

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*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1975

KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

SENATE

Tuesday, May 6, 1975

Senate called to order by the President.
Prayer by Rev. Andrew J. Spohrer,
First Free Baptist Church, Dexter:

Almighty God, this morning we praise you for your greatness and your majesty and your special blessing to us here in this State of Maine. We praise you for all the privileges that we enjoy and the freedom of our country. We praise you, Father, that we can rule ourselves, and we pray for these people this morning as they decide and as they deliberate on these matters of importance, that you will give them that divine wisdom that the end will be to your glory and your praise and to the good of all the citizens of our state. Give them wisdom, Father, for we all have our differences of opinion and there can be but one best solution, so guide them in this way, and we will praise you for the result, in our Saviour's name. Amen.

Reading of the Journal of yesterday.

Papers from the House
Joint Order
STATE OF MAINE

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

WHEREAS, The Legislature has learned of the Outstanding Achievement and Exceptional Accomplishment of Cape Elizabeth High School Girls Swimming Team Which has won 103 Consecutive Meets, Broken 7 State Records and Become State Champions for the 3rd Consecutive Year

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. (H. P. 1565)

Comes from the House, Read and Passed.

Which was Read and Passed in concurrence.

Joint Order

WHEREAS, the cost and scope of governmental services, including education and public assistance, have increased dramatically in recent years and raised the question of revenue increases, including the possibility of tax changes at both the local and state level; and

WHEREAS, the increasingly complex economic, social and other ramifications of any tax change demand a comprehensive view of tax policy at the local, state and federal levels; and

WHEREAS, vital information as to the burdens and effects of our state and local taxes is recorded by the various executive and legislative branch agencies, yet is rarely compiled and made available so as to give Legislators a comprehensive view of the tax structure of the State of Maine; and

WHEREAS, because of this lack of information, Legislators must often pursue tax reforms through narrow, piecemeal legislation and at times are not

able to judge the full consequences of their decisions; and

WHEREAS, if the need for substantial changes in state or local taxes is eventually agreed upon, then alternative tax plans, offering examples of coordinated tax increases and their effects on the people and economy of this State, must be available as guides for the preparation of tax reform legislation; now, therefore, be it

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Council be authorized, through the Joint Standing Committee on Taxation of the 107th Legislature, to study the state tax structure and to compile practical, concise background papers on the mechanisms and practical effects of current and potential state and local taxes. These background papers shall utilize information currently compiled at the local, state and federal levels and shall serve as drafting guides for new tax legislation. Such background papers shall include at least the following analyses:

1. An evaluation of existing and potential state and local taxes to determine whether their tax burdens are or would be regressive or progressive;

2. Economic profiles of different hypothetical categories of state citizens who bear the burdens of the different state taxes, for example, taxpayers by significant income brackets and sources, family sizes, consumption, property holdings, needs;

3. Complete descriptions of the state's present tax bases and possible alternative and additional tax bases, for example, the taxation of the currently exempt business inventories;

4. A listing of all current tax exemptions, including estimates of lost revenues for each exemption and an analysis of whether the goals of each exemption might be better promoted in other ways, including the collection of the lost taxes and the payment of state subsidies;

5. An evaluation of existing and possible alternative tax relief programs as to their cost, effectiveness, accuracy and the extent to which they aid the population they are designed to reach;

6. Utilizing the state's current program based budget and other information, a compilation of a "poverty budget" which would outline the state, federal and local resources that go to different categories of the poor, breaking down expenditures so as to show the amounts spent for different goals, including housing, jobs, health and food, and on different kinds of poor, including the elderly, disabled, transient and marginally employed; thereby promoting greater accuracy in poverty tax relief programs;

7. A compilation of alternative tax programs which would be used to guide Legislators seeking to promote tax reform; such alternative tax programs shall set forth new combinations of taxes, utilizing both old and new tax bases. Each new tax program shall be analyzed as to its:

A. Economic efficiency: For example, does it upset relative product costs, thereby tending to distort consumption, production and locational decisions;

B. Elasticity of tax yield: If elasticity is high, the tax collections respond to changes in economic activity, thereby affecting a citizen's spendable income by taking relatively more funds out of the income stream in an economic upswing and placing more in the income stream in

a downswing; in times of prosperity, high elasticity allows increased expenditures to be financed without changes in tax rates; and

C. Progressivity; and

8. An analysis of increases in the State personal or corporate income taxes, excise taxes or sales taxes as to their economic effect on jobs, Maine businesses and the location of new industries in Maine; and be it further

ORDERED, that any appropriate agency of the Executive and Legislative branches, including the Legislative Finance Office, the Department of Finance and Administration, the Department of Health and Welfare, the Department of Commerce and Industry and the Department of Manpower Affairs, shall be respectfully asked to compile and provide such information or studies on the state tax structure as is necessary to assist the committee in their study; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Council report the results of its findings, together with any proposed recommendations and final drafts of necessary implementing legislation, to the next special or regular session of the Legislature; and be it further

ORDERED, upon passage in concurrence, that suitable copies of this Order be transmitted forthwith to said agencies as notice of this directive. (H. P. 1555)

Come from the House, Read and Passed.

Which was Read.

On motion by Mr. Speers of Kennebec, tabled, pending Passage.

Committee Reports
House

The following Ought Not to Pass reports shall be placed in the legislative files without further action pursuant to Rule 17-A of the Joint Rules:

Bill, "An Act to Appropriate Funds for Repair and Maintenance and Operation of the State-owned Dam on Dead River in Androscoggin County." (H. P. 869) (L. D. 1046)

Bill, "An Act to Appropriate Funds to the State Parole Board for Payment of Appointed Attorneys Representing Indigent Parolees." (H. P. 826) (L. D. 1009)

Bill, "An Act to Permit the Governor to Suspend Certain Proposed Public Utility Rate Increases and Restructurings During an Economic Emergency Pending the Outcome of an Investigation." (H. P. 598) (L. D. 741)

Bill, "An Act to Require Municipal Clerks to Account for Absentee Ballot Forms and to Regulate Absentee Voting by Certain Institutional Patients." (H. P. 416) (L. D. 503)

Bill, "An Act to Permit Certain Candidates for Public Office to Purchase Voting Lists from Municipalities at One-third the Regular Cost of those Lists and to Limit the Cost of those Lists." (H. P. 1049) (L. D. 1337)

Bill, "An Act to Clarify the Law Relating to Disposal of Septic Tank or Cesspool Waste." (H. P. 1171) (L. D. 1472)

Bill, "An Act to Establish Run-Off Primaries." (H. P. 1173) (L. D. 1468)

Bill, "An Act to Insure that Certain Applications under the Site Location of Development Act List the Name of the Responsible Professional." (H. P. 1192) (L. D. 1488)

Bill, "An Act Prohibiting Repricing of Items in Grocery Stores." (H. P. 1214) (L. D. 1528)

Bill, "An Act Concerning Municipal Recreation Fund Grants by the Department of Conservation." (H. P. 1091) (L. D. 1370)

Bill, "An Act Appropriating Funds to the Department of Mental Health and Corrections for the Establishment of a Short Term Adolescent Inpatient Care Program." (H. P. 1231) (L. D. 1538)

Bill, "An Act Relating to the Sharing of State Sales Tax Revenue." (H. P. 1461) (L. D. 1734)

Bill, "An Act Relating to Bonded Indebtedness." (H. P. 912) (L. D. 1110)

Bill, "An Act to Insure Citizen Participation in the Promulgation, Amendment and Repeal of Agency Rules." (H. P. 1412) (L. D. 1734)

