, has posed a question through the Chair to anyone who may care to answer.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Connolly.

Mr. CONNOLLY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I tried to stay out of this debate as long as I could, but I guess I have to get into it.

I am the sponsor of this particular bill, and in response to the question posed by Mrs. Lewis, the way I understand the collective bargaining process, it would happen only once every two years. So it would be at that point, every two years, where the three students involved would be appointed by the board of trustees.

There are some other remarks I would like to make. This Committee Amendment "A", the amendment we are discussing now, has been significantly compromised from the original bill that I presented. The original bill would have allowed students to be involved in the collective bargaining process from the very beginning to the very end. They would have sat in on every session that was held between management and the employees. Amendment "A", which is the compromise that we agreed to, and the reason that we went after the compromise was because the only groups that originally opposed the bill were the State Employees Association and the unions, and they explained that in the collective bargaining process if a third party, like a consumer, like students, were involved on a day-to-day basis, it would tend to make both sides posture to the students, to try to please the students, but in effect that is all it would be, a posture.

So what we have done with this amendment, in trying to respect the integrity of the bill, is to allow students to be involved in the process in the beginning. They would be told by both sides what the points are that are going to be negotiated. They would then meet at least once more before the final agreement was reached. If the collective bargaining process went on for a long period of time, there would be other meetings that would be set by the collective bargaining team. But if we reject Report A and accept the Committee Report B, in my opinion it is only a token gesture. It would only allow the students to be involved initially. They would then have no input, be able to ask no question, be told nothing until the final agreement is reached, and that, to my way of thinking, is only a token gesture.

In response to the question that Mr. Lynch brought up, this bill was supported in its original form and is now being supported in its amended form by the board of trustees. It is also being supported, in addition to students, by the university professors. The only group that objected to this bill was labor, and with the amendment, they have written a letter that is in the possession of the committee and they now support the bill. So all the sides that were involved in this in the beginning now support it, and I would hope you would support Report A. It is a significant compromise, but it maintains the integrity of the bill.

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

Mr. MILLS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to pose a question. I am wondering how it comes about that the board of trustees will select the students that are going to be involved in this controversy. I am wondering why the students weren't selected from their own student body. To me, there seems to be a coercion developing there that won't be good for the university or the students either.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Mills, has posed a question through the Chair to anyone who may care to answer.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Town, Mr. Pearson.

Mr. PEARSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As I understand it, the student members under this bill would be selected by the members of the student body and not by the trustees.

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

Mr. DAVIES: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: My friend Mr. Pearson is correct to a certain extent, but what I think actually would happen, the way we intended it when this bill was presented and when the compromise was made, there are some statewide student bodies affiliated with the university. They would recommend a number of students that they felt were acceptable to the board of trustees and then the board of trustees would have the final decision of choosing three of those people. Therefore, the students will be involved in suggesting which ones, but the final decision will be in the hands of the board of trustees. The people who will be talking with them will be talking with the management team, which represents the board of trustees.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wells, Mr. Mackel.

Mr. MACKEL: Mr. Speaker, a question if I may. Do the students at the university

participate in the administration of the university in any way?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Wells, Mr. Mackel, has posed a question through the Chair to anyone who may care to answer.

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

Mr. DAVIES: Mr. Speaker, to a certain extent, the students do participate now. Over the last ten years, particularly, students have through their activities, talking with the university officials, arrived at a number of positions where students are represented on boards, commission, groups that make policy decisions. They don't have a final say, but they do have a vote on a number of the committees which will be making policies for the university.

However, with the change in the collective bargaining law, there is a distinct possibility that one of the items that could be bargained away by the management team to the labor team, the faculty in particular, is certain governance rights of the university.

Some of the things that the students have achieved are membership on committees choosing presidents of the campus that they represent, there have been students participating on committees that choose deans of colleges, that are involved in presenting policy statements for faculty committees to consider for possible approval as the policy of the university. So while they are not in hired positions as administrators, they do have a very active role in participating and suggesting ways that the university be administered, and this could be lost through the collective bargaining process.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Hughes.

Mr. HUGHES: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: If I might add something to the answer to Mr. Mackel's question of "do the students participate in the administration of the university," the structure is this, it is a corporation and in theory all of the decisions made by the corporation are made in the name of the board of trustees. In practice, however, in this university and indeed every university that I know of, there are many informal arrangements by which input is received from faculty, from students, from all constituents of the university, including alumni, and the university, over the last ten years, has accepted students as playing a stronger and stronger role in having that input. But, indeed, all final decisions are still made legally by the board of trustees, and it is up to them to structure the university in a way that provides for faculty input, for student input and alumni input.

We don't change the corporate nature of that, but what we have done in this legislature in the last couple of years, indeed at the last session, was to obligate our trustees to bargain collectively. It is a move I supported, I supported it as a trustee and I support it as a legislator, but it does change the picture. It does mean that management, in this case the university trustees and labor, in this case the faculty, can negotiate to eliminate the role played by students in the process.

All this bill does is simply provide for some input from students in the kinds of things they don't want negotiated and they do want negotiated. It gives them no role in the negotiations; it just provides some communication, and since the legislature went so far in the last session to change the

situation which has existed for a number of years, I think we ought to go this one tiny step further and just require that there be that kind of consultation prior to collective bargaining negotiations, so that the students who are the ultimate consumers of the university's product and indeed the taxpayers and citizens of Maine have that kind of input. It is a small change, a reasonable one, and I support it.

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 Durham, Mr. Tierney, that Majority "Ought to pass" Report be accepted. All in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Bachrach, Bagley, Bennett, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Berube, Birt, Blodgett, Boudreau, Bowie, Bustin, Carpenter, Carroll, Carter, Chonko, Churchill, Connolly, Cooney, Cox, Curran, P.; Dam, Davies, Doak, Dow, Drigotas, Farley, Faucher, Fenlason, Finemore, Flanagan, Garsoe, Goodwin, H.; Goodwin, K.; Gould, Gray, Greenlaw, Hall, Henderson, Hennessey, Hinds, Hobbins, Hughes, Hunter, Ingegneri, Jacques, Jensen, Joyce, Kany, Kelleher, Kennedy, Laffin, LaPointe, Laverty, LeBlanc, Lewin, Littlefield, Lizotte, Lovell, Lunt, Lynch, MacEachern, Mackel, Mahany, Martin, A.; Martin, R.; Maxwell, McMahon, Mills, Miskavage, Mitchell, Morin, Morton, Nadeau, Najarian, Norris, Palmer, Peakes, Pelosi, Peterson, P.; Peterson, T.; Pierce, Post, Powell, Quinn, Raymond, Rolde, Saunders, Shute, Snow, Snowe, Spencer, Sprowl, Stubbs, Susi, Teague, Theriault, Tierney, Truman, Twitchell, Tyndale, Usher, Wagner, Walker, Wilfong, Winship, The Speaker.

NAY — Ault, Burns, Byers, Call, Conners, Curran, R.; DeVane, Durgin, Dyer, Farnham, Fraser, Hewes, Higgins, Hutchings, Immonen, Jackson, Kauffman, Kelley, Leonard, Lewis, MacLeod, Pearson, Perkins, S.; Perkins, T.; Rideout, Rollins, Silverman, Strout, Tarr, Torrey, Tozier, Webber.

ABSENT — Albert, Carey, Clark, Cote, Curtis, Dudley, Gauthier, Jalbert, McBrearty, McKernan, Mulkern, Smith, Talbot.

Yes, 106; No, 32; Absent, 13.

The SPEAKER: One hundred sixty having voted in the affirmative and thirty-two in the negative, with thirteen being absent, the motion does prevail.

Thereupon, the Bill was read once. Committee Amendment "A" (H-977) was read by the Clerk and adopted and the Bill assigned for second reading tomorrow.

#### Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act to Exempt Emergency Vehicles and School Buses From the Statutory Prohibition of the Use of Studded Tires From May to October" (Emergency) (H. P. 1953) (L. D. 2138) reporting "Ought Not to Pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. GREELEY of Waldo  
McNALLY of Hancock  
— of the Senate.

Messrs. WEBBER of Belfast  
JENSEN of Portland  
WINSHIP of Milo  
JACQUES of Lewiston  
ALBERT of Limestone

— of the House.

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-975) on the same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. CYR of Aroostook  
— of the Senate.

Mrs. BERRY of Madison  
Messrs. STROUT of Corinth  
LUNT of Presque Isle  
FRASER of Mexico  
KAUFFMAN of Kittery  
— of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Strout of Corinth, the Minority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted and the Bill read once. Committee Amendment "A" (H-975) was read by the Clerk and adopted and the Bill assigned for second reading tomorrow.

#### Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act Concerning Transit District Buses Used for Elementary Pupil Transportation" (H. P. 1996) (L. D. 2177) reporting "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-980)

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. CYR of Aroostook  
— of the Senate.

Messrs. JENSEN of Portland  
WEBBER of Belfast  
FRASER of Mexico  
LUNT of Presque Isle  
JACQUES of Lewiston  
ALBERT of Limestone

— of the House.