Leave to Withdraw

The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on, Resolve, Providing Funds for Young Women's Christian Association Fair Harbor Emergency Shelter in Portland, Maine, an Emergency Shelter for Girls. (H. P. 906) (L. D. 1105)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on, Bill, "An Act Relating to Compliance with Federal Fair Labor Standards Act as to Working Patients of Mental Health Institutes and the Pineland Center and Appropriating Funds Therefore." (H. P. 1011) (L. D. 1278)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on, Bill, "An Act to Provide a Career Ladder and 40-Hour Week for Correctional Employees." (H. P. 1048) (L. D. 1336)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The Committee on Fisheries and Wildlife on, Bill, "An Act to Provide Funds for Fishway on the Kennebec River." (H. P. 1178) (L. D. 1470)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The Committee on Fisheries and Wildlife on, Bill, "An Act to Establish Certain Big Game Hunting License Categories and to Increase Certain Fees for Hunting Permits." (H. P. 1318) (L. D. 1596)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The Committee on Natural Resources on, Bill, "An Act Relating to Requirements for Waste Water Treatment Plants under Environmental Protection Laws." (H. P. 1183) (L. D. 1476)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The Committee on Public Utilities on, "Bill, "An Act to Amend the Charter of the Brunswick and Topsham Water District." (H. P. 674) (L. D. 849)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The Committee on Public Utilities on, Bill, "An Act to Establish the Maine Commission on Cable Television." (H. P. 1344) (L. D. 1800)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The Committee on Agriculture on, Bill, "An Act Relating to License and Enforcement of Custom Establishments under Maine Meat Inspection." (H. P. 1262) (L. D. 1556)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The Committee on Health and Institutional Services on, Bill, "An Act to Define Rodents as Private Nuisances under the Public Health Statutes." (H. P. 651) (L. D. 803)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The Committee on Business Legislation on, Bill, "An Act to Require Apprentice Hairdressers to Practice Hairdressing under the Supervision of a Registered Instructor." (H. P. 547) (L. D. 675)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The Committee on Taxation on, Bill, "An Act to Change State Income Tax Rate on All Taxable Corporations to Read 6% with an Additional 4% Surtax on Corporate Earnings over \$25,000." (H. P. 461) (L. D. 564)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The Committee on Taxation on, Bill, "An Act Imposing an Inheritance Tax on Life Insurance Proceeds." (H. P. 484) (L. D. 603)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The Committee on Taxation on, Bill, "An Act Providing for the Use of Income Averaging as a Method of Filing Maine Income Tax Returns." (H. P. 513) (L. D. 630)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The Committee on Taxation on, Bill, "An Act to Allow Trade-in Tax Credit for Camp Trailers." (H. P. 1409) (L. D. 1742)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The Committee on Taxation on, Bill, "An Act Relating to Municipal Excise Taxes on Boats and Motors." (H. P. 1455) (L. D. 1733)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on, Bill, "An Act to Authorize and Provide Revenue for the Installation of Flood Warning Devices on Major Rivers in the State of Maine." (H. P. 1131) (L. D. 1423)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on, Bill, "An Act Making Capital Construction and Improvement Appropriations for the University of Maine from the General Fund for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1976." (H. P. 1062) (L. D. 1342)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The Committee on State Government on, Bill, "An Act to Authorize Community and Rural Development Districts." (H. P. 970) (L. D. 1221)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The Committee on State Government on, Bill, "An Act Concerning Membership on the Governing Bodies of Regional Planning Commissions." (H. P. 1046) (L. D. 1334)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The Committee on Labor on, Bill, "An Act Relating to Notice or Severance Pay by Employer." (H. P. 1083) (L. D. 1363)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The Committee on Labor on, Bill, "An Act to Repeal the Seasonality Provisions of the Employment Security Law." (H. P. 351) (L. D. 435)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The Committee on Labor on, Bill, "An Act Defining Applicability of Federal Fair Labor Standards Act to Inmates of Correctional Institutions." (H. P. 1039) (L. D. 1329)

Reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

Come from the House, the reports Read and Accepted.

Which reports were Read and Accepted in concurrence.

Ought to Pass

The Committee on Local and County Government on, Bill, "An Act Relating to Fire Protection for Township 8, R. 4 and Township 10, R. 6" (H. P. 885) (L. D. 1056)

Reported that the same Ought to Pass.

The Committee on Taxation on, Bill, "An Act to Exempt from the Sale Tax Sales of Goods and Services Essential for the Care and Maintenance of Seeing Eye Dogs." (H. P. 1423) (L. D. 1693)

Reported that the same Ought to Pass.

Come from the House, the Bills Passed to be Engrossed.

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

Ought to Pass — As Amended

The Committee on Election Laws on, Bills, "An Act Relating to the Validity of Absentee Ballots." (H. P. 31) (L. D. 39)

Reported that the same Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-234).

Come from the House, the Bill Passed to be Engrossed as Amended by Committee Amendment "A".

Which report was Read and Accepted in concurrence and the Bill Read Once. Committee Amendment "A" was Read and Adopted in concurrence and the Bill, as Amended, Tomorrow Assigned for Second Reading.

The Committee on Performance Audit on, Bill, "An Act Relating to Personnel Classification and Functions of the Review and Evaluation and Fraud Investigation Division of the Department of Audit." (H. P. 1122) (L. D. 1409)

Reported that the same Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-235).

Come from the House, the Bill Passed to be Engrossed as Amended by Committee Amendment "A".

Which report was Read, Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Speers of Kennebec, tabled pending Acceptance of the Committee Report.

Divided Report

The Majority of the Committee on Taxation on,

Bill, "An Act Relating to the Valuation of Farmland." (H. P. 550) (L. D. 678)

Reported that the same Ought Not to pass.

Signed:

Senator:

JACKSON of Cumberland
Representatives:

IMMONEN of West Paris
MORTON of Farmington
FINEMORE of Bridgewater
SUSI of Pittsfield
TWITCHELL of Norway
DAM of Skowhegan
MAXWELL of Jay
DRIGOTAS of Auburn

The Minority of the same Committee on

the same subject matter reported that the same Ought to Pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-237).

Signed:
Senators:

WHYMAN of Washington
MERRILL of Cumberland

Representatives:

MULKERN of Portland
COX of Brewer

Comes from the House, Bill and accompanying papers Indefinitely Postponed.

Which reports were Read.

Thereupon on motion by Mr. Wyman of Washington, tabled and tomorrow Assigned, pending Acceptance of Either Committee Report.

Divided Report

The Majoriey of the Committee on Liquor Control on,

Bill, "An Act to Equalize the Retail Price of Alcoholic Beverages Throughout the State." (H. P. 403) (L. D. 492)

Reported that the same Ought Not to Pass.

Signed:

Senators:

GRAFFAM of Cumberland
CARBONNEAU of Androscoggin
DANTON of York

Representatives:

IMMONEN of West Paris
RAYMOND of Lewiston
MAXWELL of Jay
LIZOTTE of Biddeford
TWITCHELL of Norway
PERKINS of Blue Hill
DYER of South Portland

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

Signed:

Representatives:

PIERCE of Waterville
FAUCHER of Solon
JACQUES of Lewiston

Comes from the House, the Minority report Read and Accepted and the Bill Passed to be Engrossed.

Which reports were Read.

Mr. Graffam of Cumberland then moved that the Senate accept the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report of the Committee.

On motion by Mr. O'Leary of Oxford, a division was had. 18 having voted in the affirmative, and nine having voted in the negative, the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report of the Committee was Accepted in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

(See Action Later in Today's Session.)

Second Readers

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

House

Bill, "An Act to Provide a Uniform Filing Deadline for Candidates for State and National Office within the State of Maine." (H. P. 1128) (L. D. 1404)

Bill, "An Act Extending Eagle Lake Water and Sewer District to the Plantation of Wallagrass." (H. P. 1153) (L. D. 1447)

Bill, "An Act Authorizing the Use of Facsimile Signature on Certain Documents by the Secretary of State." (H. P. 1270) (L. D. 1570)

Bill, "An Act to Extend the Territorial Limits of the Hallowell Water District." (H. P. 1311) (L. D. 1589)

Bill, "An Act Creating the Advisory Committee on State Telecommunications." (H. P. 1443) (L. D. 1744)

Bill, "An Act Relating to Compensation of Full-time Deputies in All Counties." (H. P. 1556) (L. D. 1869)

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

House - As Amended

Bill, "An Act to Correct Technical Errors in Laws Relating to Marine Resources." (H. P. 1338) (L. D. 1624)

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

Reconsidered Matter

Mr. Berry of Cumberland then moved that the Senate reconsider its prior action whereby on Bill, "An Act to Equalize the Retail Price of Alcoholic Beverages Throughout the State", (H. P. 403) (L. D. 492), the Senate Accepted the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report of the Committee.

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

Bill, "An Act Relating to Amount of Annual Excise Tax on Railroads." (H. P. 1494) (L. D. 1740)

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

Sent down for concurrence.

Senate

Bill, "An Act to Provide for the Appointment of Deputy District Attorneys." (S. P. 321) (L. D. 1098)

Which was Read a Second Time.

Mr. Curtis of Penobscot then presented Senate Amendment "A" and moved its Adoption.

Senate Amendment "A", Filing No. S-120, was Read and Adopted and the Bill, as Amended, Passed to be Engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

Bill, "An Act Relating to the Osteopathic Student Loan Fund." (S. P. 342) (L. D. 1144)

Bill, "An Act to Clarify Provisions Concerning Travel Expenses of Members of Boards and Commissions." (S. P. 385) (L. D. 1240)

Bill, "An Act Concerning the Fee for a First-time Real Estate Broker's License." (S. P. 404) (L. D. 1289)

Bill, "An Act to Amend the Charter of the Aroostook-Prestile Treatment District." (S. P. 467) (L. D. 1562)

Which were Read a Second Time and Passed to be Engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

Senate - As Amended

Bill, "An Act Concerning the Definition of Monthly Billing Cycle under the Maine Consumer Credit Code." (S. P. 162) (L. D. 536)

Bill, "An Act to Establish Compensation for District Court Bailiffs for Work at Other Than Regular Hours." (S. P. 409) (L. D. 1291)

Bill, "An Act Redesignating the Department of Health and Welfare as the Department of Human Services and the Bureau of Human Services as the Bureau of Resource Development." (S. P. 428) (L. D. 1394)

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

Sent down for concurrence.

Enactors

The Committee on Engrossed Bills

reported as truly and strictly engrossed the following:

An Act to Amend the Charter of the Winthrop Water District. (S. P. 328) (L. D. 1114).