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting "Ought Not to Pass" on the same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. GREELEY of Waldo  
McNALLY of Hancock  
— of them Senate.

Mrs. BERRY of Madison  
Messrs. STROUT of Corinth  
KAUFFMAN of Kittery  
WINSHIP of Milo  
— of the House.

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mexico, Mr. Fraser.

Mr. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Mexico, Mr. Fraser, moves that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Madison, Mrs. Berry.

Mrs. BERRY: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the people look at this bill. This would give the company that transports the Portland children the unique permission to crowd more students into their buses than the ordinary school buses in the towns that have their own buses. I don't think this is right. I think it is starting something that we shouldn't be starting, and I would ask that you look at the bill and decide perhaps that it isn't the right thing after all.

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

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker, a



question. If I am looking at this correctly, is this a majority report? I think it is evenly divided.

The SPEAKER: If the Chair counts it correctly, it is seven to six.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Jensen.

Mr. JENSEN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This is my bill, my piece of legislation. I would like you to look at the bill. As a matter of fact, at this point the amendment is the bill. It is a bill which is a purely local matter. It is a bill which affects two groups of people, the students in the City of Portland and it also affects the Greater Portland Transit District in what they are doing.

Let me explain why I introduced the bill. Presently, you have a setup in the law that requires each student to have 13 inches of space to sit on in a bus. Now, these buses have got seats of 38 inches and 37 inches wide, which means, if you gave another inch or two you would be increasing the total number of students on a bus by something in the neighborhood of 25 or 28.

The reason I introduced the bill was that in the City of Portland you have a system where say a bus can take 40 students, and this is the transit bus, the students would get on a bus as they are going along in the morning, they are picked up along the various routes throughout city streets, throughout the urban areas, 40 kids get on the bus and that is what the legal limit says. There are two or three first, second, third grade students sitting out there. If it happened to snow that day, the weather was bad, their mother couldn't get out of the driveway because it was icy, so the mother said, take the bus. Well, they happened to be the last kids in the line. What the bus drivers are saying, I am sorry, I can't take you on, you have to walk to school, or you can't get there at all. Now, you tell me what happens when you have somebody in the first, second or third grades, small children, very small children, who are left at a bus stop without any way of getting to school. Perhaps their mother is working, perhaps she has already gone, perhaps they are not able to get to school at all. What happens then? So, I put this bill in to allow an additional 20 percent to be put on the bus. Small children of this sort, elementary school children, that is what the bill says, can fit three to a seat with no trouble whatsoever.

I am not attempting and I am certainly not intending to increase the total number of students on the bus. What I am attempting to do, is allow somewhat of a variance, allow somewhat of a certain amount of flexibility in the law.

If you will read the amendment, the amendment says, any transit district transporting students of a school administrative unit, under this section, shall, at least annually and in consultation with that school administrative district, develop a routing system for transit district buses to be used to transport those students. In developing this system for buses transporting elementary students, the district shall determine bus capacity using the standard minimum seating space required for elementary students; and not reduce minimum seating space permitted by preceding paragraph. What this means is that the bus company now has got to determine the routes in conjunction with the school board, with the school committee, with the school administration. That means they are going to be much more careful.

In addition, it also requires that if, under present law, they can carry 40 students on

a bus, they have to plan a route for 40 students. They are not allowed to plan a route for 48, as my amendment would allow them to carry if the necessity comes up. You are increasing the amount of safety by allowing the students to be picked up and go on the buses. You are not increasing, as a matter of course, the number of students that are going to be going on the bus in a normal day. You are not allowing any standees, you are not allowing anything else of that sort.

I would hope that you would vote with the majority "ought to pass" report and vote for this bill. As I say, it is purely a local matter that is supported by the school board in Portland, by the transit district and, as far as I know, by the entire Portland delegation.

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

Mr. WINSHIP: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is a bad bill. This is just something that should be settled between the school board and the transit. The ones he tells about being left are pay passengers that are not in the contract. I don't believe that there is any other bus in the state that hauls school children by contract that pay passengers can ride on.

This is very misleading to the people. This is going to reduce the space for children from 13 inches down to 10½ inches and that is a pretty small space. That is the law now, that all buses have to have 13 inches or more and when you reduce that 20 percent, that is 2½ inches down to 10½ inches.

This Portland Transit comes back every year and asks a special provision. We give them separate rights that other buses do not have, and I believe that it is time that they stopped and I move for the indefinite postponement of this bill and all its accompanying papers.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Brunswick, Mrs. Martin.

Mrs. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, how would it affect the insurance rates on the buses?

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Brunswick, Mrs. Martin, has posed a question through the Chair to anybody who may care to answer.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Jensen.

Mr. JENSEN: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is, after talking with people connected with this, that would have no effect, because the problem with insurance is if, in fact, the law now allows 40 students and they take 41 and an accident occurs, then that bus driver is liable and there is going to be the devil to pay. If you have a situation such as I am proposing, which allows them some flexibility, allows them to take on an additional student or two, then the insurance company has no problem with that because that is what the law allows.

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Committee on Transportation, We have a problem on school buses regarding the 13 inches of seating space and where there are extremely young children, it is possible to take more into a seat. Some of the school units are faced, if they are pressed by the State Police, into buying more buses simply to meet this 13 inch space requirement. Is this addressed in any other document?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Livermore Falls, Mr. Lynch, has posed a

question through the Chair to anyone who may care to answer.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mexico, Mr. Fraser.

Mr. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The remarks I intended to make I think will in part answer the question of the gentleman from Livermore Falls, Mr. Lynch. In spite of the fact that this young gentleman on my left has created quite a lot of problems for me in the last couple of years, when he first presented this bill to the Transportation Committee, my first thought was to oppose it and I did oppose it, but I finally agreed to go along with it, providing it was limited to elementary children, the lower grades. We have to agree that those students in the lower grades have a much narrower rump than those beyond that and I believe they could take care of it all right.

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

Mr. STROUT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think the gentleman from Portland has tried to give you a clear picture on this bill, but my feeling on this is that we should not give the Portland Transit District any more provisions than what we provide other school districts in the State of Maine.

We allow 40 passenger buses now to carry 40 elementary students. This 20 percent, no matter how you look at it, whether it would allow an additional 8, I wonder now if they had problems putting that 41st one on, they will probably come back in the next session and want to go from the 48, which it would allow them, what are they going to do with that extra one there?

I am amazed today, I guess, at the young gentleman from Portland, that he always opposes any tolerances for trucks, but I am wondering if he is talking here today a tolerance for elementary students?

There is a little bit more to this bill, I think, than he brought out. In this particular amendment, it allows these buses to be inspected at staggered times rather than the twice a year that we have the other buses to be inspected, and he wants to put a little provision in here that these Portland Transit buses could be inspected at staggered times. I know this could be approved by the Chief of the Maine State Police, but I don't think we want to give any provisions today, and I will go along with the indefinite postponement of the whole bill.

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

Mr. LAPOINTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This morning, Mr. Jensen, my colleague from Portland, has done an able job in trying to present the substance of some of the issues involved in this minor bill that attempts to clarify the law.

I would like to point out to members of the House this morning that I never really was one of the enthusiastic supporters of the concept of putting the Greater Portland Transit District under the auspices of the school bus safety law that we passed in the special session of the 106th Legislature. And one of the reasons I had in the back of my head, in not enthusiastically supporting the provisions of school bus safety law that would have affected the Greater Portland Transit District, was that we have a unique situation in Portland.

We have a quasi-governmental agency called the Greater Portland Transit District which receives funding from four

different municipalities in the Greater Portland area, if not five, and in addition to that, they contract with the Portland School Department to provide transportation to school children in Portland. It is a very awkward, at times, relationship, but it was put together with the idea of trying to save some dollars at the local level and to call for a more efficient utilization of resources.

What we have here is purely a local matter. We have a situation where we have kids, elementary school children, as Representative Fraser has pointed out, who are left stranded on the streets because the letter of the law that the school bus drivers have to adhere to, they don't want to violate it and these kids are left there. I think that that is the important issue.

I think that as long as the Greater Portland Transit District as a local unit of government is trying to work out some of its problems, it is going to constantly be back before this legislature, because you have made it a creature of the legislature because of the school bus safety law, so I would plead with you this morning, if you have some problems with the school bus inspection provision, go along with at least the provision of the proposed legislation that would allow us not to leave these kids out in the street in the morning, particularly these cold Maine winter mornings. So don't indefinitely postpone the bill, accept the majority report this morning. If there is a problem with the inspection provision, let's take care of it in second reader and we will amend it out, but for goodness sake, let's think of some of the children involved here, please.

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

Mr. WINSHIP: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Some of these statements are a little misleading. The school district contracts with them to haul a certain number of students and they give the children books of tickets and they pay 30 cents each way for these children to ride. The buses have capacity enough to haul all of these children. Then the Transit District sells tickets to other children within the limit of what contract children are, less than a mile, and these are the children that they are trying to get on the buses, not the children that are contracted by the school committee.