An Act to Amend the Portland Renewal Authority Law. (S. P. 389) (L. D. 1249)

An Act Relating to Employment of Minors. (S. P. 501) (L. D. 1852)

An Act to Tax the Personal Property of Domestic Life Insurance Companies. (H. P. 695) (L. D. 872)

An Act to Exempt Incorporated Nonprofit Volunteer Literacy Programs from the Sales Tax. (H. P. (90) (L. D. 963)

(On motion by Mr. Huber of Cumberland, Placed on the Special Appropriations Table.)

An Act Relating to Motor Vehicle Inspection Mechanic Licenses. (H. P. 951) (L. D. 1189)

An Act Relating to Railroad Crossings. (H. P. 1013) (L. D. 1271)

An Act to Expand the Right-to-Know Law to Cover the Boards of Trustees of the University of Maine and of the Maine Maritime Academy. (H. P. 1018) (L. D. 1316)

An Act Increasing Indebtedness of Jackman Sewer District. (H. P. 1025) (L. D. 1318)

An Act Relating to Sources of Supply and Authority of Yarmouth Water District. (H. P. 1076) (L. D. 1356)

An Act Concerning the Powers of Officers of Religious Societies (H. P. 1164) (L. D. 1463)

An Act to Authorize the Board of Environmental Protection to Solicit and Receive Testimony on the Economic Effects of Proposed Developments. (H. P. 1500) (L. D. 1823)

An Act Amending the Lead Poisoning Control Act. (H. P. 1531) (L. D. 1847)

An Act Relating to Reciprocal and Apportioned Registration of Vehicles. (H. P. 1542) (L. D. 1853)

Which except for the tabled matter, were Passed to be Enacted and, having been signed by the President, were by the Secretary presented to the Governor for his approval.

An Act Creating the Dickey-Lincoln Power Authority. (S. P. 189) (L. D. 662)

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

Mr. TROTZKY: Mr. President, I request a roll call on this matter and urge the members of the Senate to vote against enactment of this bill.

The PRESIDENT: A roll call has been requested.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Cyr.

Mr. CYR: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I think possibly the good Senator from Penobscot will probably be winning the award of the year for optimism. This bill which we are now debating has been passed by the House after three attacks by a two to one margin. It was passed in these chambers by a comfortable margin, and I say "comfortable" because it wasn't given a chance in the first place to stand up.

You know, all of us have at one time or other certain bills that we feel for. For the past four months I have rationed my time in debates just for this issue because I feel for this bill. I have been involved with this legislation or this project since 1959 when the late Governor Clauson appointed me to his Quoddy Power Committee and in the

engineers report there was a paragraph that really struck me. It said "Rankin rapids by itself on the St. John would be very desirable." I have devoted all my political life to trying to make this project come about. I was born and raised on the St. John River and I know what this project would mean to us. I have even changed parties. That is how strong I felt about this issue. I have changed parties because I would not submit myself to the pressure of the vested interests which were applied to me through my party. This is how strong I feel about this bill.

Now, I think possibly the issue was brought about in today's editorial in the Portland Press just as well as I can present it to you. It says "Planning for Dickey", and they talk about a coalition of environmental groups, the Friends of the St. John, which as you know from probably reading in the papers that last week they were in Washington trying to kill another appropriation of a million dollars to try to finish these studies, and I will read some quotations from this article.

"Friends of the St. John believe the project cannot be justified either on economic grounds or in terms of the energy it will produce. We in turn continue to hope that the congress will persist in its determination to authorize the planning funds for the project. The funds in part will be used to determine the authenticity of the claims of the environmentalists. The money will be used to weigh the benefits for the proposed hydro project against its anticipated costs and to measure environmental dislocation against the alternative recreational possibilities which will result from a dam high on the St. John. We hope that the planning funds will reveal that the project is both economically feasible and environmentally sound."

I have to apologize to the Senate because I thought possibly this would come a little later and I wasn't prepared; I left my notes home.

"We believe that the remaining hydro electric sites ought to be developed as a means of meeting the region's rapidly expanding power demands, and we believe that the proposed site purposely located upstream in order to maintain the integrity of the Allagash Wilderness Waterways is thoroughly defensible. Obviously the Friends of the St. John do not share our belief any more than we are inclined to share theirs. And it is precisely because of this lack of agreement that the million dollars in planning funds ought to be kept in the federal budget. Hopefully the studies undertaken with the funds will provide solid answers."

Now, the bill that I have presented to you includes this amendment which we debated in former debates: "This act shall take effect only if the following conditions are satisfied: "And of the conditions that have to be satisfied, first of all, the economic feasibility has to be favorable. Obviously if the figures tossed around by The Friends of the St. John of a billion dollars are true, then this project will never produce economical power that can be sold.

The second condition is that the environmental impact study has to be favorable. So naturally there is going to be some tradeoff of resources, but this study, if it comes out favorably, means that the benefits will surpass the damages that it might cause to the environment.

Now, if these two studies are favorable, then the federal government has one year

to commit itself to the project. We are not trying to compete with the federal government. That is not what we are saying. What we are saying is that if these two studies are favorable, then it means that the State of Maine has a resource of energy that should be developed. Now, these studies are going to be thorough, they are going to be complete, and they are going to be well documented. You can be very sure of that, because this is a test case. This is the first major hydro project since the 1969 federal law was passed that every public project has to submit itself to an environmental study, so this is a test case, and you can be sure that the figures that are going to come out are going to be well documented.

Now, if those figures prove that it is not economical, you don't have to worry, it is not going to be built. It is that simple. If the cost of the power is too expensive, it is not going to be built. They won't be able to market this power. It is that simple. However, if the arguments presented by the opposition are exaggerated and have no foundation, then the impact study will be favorable. And that means that we here in the State of Maine, particularly during this energy crunch that we are having, should accept our responsibilities and do what is needed to accomplish this.

You know, in our last debate I mentioned to you that these Friends of the St. John are a breed that die hard, and I even referred to them as dying just as hard as the spruce budworm. Well, I notice that one of them thawed with the spring weather last week and has been lobbying in the back here since last Friday. He used to overwinter on the second floor downstairs until January 2, when he was replaced. I understand that they have been trying to make this a party issue. However, I am told by some very good friends of mine in the opposite party that they haven't succeeded.

Let's look at the implications that this would have. This is passing the House at two to one. If it is defeated here in the Senate, which has a Republican majority, and these two studies come out favorably and say that we have a resource that should be developed, how do you think this is going to settle with the voters of Maine, having been turned down by the Republican Senate. Assuming that the project is done by the federal government, who has the majority in Congress? Naturally, the question is going to be who brought it to you, or who developed those natural resources that you have?

Now, in this energy crunch we have to be foresighted, we have to look ahead. We are told in pretty nearly every article that we pick up that our world's supply of oil, at the rate that we are using it now, will be depleted by the year 2000. Assuming that these two studies are favorable and that this project is started — it can't get started before 1977 — it will take seven years of construction and two years to fill up the reservoir, so that is nine years and takes us to 1986. We have got 14 years left to find another resource. You might say we have Quoddy, possibly but not probably.

You might say, well, we should go nuclear. To some extent, yes, but the more nuclear plants we build, the more we are going to need this peaking power source up here, and nuclear plants cannot produce peaking power and do it efficiently. So you are going to need the hydro, which is an ideal resource for peaking power.

You might say, well, we have the sun and we have the wind. These are

potentials, these are possibilities, but we have a resource here in our own state that we have been studying for the past 25 years, and we know that hydro power is not experimental any more; it is the first one that we ever had.

So how are you going to answer your constituents in 1986 when the lights go out? What are you going to answer to your constituency? These are things that should be reflected upon.

Now, we heard objections. Some people will say we don't want the State of Maine to get into the power business. If you read 662, the State of Maine is not getting into the power business. If the economic feasibility study is favorable, it means that we have power that is competitive. If it is competitive, there is going to be demand for it. Our growth is approximately 8 percent a year, which means that by 1986 we are going to need double the capacity that we have now. We are going to need the pumped storage, we are going to need the nuclear plants, we are going to need all the power we can get from Canada, if they will keep on selling it to us, but we are also going to need to keep Lincoln School. Now, if that power is competitive, we know there is going to be a market for it. So the power will be sold to the existing utilities and the contract with the utilities for this power will secure the bonds. And in 662, it tells you right there that the credit of the State of Maine is not pledged whatsoever.

Why an authority? It is because an authority, being a quasi-governmental function, can sell tax-exempt bonds, bonds that you can sell for 2 percent less on interest rates, which means in this case that, assuming the project is going to cost half a billion dollars, 500 million dollars with the transmission lines, 2 percent of that is 10 million dollars a year that the ratepayers won't have to pay through interest. This is the only reason for this authority.

If you read the report of Professor Dineen of the University of New Brunswick which he made for his government in 1973, you will see that Dickey is the only tool that will stop flooding on the St. John River.

I don't know how much deeper I should get into this, but there is one thing for sure: some day we are going to have to account to somebody for the action we are going to take here this morning. I know very well that some of you are probably locked into positions so you cannot move. For whatever reason, I appreciate that. However, those of you who are not locked into position, I hope you will support me on this motion here today.

This is standby legislation and it cannot be activated until three conditions are met. First, the economic feasibility study must be favorable. The environmental impact study must be favorable. Then the federal government has one year to commit itself. This is only standby legislation. But some day we may be glad to have it.