When it comes to the inspection of these buses, they say they have to pay overtime to get these repaired. I should hope that they didn't neglect their buses for the whole six months until the time of inspection. They have the week of February vacation to inspect these buses, not particularly to repair them, they should have been kept in repair right straight along, and they have the whole summer to repair for the other six months.

This is definitely a privilege bill and should not be on our books.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Madison, Mrs. Berry.

Mrs. BERRY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We have heard that this is just a clarifying of the law; this is not so, this is changing the law. If it is possible to seat more small children in Portland for a contract bus, then it should be permissible to seat more all over the state. Other towns would like to save a little money also. I think when we do this for one, we should expect to do it for all. It is a safety factor and therefore I would ask that you vote for the indefinite postponement of this bill.

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

Mr. MORTON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I just made a quick phone call to double check a couple of items. The answer to the question of the gentleman from Livermore Falls is that this bill does not in fact do anything for school buses which are not in the Portland Transit District. It does not alleviate the problem that we are having with state police very carefully checking on the capacity of regular school buses.

The other thing I was able to ascertain was that because of the scheduling in the Portland area, these buses set up their schedules early in the season, right after school starts, but they do have the option of taking on more students on a paying basis. There is some question that this might be a money-making scheme for the bus company in the Portland area by being able to take on some extras.

So on the surface, I see no real reason why this should be supported and I support the "ought not to pass" report or the indefinite postponement motion.

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am grateful to the gentleman from Farmington for answering the question. It is of great concern to me because we are spending \$15 million a year on transportation of public school children, and if the law is strictly enforced, we are going to be buying a great many more buses than we have now and we can ill afford to do this.

I think the problem is probably of a greater significance across the state than it is in Portland and I would suggest that the bill either be tabled and amended or indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. JENSEN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill does do a number of things that have been suggested. One of the things that people have talked about is the fact that Portland is unlike other areas and they talk about this company, this transit company, like it was a money-making scheme, like it was a company that was out just to make a fast buck. The fact of the matter is, this is a government-supported, taxpayer-related organization. It is subsidized by four greater Portland communities, it is owned by four greater Portland communities. Any deficits that it incurs are paid for out of the property tax. If you look at other school districts, what occurs is that a school district hires a bus or they rent a bus, they buy a bus, whatever, and they figure there are, say, 40 students on that bus and if there are 40 students that show up, fine, if there are only five students that show up, fine. That bus still has got to go and that bus driver gets paid the same amount of money for carrying five students as he does if he carries 40 students.

Portland Transit District doesn't work that way. What they have done, in order to save taxpayer dollars, education dollars, they say, we will accept the money for the number of students that go. We won't take money for students that aren't there. We won't force you to pay for empty seats. You pay for the students that go. You are talking about taking students who are on the bus, driving them along, picking them all up, taking them to school. Right now there are 40 students allowed on the bus,

they can't take any more, they leave the students stranded.

The laws regarding safety for school buses are fairly rigid and they are set up based on something called Standard 17, issued by the federal government. Standard 17, interestingly enough, has a provision in there which says that transit district buses are different, they can and may well be wholly exempted from these types of laws. A transit bus probably costs something in the neighborhood of sixty or seventy thousand dollars. Can you show me a school bus, a normal yellow school bus that just carries kids to school that costs that much? Can you show me a school bus that weighs the kind of weight that these buses do? Can you show me a school bus, in its normal course of operation, goes on city streets and probably averages 20 miles an hour, that carries children, I would say at the most two or three miles? Heck, the whole City of Portland from one end to the other isn't much more than six miles long. Is that the same as being in Aroostook where you may drive an hour to get to school? Is this the same kind of situation?

I think it is pretty clear that a transit district bus is much, much different than other school buses. Sure, there are amendments that have been offered in the past to this and I am sure they will continue until something is done. You have to recognize that a transit district is very different, it has a different area, it goes in a different constituency. These buses are used day and night, seven days a week, it is very different.

I am sorry, I didn't intend to mislead anybody by not mentioning the first paragraph. I felt that that was something of minor consequence. What I have done is, I have allowed the Chief of the Maine State Police Colonel Nichols, if he finds that he can stagger the school bus inspection stickers for Portland Transit District buses without great cost, without great hassle, without great inconvenience, then he will do so.

You have 44 buses in the City of Portland that are used primarily for school buses during school hours, and you have got an additional 30-some-odd buses that are used throughout the city. That is a total of something around 74 buses that are used to provide public transportation to the people of Portland. This bill is attempting to take care of some of the problems that were caused when once again a bill was passed, perhaps too hurriedly, in spite of the fact that people from the transit district said, hey, you are going to run into all kinds of problems with this. Standard 17 says that we can be exempted, why not exempt us? They said, no, this is a landmark piece of legislation, like a number of others that we have passed in this body. It was very well intentioned and basically very much needed, but there are different circumstances, this is one of them.

I would ask that you vote against indefinitely postponing this bill and pass it to be engrossed.

Mr. Strout of Corinth requested a roll call vote.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Hewes.

Mr. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to support the position of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Jensen. I would also like to point out that the way the debate has been going, I think the impression that may be received by members of the House is that as these transit buses carrying school

children are going to and from school, they also pick up the general public. It is my understanding that is not the case. Although these buses are used, say, 24 hours a day, seven days a week, during the times that they are carrying students, they are carrying students exclusively and not picking up members of the public at that time.

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

Mr. LaPOINTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Very briefly, I would like to make a comment and possibly raise a question, but I think ultimately the resolution of this particular problem, that is of transporting school children in Portland, is going to be solved one way and one way only unless we attempt to deal with the unique situation that exists in Portland rather flexibly and that is, we are just going to have to buy school buses. We all know, I think we all know, where ultimately the cost of those school buses is going to be borne. It is going to be partly borne by the state. I think that ultimately that might be what we would have to do. I don't know, maybe somebody could respond in another way.

But I would hope that the House would consider the unique situation that exists in Portland. I would hope that the House would not indefinitely postpone this bill this morning and that the House would attempt to accommodate some of these unique situations, or rather this unique situation that we have in Portland.

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am sure you are considering the position in Portland, but let's take a few minutes to consider the State of Maine. You have school buses that have a student capacity of around 60. If these buses are strictly enforced to the 13 inch minimum, they will carry 40. Now, how many more buses do you want to buy in the State of Maine. If you are going to address a problem peculiar to Portland, why not take a stance and do justice to the rest of the state?

Mr. Jensen of Portland was denied permission to speak a third time, there being objection.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mexico, Mr. Fraser.

Mr. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Nothing has been mentioned of the fact that these pay students that they pick up are students that live within a mile or mile and a half limit of the school. Ordinarily, they have to walk, but in stormy weather they will try to ride, and these are the pay students they are talking about.

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise on a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Kelleher, may pose his point.

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am surprised and disturbed that a member of this House would shut off another member from speaking before this body. I, myself, am somewhat tired and the lateness of the hour of debate but, nevertheless, what is important to John Jensen or what is important to Ed Kelleher in speaking their respective positions on the Floor of the House should be heard.

I do resent the fact that anyone would

shut off debate on any other member. We are elected to come down here to speak on behalf of our constituents and to speak in behalf of what we believe to be problems in our own area and I feel very disturbed with the fact that a member of this House was denied the right to speak in here.

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 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 Milo, Mr. Winship, that Bill, "An Act Concerning Transit District Buses Used for Elementary Pupil Transportation," House Paper 1996, L. D. 2177 and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Ault, Berry, G. W.; Birt, Burns, Byers, Call, Chonko, Dam, Doak, Dudley, Fenlason, Finemore, Greenlaw, Hall, Henderson, Hennessey, Higgins, Hunter, Hutchings, Immonen, Kauffman, Kelley, Laffin, Laverty, Lynch, MacEachern, McKernan, Mills, Morin, Morton, Pearson, Pierce, Powell, Raymond, Rollins, Shute, Smith, Sprowl, Strout, Susi, Teague, Torrey, Tozier, Truman, Twitchell, Usher, Wagner, Winship.

NAY — Bachrach, Bagley, Bennett, Berry, P. P.; Berube, Blodgett, Boudreau, Bowie, Bustin, Carpenter, Carroll, Carter, Churchill, Conners, Connolly, Cooney, Cox, Curran, P.; Curran, R.; Davies, DeVane, Dow, Drigotas, Durgin, Dyer, Farley, Faucher, Flanagan, Fraser, Garsoe, Goodwin, H.; Goodwin, K.; Gould, Gray, Hewes, Hinds, Hobbins, Hughes, Ingegneri, Jackson, Jacques, Jensen, Joyce, Kany, Kelleher, Kennedy, LaPointe, LeBlanc, Leonard, Lewin, Lewis, Lizotte, Lovell, Lunt, Mackel, MacLeod, Mahany, Martin, A.; Martin, R.; Maxwell, McMahan, Miskavage, Mitchell, Nadeau, Najarian, Norris, Palmer, Peakes, Pelosi, Perkins, S.; Perkins, T.; Peterson, P.; Peterson, T.; Post, Quinn, Rideout, Rolde, Saunders, Snow, Snowe, Spencer, Stubbs, Tarr, Theriault, Tierney, Tyndale, Walker, Webber, Wilfong.