Now, if The Friends of the St. John are going to chase this around Washington and around the federal government, and if Senator Corson wants to introduce some of his yellow nose vole and transfer Bigelow Mountain into a mole hill, or if some unknown biologist from California comes up here and finds a rare species of cricket and says we can't have a dam there because we are going to change their habitat, then I don't think we want that. We also have a rare species of frog along the St. John, and they are called bilingual,

and I wouldn't be surprised to see The Friends of the St. John put them on their endangered list unless their ponds are flooded every spring.

Now, if we have that kind of delaying tactic and delaying action, and we are going to have another Alaskan oil pipeline, then the governor can turn around and appoint his commission after a year of this stuff. After a year, if the federal government doesn't commit itself within a year, the governor can appoint his commission and go to work.

Now, what I am asking you, what I am begging you, those of you who haven't been locked into opposition, I hope you will accept some of the statements that I have given you here this morning at face value. I have spent a lot of time on this thing, and possibly the outcome of these studies may be against me. If they are, I will have to accept the outcome. But if they are not, if they are favorable, then we certainly would not be accepting our responsibility as reasonable legislators by voting this down here this morning. So I hope you will stick by me and let's put this on standby legislation. This will force the federal government also. I am not trying to compete with the federal government. If the federal government wants to build it, O.K., that is fine. But if not, then let's build it ourselves. Thank you very much.

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

Mr. TROTZKY: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: The distinguished Senator from Aroostook asked a pertinent question when he said what are you going to tell your constituents. There is no question about it, there is a demand for energy now, and there will be a greater demand in the future, so I will try to give an answer to that.

In Dickey-Lincoln we are talking about, what we are talking about really, is peaking power. The New England River Basins Commission came out with a study in the New England area and they recommended five pump storage sites for Maine, and these sites would take care of peaking power in the future.

The PRESIDENT: Is the Senate ready for the question? The pending question is the enactment of L.D. 662, An Act Creating the Dickey-Lincoln Power Authority. A roll call has been requested. In order for the Chair to order a roll call, it must be the expressed desire of more than one-fifth of those Senators present and voting. Will all those Senators in favor of a roll call please rise in their places until counted.

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

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Speers.

Mr. SPEERS: Mr. President, I will be very brief. I would like to make very clear that in spite of the efforts of the good Senator from Aroostook, Senator Cyr, to make this a party issue or to suggest that perhaps it is a party issue, I would like to make it very clear that it is not a party issue. And I would like to explain my vote on this matter by the statement in his last comments. The good Senator from Aroostook mentioned that if the federal government does not build this project that the State of Maine should go ahead and build it. I would simply like to ask the question as to where the billions of dollars are going to come from in order to build a project of such magnitude?

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

Mrs. CUMMINGS: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: It is with regret that I have to inform the good Senator from Aroostook, Senator Cyr, that I am going to change my vote today and I am going to vote against this bill of his that he has worked so hard and sincerely to get our approval of. I would like to make it clear that my change of vote has nothing to do with the actions of the Executive Council, nor has this change of vote anything to do with any party orientation. I'm changing my vote because I have been given information which I think is of great importance, and I would like to share it with you.

I have no objection to public power. I have read enough to realize that most of the states who give the best rates to their customers have a combination of public and private power, and I am hoping this will happen in Maine some day, but I think that this peaking power plant is not what Maine needs. We are in greater need of a plant that will give us the base load. The peaking demand in the Boston area is about six hours, but because of the small flow in the St. John River the peaking output of the Dickey-Lincoln will be only two and a half hours, not enough to be of real help in meeting the demand. In fact, the flow in the St. John is so small that if the generators were to operate at full capacity the dam would be emptied in less than two months, and then it would take two years to fill.

It will cost approximately 500 million dollars, which is significantly more than the fossil plant that is in the process of being constructed on Cousins Island. It annually will produce 15 percent as much power as that fossil fuel plant.

Also, I think those of you who have been up around Flagstaff Lake have seen that that is no place for recreation: The shores of that lake are so encumbered with the sunken and drowned trees that it is impossible to use it for boating and, because of the fluctuation in the shoreline as the water is increased or allowed to escape, it is no place to build a camp. This would be true of this dam and would therefore, in my mind, create 64 miles of total waste.

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

Mr. JACKSON: Mr. President, Might I ask through the Chair the committee report.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Cumberland, Senator Jackson, has posed a question through the Chair, the Secretary will read the committee report.

The SECRETARY: The majority report of the Committee on Energy, to which was referred the bill entitled "An Act Creating the Dickey-Lincoln Power Authority" (S. P. 189) (L. D. 662), have had the same under consideration and ask leave to report that the same ought not to pass. Signed by Byers of Newcastle, Torrey of Poland, Jackson of Yarmouth, Durgin of Kittery, Connolly of Portland, Kelleher of Bangor, Senator Trotzky, Bennett of Caribou, Senator Roberts, Greenlaw of Stonington, Davies of Orono.

The Minority report of the Committee on Energy, to which was referred the same bill, have had the same under consideration and ask leave to report that the same ought to pass. Signed by Farley

of Biddeford and Senator Cianchette of Somerset.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Somerset, Senator Cianchette.

Mr. CIANCHETTE: Mr. President, I will give my impressions of the committee report, and there may be other impressions. The bill, as it was before the Energy Committee, was in to to unacceptable to me, and I think to many on the committee, and I made the motion in committee that the bill ought to pass on the theory that let's get it out on the floor and let these things be thrashed out with amendments, because I thought that more people in the legislature than just the Energy Committee would be interested in this particular bill, which I believe proved true. So I think maybe there are some on the committee who voted ought not to pass on the bill as it was before the committee.

I would like to say something else in defense of this bill. Unless we have total unfaith in our government and in the Corps of Engineers, I believe any move made and any reasons given here about why we should not build Dickey concerning either the environment or the economics are just out of place at this time and I don't feel should be considered, because the bill, as you know, was amended to say that first the environmental impact study must be positive and the economic impact must be positive or, the bill says, the project will not be pursued. That is what the bill says.

Now, I don't feel capable and I don't feel that I can be the judge. I don't feel that I have all the information available. I don't know if that pond is going to rise 38 feet or lower 42 feet, or anything of the sort. I don't have that knowledge, and I question whether anybody in this room has that knowledge. We don't know what is going to happen up there. We don't know what these studies are going to say. And to prejudice them and say that it has got to be just peaking power, or it is going to be a waste land, or any of these things, really, if these things are true, neither the environmental impact study will prove positive nor will the economic impact study prove positive, and in that case the bill is dead.

So I really feel that if anybody is voting against this bill and the only reason they have got to vote against this bill is because they are against a project being built on the St. John River, period, without any consideration to the economics or the environment, they are just plain against it, period, and they don't care to see any development up there for their own reasons, but I think those are the real reasons we are talking about, and if you have any faith in the Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Government, then I think you can support this bill and feel perfectly safe that your interests are going to be protected. So I urge the passage of this bill.

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

Mr. CYR: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: In answer to Senator Jackson on the report, asking for the report, may I bring out the fact that more than half of the legislators who signed the "Ought Not" report were not at the hearing.

In answer to Senator Speers' question of how are we going to get the money and how are we going to finance this, I thought I had mentioned it in my presentation but maybe it wasn't emphatic enough. If the economic feasibility report comes out

favorably, it means that you have power that you can sell on the competitive market. Now, how this is going to be done, assuming that the authority were to do it, they would contract out to the existing utilities a block of power and sign a contract for that power. And it is these contracts that would secure the bonds. This is hardly any different from the concept of Maine Yankee, Maine Yankee is a coalition of 11 utilities, eight of which are outside of the State of Maine, and they are getting the amount of power depending on their contribution. Now, if Maine Yankee had gone through an authority, you would save five or six million dollars a year in interest.

In answer to Senator Cummings on the mud pond created by Flagstaff, and all that, let me bring out the difference in projects that we have. Flagstaff, or that dam, is what they call the run of the river, which means that they haven't got much of a head pond. Now in this right here, the storage would be at Dickey, and this would be the storage that would feed the plant downriver. You have downriver plants at Grand Falls, at Beechwood and Mactaquac. Now, those plants are suffering today from lack of water.

Also, as to the argument that this would cost too much and would take too many of our resources for the amount of power that would be produced, let me bring out to you the fact that only one-third of the river is now developed, only one-third. There are seven plants on the river developing 644,000 KW. With the advent of Dickey this would be raised to 2,263,000 kilowatts, and the key to it is Dickey.

Now, unfortunately for us, in a way, the downriver plants are all in Canada, and those are the plants that will benefit the most, so Canada will benefit more than we are from the construction of this project. However, let me remind you that in 1973 New Brunswick exported to Maine and the New England Pool 2.8 billion kilowatt hours. This is almost the total production of the river, which is over 4 billion kilowatt hours. So when you are talking of this project you don't want to just isolate the dam and say this is what it is going to do and this is what it is going to cost. You have to look at the whole river.