ABSENT — Albert, Carey, Clark, Cote, Curtis, Farnham, Gauthier, Jalbert, Littlefield, McBreairty, Mulkern, Silverman, Talbot.

Yes, 48; No, 89; Absent, 13.

The SPEAKER: Forty-eight having voted in the affirmative and eighty-nine in the negative, with thirteen being absent, the motion does not prevail.

Thereupon, the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report was accepted and the Bill read once. Committee Amendment "A" (H-980) was read by the Clerk and adopted and the Bill assigned for second reading tomorrow.

#### Consent Calendar

##### First Day

In accordance with House Rule 49-A, the following items appeared on the Consent Calendar for the First Day:

Bill "An Act Relating to the Maine Transportation Board" — Committee on Transportation reporting "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-974) (H. P. 1858) (L. D. 2026)

On the request of Mr. Cooney of Sabattus, was removed from the Consent Calendar.

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

Mr. COONEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Since I took an interest in this bill when it was out on the floor before, and I see that there is a Committee Amendment that affects several sections, I would like an opportunity to review it and perhaps talk to a couple of the members of the Transportation Committee. I would ask that someone table the bill for a day or two.

On motion of Mrs. Najarian of Portland, tabled pending acceptance of the Committee Report and tomorrow assigned.

Bill "An Act to Amend the Definition of 'School Bus' to Include School Buses Rented from School Administrative Units by Nonprofit Organizations in Order to Transport Children" (Emergency) — Committee on Transportation reporting "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-973) (H. P. 1930) (L. D. 2117)

Bill "An Act to Reconstitute School Administrative District No. 42" (Emergency) — Committee on Education reporting "Ought to Pass" (H. P. 2059) (L. D. 2237)

No objections having been noted, the above items were ordered to appear on the Consent Calendar of March 16, under listing of the Second Day.

#### Consent Calendar

##### Second Day

In accordance with House Rule 49-A, the following items appeared on the Consent Calendar for the Second Day:

Bill "An Act Concerning Insurance Coverage for Blind Persons" (Emergency) (C. "A" S-425) (S. P. 637) (L. D. 2012)

Bill "An Act to Amend the Mandatory Reporting Law on Child Abuse and Neglect" (C. "A" H-968) (H. P. 1898) (L. D. 2078)

Bill "An Act Relating to the Trustees of the Dexter Utility District" (C. "A" H-971) (H. P. 2103) (L. D. 2269)

No objections having been noted at the end of the Second Legislative Day, the Senate Paper was passed to be engrossed as amended in concurrence, and the House Papers were passed to be engrossed as amended and sent up for concurrence.

#### Passed to Be Engrossed

##### Amended Bill

Bill "An Act to Amend the Medical Practices Act" (Emergency) (H. P. 1919) (L. D. 2107) (C. "A" H-966)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Second Reading, read the second time, passed to be engrossed as amended and sent up for concurrence.

#### Passed to Be Enacted

An Act to Establish the Belfast and Moosehead Lake Railroad Authority (S. P. 741) (L. D. 2292)

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

#### Orders of the Day

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

Resolve, Authorizing the Exchange of Certain Land in the Capitol Complex as

Recommended by the Capitol Planning Commission (H. P. 1968) (L. D. 2157)

Tabled — March 12 by Mrs. Najarian of Portland.

Pending — Passage to be Enacted.

On motion of Mrs. Najarian of Portland, retabled pending passage to be enacted and tomorrow assigned.

(Off Record Remarks)

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

Mr. DAM: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It is not very often that I rise on my feet to commend any newspaper in this state. Today, the part that I will commend is only for the feeling of concern that the Bangor Daily News has shown for their carriers, and that is about as far as my commendation goes.

This week, we will be under pressure for state employees pay raises. The state employees have said that the work has been doubled up on them in some instances because of non-hiring-of-help-or-not-replacing those that have retired. I feel for them, but I think I feel more today for the newsboys in this state than I feel for anyone else.

I think we are all aware that in previous sessions I have sponsored a bill for supplements and to pay the newsboys for doing their just work. I commend the House because on every occasion I have received a good vote on that bill. I am sorry today that that bill did not become law. Evidently the newspaper and, today especially, the Bangor Daily News feels that they have got the legislature and the State of Maine in their pockets. Not only are they going to wind the supplements to the carriers without pay, but they are going to force the carriers to bring additional help on to help them deliver their papers and still they are not going to give them any extra money.