Now, the whole river, as I mentioned, will be increased by two-thirds of its production as we have it now, and this is where the downriver benefit comes in. Studies have been made, Canadian and American studies have been made, that signifies that over 350,000,000 kilowatt hours of downriver benefits will be accrued from this project. What does that mean? It means that by having a steady flow of the river you will increase the production of the plants downriver by 14 percent, which will give you 350,000,000 kilowatt hours. Canada has already signified that half of that would come to help us pay for the expense of the dam, which means that 175,000,000 kilowatt hours will come to Maine.

Just recently I picked up an article which gave us the 1974 average for the cost of power in Maine as 3.1 cents per kilowatt hours. If we use that figure and multiply it by 175,000,000 kilowatt hours, we have a figure of over five million dollars. So we are going to get annually over five million dollars worth of power from Canada to help us defray the expenses of the dam. Plus the fact, as I mentioned, in '73 we got 2.8 billion kilowatt hours into the New England Pool in Maine.

Now, all of those contracts are short-term contracts. They are what are called interim contracts. And you might think that this is not important, but just last week we had the bill on the Woodland Power District where the present owner has been notified that Georgia Pacific after December of '76 will no longer be able to supply the present owners with power. Where are they going to go? The Eastern Maine Co-op services that area, but not the Woodland area. The Eastern Maine Co-op contract is expiring next year, and they don't know what is going to happen and whether Canada is going to keep on supplying them.

Now, we have been taking this for granted and we have been taking Canada for granted. It is weren't for New Brunswick we would be having a lot more brown-outs than what we are having now and possibly some black-outs. But those people some day may decide to sever those connections because today by law they can only export the surplus, and if you had taken in the TV program that I did last night on the French station here and found out the bad feelings that exist between some of these Canadian politicians, I think you would start shivering in your boots as to whether or not some day you are not going to pick up a newspaper with headlines that say Canada is not going to supply you any more power after five years. You might say this will probably never happen. Well, it is happening on oil, and we got that same headline last year on oil.

So what I am saying is that today we are depending an awful lot on Canada, and we have to look at the whole river. If we develop this here, then Canada will cooperate with us and will continue. Probably that is long enough, and I hope you vote for enactment.

The PRESIDENT: Is the Senate ready for the question? The pending question before the Senate is the enactment of An Act Creating the Dickey-Lincoln Power Authority. A roll call has been ordered. A "Yes" vote will be in favor of enactment; a "Nay" vote will be opposed.

The Secretary will call the roll.

ROLLCALL

YEAS — Senators E. Berry, Carboneau, Cianchette, Clifford, Conley, Cyr, Danton, Gahagan, Johnston, Marcotte, McNally, Merrill, O'Leary, Thomas.

NAYS — Senators R. Berry, Collins, Corson, Cummings, Curtis, Graffam, Graham, Greeley, Hichens, Huber, Jackson, Katz, Pray, Reeves, Roberts, Speers, Trotzky, Wyman.

A roll call was had. 14 Senators having voted in the affirmative, and 18 Senators having voted in the negative, the Bill Failed of Enactment.

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

Mr. TROTZKY: Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider its action whereby the bill failed of enactment and urge the Senate to vote against me.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Penobscot, Senator Trotzky, now moves that the Senate reconsider its action whereby this bill failed of enactment.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Conley.

Mr. Conley of Cumberland moved that the bill be tabled and Tomorrow Assigned, pending the motion to Reconsider.

On motion by Mr. Speers of Kennebec, a division was had. 16 having voted in the

affirmative, and 15 having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

An Act Providing for the Observance of Memorial Day on May 30th. (S. P. 371) (L. D. 1198)

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

Mr. CONLEY: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I think today with this bill pending before the Senate it is going to have a great deal of influence upon many of the citizens of this state, particularly a lot of our former citizens who are now living in other parts of the country. I personally feel that this bill should not be passed because I believe that in the way the observance of Memorial Day is currently being practiced it does give a tremendous number of former citizens of this state an opportunity to come back to the state at this time of the year, and also gives the residents of this state an opportunity to visit out of state for the same purpose of observing Memorial Day.

The federal government undertook several years ago to change certain observed holidays that we take particular notice of each year by making them three-day holidays to allow citizens more of an opportunity to celebrate or be able to observe these holidays. So I think for us to change this one particular day is an act that is really going to change the lives of many people in the sense that they will not be able to participate in what I consider to be one of the most significant holidays that we do pay tribute to.

Therefore, Mr. President, I would move that this bill, L.D. 1198, be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. BERRY: Mr. President, the good Senator from Cumberland, Senator Conley, has mentioned the effect on other states, and I would only bring to mind to the Senate that the three states that were celebrating Memorial Day on the third Monday of May were Maine, New Hampshire and Massachusetts. New Hampshire has passed legislation going back to May 30th, Massachusetts has legislation pending on its books now, which is expected to pass, going to May 30th. And to shorten the debate in the Senate Chambers, I would only ask those Senators who have supported this bill to keep in mind that it did pass by a large majority in the House and ask them to support the bill to bring Memorial Day back to May 30th.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair would ask the Senator to refrain from referring to the House action, and I would also ask the other members of the Senate not to refer to action in the other body as it affects legislation.

The Senator may proceed.

Mr. BERRY: Mr. President, I would only ask the Senators if they would continue to support this bill as they have done in the first and second readings.

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

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

The PRESIDENT: A roll call has been requested.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Clifford.

Mr. CLIFFORD: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: The 106th Legislature changed Veterans Day from a

Monday holiday back to November 11th. I think the circumstances in that situation were substantially different. First of all, November 11 was the actual day on which the armistice was signed to end the First World War, and it had a particular significance for a great number of World War I veterans who are still active in the veterans organizations.

Secondly, Veterans Day occurs in the fall of the year, and Memorial Day occurs during the spring of the year, during the time between spring and summer, and the Monday holiday is especially significant for some of the resort areas for people to come in and open their camps, people to come in and rent cottages, and people to come in make plans for summer, which is a very important industry in our state. But I think more importantly than that is the fact that May 30th really has no special significance except for some sentimental value, so I think we are talking about a very different situation than Veterans Day.

I would hope we could go along with the motion of the good Senator from Cumberland, Senator Conley, and indefinitely postpone this bill so that Memorial Day will be celebrated on a Monday, and not only allow more people to attend the celebrations and the commemorative exercises, which is the purpose of it, but it will also allow people to utilize the three-day weekend to come up and begin the summer tourist season, which is very important to our economy, and certainly I think we would all agree that this is not the time to change that and put any kind of a crimp in the tourist economy. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

Mr. DANTON: Mr. President, I withdraw my motion for a roll call.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from York, Senator Danton, withdraws his motion for a roll call.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oxford, Senator O'Leary.

Mr. O'LEARY: Mr. President, I request a roll call.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Oxford, Senator O'Leary, has requested a roll call.

The Chair recognizes that Senator.

Mr. O'LEARY: Mr. President, all too often I believe we are losing a little bit of our heritage. I think this is a very good bill, and I hope the rest of you will remind yourselves that we have celebrated May 30th as Memorial Day for in excess of 160 years, and I think it is a good thing to return to.

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

Mr. HICHENS: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I am not going to discuss this matter too long this morning because I gave my reasons and opinions on this bill when it was first brought up to us, but in answer to the remarks made by the good Senator from Cumberland that the federal government had changed these dates, you will remember a few years back the federal government changed the date of Thanksgiving, and the New England States, along with one or two others in the country, just refused to go along with it, so the federal government finally reversed their decision and came back to letting us have Thanksgiving on the fourth Thursday of November. And then they also set Veterans Day, and the State of New Hampshire and the State of Maine, along with one or two other states in our union

have changed Veterans Day back to its original date, and I believe that we can be the forerunners again, along with the State of New Hampshire, and have Memorial Day where it rightfully belongs.

As the good Senator from Oxford, Senator O'Leary, just stated, this has been a holiday for 160 years, long before Veterans Day was set. We can go on for Memorial Day observing the real significance of remembering those who have gone on before us. I believe that this is the time we have, the opportunity we have today, for putting Memorial Day in its rightful place.

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

Mr. McNALLY: Mr. President, I just want to make a little explanation of why I am going to vote for this holiday to be on the 30th. One of the first things I can remember is sleeping in a cottage beside the headquarters of Camp Benson out of Newport and hearing the gun in the morning at daylight. My uncle happened to be a Civil War veteran. And the first governor I ever saw came there to make a speech on Memorial Day, and it was Oakley C. Curtis, so that is back quite a long time.

I went to a Republican meeting last night in Ellsworth, and maybe we are some different kind of people, but they said "Thank heavens, there is one good thing you have done, you are going to change Memorial Day back where it ought to be."

The PRESIDENT: Is the Senate ready for the question? The pending question before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Conley, that L. D. 1198 be indefinitely postponed. A roll call has been requested. In Order for the Chair to order a roll call, it must be the expressed desire of more than one-fifth of those Senators present and voting. Will all those Senators in favor of a roll call please rise in their places until counted.

Obviously more than one-fifth having arisen, a roll call is ordered. The pending motion before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Conley, that L. D. 1198 and all its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. A "Yea" vote will be in favor of indefinite postponement; a "Nay" vote will be opposed.

The Secretary will call the roll.

ROLL CALL

YEAS: Senators. Carboneau, Cianchette, Clifford, Collins, Conley, Cummings, Curtis, Danton, Gahagan, Huber, Johnston, Katz, Marcotte, Merrill, Pray, Speers, Trotzky.

NAYS: Senators, E. Berry: R. Berry: Corson, Cyr, Graffam, Graham, Greeley, Hichens, Jackson, McNally, O'Leary, Reeves, Roberts, Thomas, Wyman.

A roll call was had. 17 Senators having voted in the affirmative, and 15 Senators having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

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

Mr. CONLEY: Mr. President, having voted on the prevailing side, I now move that the Senate reconsider its action whereby this bill was indefinitely postponed, and I would wish the Senate would vote against me.

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

Mr. Berry of Androscoggin then moved

that the bill be tabled and Tomorrow Assigned, pending the motion to Reconsider.

On motion by Mr. Pray of Penobscot, a division was had. 17 having voted in the affirmative, and 15 having voted in the negative, the tabling motion prevailed.

Resolve, Reimbursing Mars Hill Utility District for Bonds Issued for Sewer Construction. (H. P. 14) (L. D. 22)

Resolve, to Reimburse A. L. Stewart and Sons of Cherryfield for Loss of Beehives by Bear. (H. P. 335) (L. D. 418)

(On motion by Mr. Huber of Cumberland, the above two Resolves were placed on the Special Appropriations Table.)

Emergency

AN ACT Relating to State Subsidy for Units with Federally Impacted Students. (H. P. 107) (L. D. 104)

(On motion by Mr. Huber of Cumberland, placed on the Special Appropriations Table.)

Emergency

AN ACT to Revise Certain Provisions of the Act Creating Hospital Administrative District No. 4 in Piscataquis, Somerset and Penobscot Counties. (H. P. 933) (L. D. 1213)

This being an emergency measure and having received the affirmative votes of 27 members of the Senate, was Passed to be Enacted and, having been signed by the President, was by the Secretary presented to the Governor for his approval.

Orders of the Day

The President laid before the Senate the first tabled and Specially Assigned matter;

Bill, "An Act to Amend the Site Location of Development Statute." (H. P. 619) (L. D. 765)

Tabled — May 2, 1975 by Senator Trotzky of Penobscot.

Pending — Adoption of Committee Amendment "A" (H-225).

In the House — Passed to be Engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

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

Mr. TROTZKY: Mr. President, I move the indefinite postponement of Committee Amendment "A", Filing No. H-225, and will submit a Senate Amendment tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Penobscot, Senator Trotzky, now moves that Committee Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Conley.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Conley of Cumberland, tabled and Tomorrow Assigned, pending the motion by Mr. Trotzky of Penobscot that Committee Amendment "A" be Indefinitely Postponed.

The President laid before the Senate the second tabled and Specially Assigned matter:

SENATE REPORTS — from the Committee on Education — Bill, "An Act to Authorize the University of Maine to Proceed with the Development of a School of Medicine as Part of the Teaching Program of the University System." (S. P. 224) (L. D. 773)

Majority Report — Ought to Pass; Minority Report — Ought Not to Pass.

Tabled — May 2, 1975 by Senator Katz of Kennebec.

Pending — Acceptance of Either Report. Mrs. Cummings of Penobscot then moved that the Senate Accept the Majority Ought to Pass Report of the Committee.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator has the floor.

Mrs. CUMMINGS: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I think it is probably patently obvious to everyone here that our present health situation in Maine is critical. In 1900, with a population of almost 700,000 people, Maine had over 1,000 physicians. At present, with nearly a double population, we have just slightly more than 1,000 physicians.

The greatest need now is for family practice or primary care physicians. Physicians in general practice here tend to be older than their associates, with more than 60 percent over 50 years of age, and half of these being over 60 years old. The present family practitioner in rural Maine may have an active patient load numbering more than 4,000 patients, and some of these have to travel over 100 miles to receive that medical care. There is also a shortage of primary care physicians in the large cities.

For years Maine has averaged only 24 residents per year entering medical school. We have the lowest ratio of medical students to population of any state in the United States. Furthermore, these students are now attending traditional medical schools oriented toward specialization, where this school would be oriented toward the family physician.

It is difficult to assess the impact a medical school will have on our health care problems, however, it has become obvious to me that if we want more physicians in Maine, especially these family practice physicians, we must educate them in Maine, with highest priority being given to Maine residents. Even though we have and are continuing to develop key areas of medical excellence, it is imperative that we do not ignore the growing problem of lack of available primary medical care throughout our state. Unless we take positive action now, we are surely going to face a major health care crisis.

One of the main objections to this bill is the possibility of astronomically rising cost due mainly to the building of medical buildings for teaching, and I have a letter here from Acting Chancellor Stanley Freeman of the University of Maine, who says: "Dear Senator Cummings:

"We are aware of the continuing concern of a number of legislators that as the school of medicine develops major new construction will be required. This is just not true. Since the beginning of our plans for a medical school for Maine, we have planned to use existing facilities for instruction. The hospitals for clinical instruction already exist within the state and will not be duplicated by the University. The offer of excellent space at the Bangor Mental Health Institute promises excellent facilities for basic science instruction as well as offices for faculty and administration. With minimal alterations, this building is more than adequate for our needs for the basic sciences for the foreseeable future.

"Although it is difficult to project future needs in higher education, it is our firm belief that with the available existing facilities there will be no necessity for new construction for this program."

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

Mr. KATZ: Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the motion to accept the majority committee report. May I ask the Secretary to repeat the committee report please?

The PRESIDENT: The Secretary will read the committee report.

The SECRETARY: The Majority Report: The Committee on Education on this bill, Senate Paper 224, Legislative Document 773, have had the same under consideration and ask leave to report that the same ought to pass. Signed by Powell of Wallgrass Plantation, Ingegnieri of Bangor, Carroll of Limerick, Mitchell of Vassalboro, Fenlason of Danforth, Tyndale of Kennebunkport, and Connolly of Portland.

The Minority Report, which is the ought not to pass report on this same bill, was signed by Senator Thomas, Senator Katz, Senator Berry, Lynch of Livermore Falls, Bagley of Winthrop, and Lewis of Auburn.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator has the floor.

Mr. KATZ: Mr. President, the Senate will note it was a seven to six committee report, which perhaps was predictable from the start, because last year I asked the Health Council to review the implications of this bill, and those of you who noticed the press reports noticed that their executive committee split right down the middle with the chairman of the committee refusing to vote, and that has pretty much been the story of the medical school proposal since it got started. It is extremely controversial. There is good faith on both sides. I have enormous respect for those who propose it, but let me tell the Senate this morning the basis for my misgivings about the project as being untimely and perhaps not as effectively optimistic as the proponents would suggest.

First, any kind of medical education, regardless of whether it is done in the context of a shiny new building or out in a cow pasture, is the most expensive kind of education there is in the United States, and I think statistics will bear that out.

Second, the major thrust of this bill is the fact that we can get into the project cheaply. And to those of us who are presently so distressed by our fiscal problems, there may be a temptation to say hey, here is one we can get into for freebies, this is going to be a real cheapie, and it will take the 108th, the 109th and the 110th Legislatures actually to catch up with the full costs, and the temptation is very great.

Third, there is a feeling that a medical school in Maine will solve the very important political problems of access for Maine kids, and I do not underestimate this as a real, real motivation, the feeling that if you have a medical school that Maine kids who are qualified will be accepted into the school and enter the very heady profession of being doctors. This just simply is not true. Any state in the nation which has a medical school runs into the same problems of access. The fact is that there is not and never will be in any state adequate access so that every qualified youngster can become a doctor.

Four, this will supply health care in the rural areas of the State of Maine. This also is a very heady proposal, that if you have any small towns in your constituencies vote for the medical school because this will result in better health care in the small towns in the state. Well, I wish it were true. I am not certain that this has happened anywhere in the United States.

Five, this concentrates on family

practice, and most medical schools in the United States are concerned with specialists. Well, as a matter of fact, because of the federal impetus, conventional medical schools are relying more and more and more upon the promotion of family practice physicians. The medical schools that I have spoken to, and I have spoken to quite a few deans, indicate that they are changing their orientation to family practice. At the moment in the Augusta area we have a residency of family practice.

And that brings us up to the question of the next one on the list: with a medical school we can have a proliferation of residency programs in the state because that is where we get our doctors. As a matter of fact, we have residency programs and a good teaching facility in the Maine Medical Center in Portland today, we have residency programs in central Maine, the Lewiston-Augusta-Auburn area, within a year we will have teaching experience, clinical experience, for doctors in the Eastern Maine General Hospital, and this question of teaching facilities in Maine is expanding with or without a medical school.

In the last analysis, you have got to put some kind of a cost-benefit ratio on this, not the cost-benefit ratio as it exists today, but looking ten years down the road, and that is where my opposition beings. It is not easy as the Chairman of Education to oppose an educational program that is very near and dear to so many people's hearts, but is this the best way to ensure a better delivery of health services to Maine people? Is this the most economic way? And I say no, it is not the most economic way. And on the face of it, for the small low income State of Maine to attempt to solve this most expensive of all problems completely within the confines of our border I say is as risky a proposal as I have had come in front of me in the education world so far.