I hope the time will come in the next session when I can see my bill become law, because after this happening over the weekend, I would even add more meat to that bill saying that when an additional or undue burden has been placed on a carrier where it necessitates him or her to go out and get additional help, that that newspaper will pay for the additional help.

This would not have been brought to my attention had it not been for an exceptionally good seatmate, Mr. Pearson from Old Town, who called me on Friday and told me what was happening in the Bangor area. It is also happening in other areas of the state.

The Bangor Daily News did see fit to notify the newsboys with a little printed statement which was put out last Friday, saying "Tomorrow's issue of the Bangor Daily News will contain approximately 80 pages. Because of its size, you may want a brother or sister or a friend to help you deliver." But they did not say they would pay any extra. What they said to the newsboys and the newsgirls, we are going to put the burden and the load on you, and if you don't want to make six or eight trips running back and forth to carry the papers, get your brother or sister to help you, or maybe we can find a friend. Well, I think this has gone on long enough in the State of Maine, when we are using the young people to further the economic gains and the profits of newspapers that would use those young people.

The reason for this speech today is to bring it to your attention and to bring it to the attention of the newspapers in this

state. I think I am coming back, and I will serve notice on those papers that not only will the supplement bill be back, but there will be more meat put to that supplement bill. I have not changed my mind from the speech I made when I had the bill before you. I am strongly considering going across this state and initiating a bill so that the legislature, both bodies, will either act on it or it will definitely go before the people, because this has gone on too long and it has gone too far.

Mr. Laffin of Westbrook was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. LAFFIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I recede and concur with Mr. Dam. He just left out one thing — don't forget the Guy Gannett newspapers.

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

Mr. CARPENTER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I won't keep you but just a second. I would point out that I haven't had an opportunity to speak to either Mr. Dam or Mr. Laffin this morning, but I rise because I am a little bit upset, and I think I have a right to be, and I think at least 95 other members of this House have a right to be also, perhaps unfortunately, because it is going to look like a conspiracy, but I also have a complaint with the Bangor Daily News.

I, for one, would just as soon that 80 page paper was never delivered on Saturday, at least one page of it. I am a little bit sick and tired of bearing the brunt of the hysteria, paranoia, fantasy and pipedreams of the political writer of the Bangor Daily News. Let me go back just a second to when I first came down here a year ago. I would go home Saturday after Saturday, pick up my copy of that paper, because that is the only paper, I do not have the option of the Guy Gannett papers, living in Houlton, pick up the Bangor Daily News, read an account of what had taken place the day before in this legislature and Saturday after Saturday I would wonder if they were talking about the same place I had sat the day before.

Saturday morning, also, there is an article, an editorial opinion or whatever, political article, written by Mr. Day every Saturday morning. The first one that came to my attention was one that said that members of this Legislature were doing all they could to drive Governor Longley insane, and it went from bad to worse, from there it has all been down hill. Saturday after Saturday I have to put with this pat and I don't like it.

Maybe I haven't gotten up before because this is the first one that happens to affect me. The headline in this one says, "Bad Loans and Sugarbeets". I will quote just part of it, "The ability of the Maine Legislature to blindly ignore the lessons of the past and once again plunge into areas where only fools dare to tread is a continual source of amazement to many people." He goes on from there. He declares the bill flew through this legislature when in fact it took almost three weeks to hammer out, get through a bill. He questions the integrity, and I quote again, "Hardly anybody outside of the Aroostook Delegation actually understood the bill." I would look around here at the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft and the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, the gentleman from Cumberland, and a few of the other people who supported us on this and I would point out to you that only two members of the Aroostook County

Delegation even spoke on this bill. That was the gentleman from Eagle Lake, and myself. The debate was carried by the members of the Appropriations Committee that reported this bill out unanimously.

It goes on from there, there is more fantasy, more cloak and dagger, more schemes, and I will quote one more time, "It was the political wheeling and dealing and bad loans like the sugarbeet fiasco which prompted Moody's Investment Counseling Service to downgrade Maine's bond rating from Triple A to Double A in April of 1974." I guess my point has been made.

I knew what was in the bill. I would like to think that 95 other people in this House knew what was in this bill and 27 down the other end of the hall. I put some time in this bill, as did most of the members of the delegation. I didn't put as much time, probably, as members of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Garsoe, the gentleman from Falmouth at the other end of the Hall, and I resent very much Mr. Day taking out his pipedreams and, unfortunately, and I am sure most of you realize this, unfortunately, many of my constituents take this as fact, not opinion.

I had a few calls over the weekend and I had to sit down, the bill is all of two pages long, it was real difficult to explain, real difficult. I only regret that he is not here today.

On motion of Mrs. Tarr of Bridgton, Adjourned until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.