I have a confession to make. A number of years ago when I was much more devious than I am now, because now I am open and honest, I had legislation which became the University of Maine out here in the country in an open cow pasture, and my appropriation was \$28,000. And I am not quite certain how it happened, but the school was authorized and needed for \$28,000. I do not know what our budget is today but it is in excess of \$28,000.

I have heard it said that we will get by with current facilities, but the Bangor Mental Health Institute is a campus of sorts, and we are going to have to develop, we are going to have to remodel, we are going to have to make sure that the facilities are adequate for this extraordinarily involved profession.

What happens a few years down the road? Well, we are going to have a Maine medical school catering to Maine youngsters who are going to have their clinical experience in Maine, presumably we are going to have residency programs in Maine, which will be a great place for Maine graduates of this Maine school, and then after the residency programs these Maine youngsters are going to spread out and practice in Maine. Now, there was the word "incest" used a little earlier this session in another context, but I question whether or not quality education can be developed in such a provincial manner.

A handful of years down the road those who give accreditation to medical facilities are going to come into Maine, and I predict today on the record that the

first visitation will be something like this: they are going to say you have done an absolutely spectacular job in this innovative approach, you have made progress beyond what we ever dreamt you would, and we want to commend all of you and the taxpayers of the State of Maine for supporting this project, however, there are a few deficiencies which we would like to call to your attention — and then will come the deficiencies — and in order to maintain accreditation you are going to have to upgrade your clinical facilities, your labs, you are going to have to expand faculty in certain specialties, you are going to have to do A, B, C, D and E, and the price tag is going to be a million dollar price tag, and once we are in it we are in it. This is where the costs are going to proliferate, and this is my basic concern for the idea of getting into a medical school.

You know, ladies and gentlemen, I wish for just once we could bring to your attention an easy black and white educational problem, and this is not one of them, but with all my heart I say that we are today in the position of a man diving off the end of a diving board into the pool; once we leave that spring board we are committed.

The University of Vermont is having some extraordinary experiences this year. The University of Vermont has got financial problems like you wouldn't believe. The superficial part of their problems is indicated by their getting out of varsity football, which is nothing but a cosmetic indication that they are cutting costs everywhere they can. The costs of tuition at the University of Vermont are the highest in the nation. And I would like you to ask yourself today that when the medical school is in place, and the costs are full costs and visible costs which must be met by this legislature, what is going to happen to the ongoing programs of the University of Maine?

One of the previous honchos of the University has based his opposition, quiet but positive, to this bill upon the fact that very clearly he feels that a proximate result of a medical school will be a general increase in tuition for all university youngsters. And if the University comes in here and asks X millions of dollars, the money has to come from some place.

Perhaps I have belabored the point too long. I respect the position very deeply of those who feel that the medical school is a timely and an economic answer to Maine's problems, but I have never, never been persuaded that this actually is the case.

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

Mr. GAHAGAN: Mr. President, I rise this morning to support passage of this bill, and would like to share with you a letter I received from Aroostook Health Development Services, Incorporated, a letter written by a former and very distinguished member of this body, the Honorable Floyd Harding of Presque Isle. I read from the letter:

"Aroostook Health Services Development, Incorporated, designated the agency for health planning for Aroostook, northern Washington and northeastern Penobscot Counties, did a detailed study of the proposed Maine medical school. The report was presented to the full board and after a full discussion it was voted unanimously to endorse the proposal.

"As you will note from the makeup of the officers and directors, this is a

non-partisan organization, with membership from the entire county representing all walks of life. Our agency had representation at the hearing of this bill before the Education Committee. Scores of people speaking from various segments of Maine, geographically, politically and economically, spoke in favor of the bill. There was only one opponent, a physician from the Maine Medical Center in Portland. He had two main objections to the bill. One was the cost, and the other was that the bill was not a panacea to all of Maine's medical problems. The last objection is absurd on its face because no one suggests that it answers all of our problems.

"We do suggest that it will give Maine boys and girls a chance to be family type practitioners, which are in such short supply throughout Maine that in many regions like Aroostook County we depend upon foreign doctors to administer to our needs. I don't want to be biased but I don't think it is fair to give the first opportunity to foreigners, to the detriment of our local and capable people.

"As to the cost factor, you must bear in mind that Maine people spend \$400,000,000 per year for all forms of medical, hospital and dental expenses. That's right, \$400,000,000. That is more than the general fund budget for the State of Maine which you folks are now debating, and represents about \$400 for every man, woman and child in Maine.

"The proposal for the first two years would cost 15 cents per year for each citizen and might go as high as \$2 per year many years down the road. This is a pittance compared to the total expenditure, considering the good to be accomplished and the opportunities presented to Maine boys and girls. Also bear in mind the scores of jobs that will be created by this money, plus federal matching funds coming into Maine rather than us sending our tax dollars and children out of the state to receive the kind of medical training for our state that is not in short supply. There would, of course, be considerable income, sales, gasoline and other taxes generated by these new jobs, and more jobs is what we need in Maine, right now."

This is the end of the letter. I wish to request that if a roll call hasn't been requested that we do have one, and I urge support for this bill.

The PRESIDENT: A roll call has been requested.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington, Senator Wyman.

Mr. WYMAN: Mr. President and members of the Senate: It is with hesitation that I rise to oppose the good Senator from Kennebec. In fact, he had me almost persuaded when he said this was the worst bill that we had before the legislature, somehow 1994 went through my head, and I thought if this is a worse bill than 1994 that we had better kill it, but somehow he can't quite persuade me.

Now, what is more important than the health of the people of Maine? It just seems to me that that is paramount. Now, we have a lot of specialists, and this is fine, we need them, but I live in a rural area and I think we need rural physicians and not specialists.

I had a surgeon call me from a small Maine hospital yesterday, and he said "For heavens sakes, support this bill. What we need is general practitioners; we don't need more specialists." I think a general practitioner, if we can have those,

will send the cases that need to be referred to a specialist, and that is fine, that is what we need, but we have a great dearth of general practitioners in the rural areas, and we are not as fortunate as the good Senator from Kennebec who lives in a medical center.

Once more, I think the point is what is more important than the health of the people in Maine. And while the good Senator has some reservations as to whether this is going to accomplish it, I just think that we should go ahead and pass this bill, and I certainly hope that it won't be as bad as some bills that we pass. Thank you.

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

Mr. THOMAS: Mr. President, I would like to speak very briefly because I want to support Senator Katz on this matter. No one in this room is probably more familiar with the escalating costs of higher education than I am. It is going up five or six hundred dollars a year in my institution.

The University of Massachusetts started a medical school about five years ago, and if you ever want to see a disaster it is that. And if you would like proof of it, read the May issue of Atlantic magazine, the current issue. They have spent one-third of a billion dollars on a medical school in Worcester. Now, I will admit that the majority of the money was for buildings, but it is costing the Commonwealth of Massachusetts \$160,000 per year for every student in that school.

Before they built this school, Tufts, Harvard and B.U. offered to contract with the Commonwealth. They refused, and they built the school in Worcester. Since this refusal these three medical schools have opened up over 500 extra spaces, which have been available to not only Massachusetts students but to other students in New England and elsewhere.

And Senator Katz is absolutely right when he talks about accreditation. I know what accreditation is; I have gone through it twice. Once we had to build a library. Senator Cummings is a trustee, and so is Senator Curtis, of a college which just got accredited, and I will lay you odds it mentioned the library. Am I right? I know what accreditation is. It is an expensive process. This medical school should not take place in the State of Maine. Thank you.

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

Mr. MERRILL: Mr. President, as one of the cosponsors of this bill, I would like to explain briefly how I came to be involved with it and how I originally shared some of the concerns, and still do, to a lesser extent, of the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Katz.

In the years past as this talk of a medical school has been germinating here in Maine I, without having given it a great deal of thought, favored the concept. And in the most recent past year I heard a great deal of talk, especially in my home town of Portland and around the University, which is a habitat with which I am familiar, generally criticizing the concept and suggesting maybe that it was an approach we shouldn't take in solving our medical problems here in the state. So when I was

approached in the first instance to cosponsor this bill my reaction was a negative one, but I did offer to take a long look at the facts that have been assembled, and to take a look at some of my own assumptions and some of the assumptions that I have developed in a more casual way over the previous year.

The first question I wanted to take a look at was the whole question of need in terms of the medical problems that we face in this state. I think if we talk about cost benefits and that sort of thing before we get down to the first and crucial issue, which is whether or not there is a need for any solution, sometimes we lose sight of how high priority we should be placing and how much we should be willing to spend. And frankly, I was shocked by the medical situation in this state.

You know, most of us have a tendency to watch TV and see the healthy families on there and assume that everybody is becoming more healthy and their teeth are better and that they are living longer and more healthy lives. The fact of the matter is that in many areas of Maine just the opposite is true. The fact of the matter is that we are marching backwards in Maine in terms of medical health care delivery. It can't be overlooked, it can't be denied.

Since we lost our medical schools in Maine — and there have been medical schools here in the past; as a matter of fact, probably some of the more senior members of this Senate, and maybe some of the younger members, are probably still serviced by doctors who were trained at Bowdoin, and serviced very well, for the most part, by the doctors that were educated there. So this isn't a completely new concept to the State of Maine. But to go on, if we look at the situation that we face in the medical delivery situation here in Maine, I think we have to say that it is nothing short of a crisis. The fact is that the matter is that we lead the nation in deaths per capita due to heart disease; that we are up front, in a very tragic sort of way, in deaths from pulmonary and cancer problems; that everywhere you look where continuing care would make a difference you find that Maine is in the rear, that it is No. 50 or No. 49 among the 50 states.

The fact of the matter is that in looking into health care delivery in our rural counties we find that close to 50 percent of the women never had a pap smear, the first line of defense against cancer. We find that many, many people who live in these rural counties don't have regular medical checkups, the first line of defense against such things as heart disease. The fact of the matter is that we are not taking care of one of the primary needs of our people here in Maine, and that ought to be the first thing that we come to grips with. And if this medical school isn't the way we are going to deal with it, having recognized the seriousness of this problem, then I think we ought to ask ourselves what are we going to do, and we better give ourselves an honest answer, and not just a glib answer that this isn't the way to do it, so we will forget the problem.

Now, there are other approaches that may be followed. I don't think that the medical school proscribes or limits us from doing any of those. As a matter of fact, I think it helps us in that direction. But I think that there are two issues that this whole problem comes down to. One is the issue of costs. There are two issues here. One is: are the projected costs unrealistically low so as to indicate that the state is going to have to increase to a

great extent the amount of money that it spends over what is projected? I don't think that is the case. I think a look at the total costs that we plan to spend on the education of our people in the medical school here in Maine from all sources, which include tuition and state money, VA money, etc., I think the total cost is in the neighborhood of \$12,000 a year. And that is roughly what it costs to educate a student at the University of Vermont Medical School. As a matter of fact, I think it costs about \$15,000 a year at Dartmouth and some of the better medical schools in New England, or some of the more prestigious, I should say, medical schools in New England, and I think the \$12,000 figure is in the ballpark. It isn't a figure that is unrealistically low, as we have been led to believe here in the debate this morning. As a matter of fact, I would like to compliment the people who put together this plan on presenting us with an honest appraisal, I think, of what the operating costs will be. So I think that the scare tactics of the great open door, beyond the limitations that we have in any area of projecting what will happen to expenses, the limitations on everything we vote on, I think are a little inappropriate to the proposal that is here before us.

In terms of the actual amounts of money spent, I think we can argue about whether or not Maine should spend that much money to solve this problem. I think we should.

There is one other problem that this thing really boils down to, and this is not to say that this is the only benefit that we will receive from a medical school, but it is the primary one and the one of primary concern. I think, to every Senator here, and that is if we educate these people here in Maine, if we send them to our medical school, if we build it and let them go there, will they stay here in Maine and will they practice medicine in the rural areas. It is pretty hard to assure that that will happen. I think what we see when we look at the situation in the other New England States in regards to the ratio of doctors to the population, it indicates that those states that have medical schools do considerably better in this regard. The University of Vermont may be having its troubles and Vermont may be having its troubles, but the people in that state are lucky to have a much better doctor to population ratio than we have in Maine, one that comes a lot closer to the national average than ours in Maine.

And I would point out while I am on that subject that there are in Maine counties that have a doctor to citizen ratio of about 1 to 2000, Waldo County being the worst in the state. That is compared to a national average somewhere in the mid-500's, 1 to 550 or 1 to 600, in that area. I think that is a disgrace. The fact of the matter is that the number of doctors in these counties is going down, not going up, and I think that is the most troubling aspect of all.

I think that we can make this proposal do something about this. I think if we educate people here in Maine that a lot of them will stay here. You will hear that doctors will stay where they do their residency, but there are studies that indicate in the area of family medicine that doctors educated in family medicine will go back to towns similar to those from which they came, that they will want to go back to a rural community if they came from a rural community. I think we can aim our program at family medicine, I think we can aim our program at the unique rural problems that we have here in Maine, and

that is one of the reasons why I think we should do it with our own medical school.

There are a lot of reasons we could talk about as to why we are for the medical school, and there are a lot of reasons we can find to not be for it, but looking at the big problem that we have with medical health care delivery in this state, I think we ought to ask ourselves whether we are genuine in those.

I think there is something we can do. If we are not assured yet that the cost-benefit ratio is worth it, or if we are not totally assured yet that the doctors will stay in Maine, I think there is something we can do in that respect and, if the Senate accepts the ought to pass report today, I will offer an amendment for the consideration of the Senate, when this comes up for its second reader, which would allow us to send to the board of trustees the message that we would like the tuition to be charged at this school to be much higher than is presently contemplated, and that we would like a loan program to set up to be made available on the basis of need to the students that go there, and the loans could be paid off in the traditional sense, or they could be forgiven if the people practice family medicine in Maine.

If it is the desire of the Senate to accept the ought to pass report, I will offer those amendments tomorrow, and I think at that time we can consider the merits of those. I mention it in the debate today only to say that if we are concerned about the cost problem, if we are concerned about the problem of whether or not they will stay here, I think there are ways that we can take care of that within this bill. I think this is a good vehicle towards dealing with our health care problems, and I urge the Senate to accept the ought to pass report.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON: Mr. President, if Maine has two overriding problems, one is the cost of energy to our industries and to our people, and the other one is the cost of health care to Maine citizens. Maine citizens annually pay \$400,000,000 for health care. That is a figure that is higher than the general fund budget for the whole state.

This body already this morning has taken one giant step backwards with relation to the first problem. I would certainly hope that we wouldn't further distinguish ourselves by voting twice in the same day against the best interests of Maine people. I urge your support of this bill on this medical school.

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

Mr. BERRY: Mr. President, having voted ought not to pass on this piece of legislation, I would like to point out to the Senate some of the questions that were asked by myself on the medical school, if I may.

No. 1 was: will it provide better health care for Maine people? We heard the proponents and the opponents on this. Some naturally said that it would because after the first graduating class we would be dumping a continuous amount of doctors on the market each year. The other side of that coin was that even though we were graduating a specific number of doctors we had no guarantee that they would remain within the State of Maine.

The second question was that there was nothing in the bill that would commit a graduate of the Maine medical school to a

residency for five, three or even one year in a Maine hospital.

Another question that was asked was are our quotas to the Vermont Medical School or any contractual medical schools that we have available to us being filled at the present time and have they been filled in the past.

What percentage of state graduates return to Maine after they graduate from medical school and what percentage comes back for their residency in the State of Maine?

How does the cost compare to the outside contractual agreements?

Mr. President, I was opposed to the bill as it was in committee, and as I stand here now I am opposed to the bill. I have spoken to my good friend, Senator Merrill, from Cumberland. Senator Merrill has said that he would like to offer some amendments that may rectify some of the problems within this bill, and I am willing to give him that chance to offer those amendments.

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

Mr. BERRY: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I have been very much impressed here by the fact that we are all very concerned with the overall problem of health care and the delivery of health care to Maine citizens, and I think on that we all share the common concern. And there is no question about this, those of us who are for it or against it cannot apologize, and don't need to, for our position; we have that objective. It may be that some of us are not fully cognizant of the background of this particular piece of legislation, and I think it would be worthwhile just very briefly to recall what has happened.

This project first was presented and passed by the legislature on the concept far different than that in which we see it in legislative form at the present stage, where the legislature was sold on the concept of a so-called medical school without walls. And I call to your attention that no one has used those words this morning in the debate, because that concept has been totally thrown out the window. We are concerned here with a proposal for the initiation at Orono and the continuation at Orono of a permanent medical school, a branch of the University of Maine at Orono. This is not the original concept.

The resolution as passed by the legislature requested the trustees of the University of Maine to study the concept of a medical school without walls and to report back to the legislature with their recommendations. I invite to your attention the fact that the present bill goes far beyond this, that the present bill, as you will read on page 2, indicates a health delivery system for the State of Maine. This is a duplication of existing programs in the state. Query: is this a bureaucratic grab?

Let us explore very briefly what is proposed in the bill in addition to a permanent installation at Orono. I must tie Senator Katz's discussion with Senator Thomas's discussion and just strongly suggest that when we jump off the springboard let's be sure there is some water in the pool.

What is proposed is a permanent installation, as I said, at Orono, and there would be a two-year residency program at Orono. Starting the third year, the students would have some of their

teaching at various health institutions around the state; health centers, medical centers, and so forth. Some will go to small communities where there are hospitals. If I were a member of the third year class, and I had a choice where I was going for my future training, I think I might opt for perhaps the Maine Medical Center at Portland versus the Machias Hospital. I think that I might get a more comprehensive, a better qualified training at Portland, Augusta, Presque Isle, or Bangor than I would at Machias. Now, why is this? Because the facilities at these institutions are much better.

I would assume that a doctor at Machias at present is rather occupied, with quite a lot to do, as Senator Wyman says, in Washington County. I would question whether the doctor at Machias is going to have the time or the technical expertise to take these third year medical students and teach them what they want.

It is also interesting to note in the bill that in the statement of fact it says the purpose will be accomplished through the provision of medical education specifically oriented to Maine's needs. Now, this brings up, as Senator Thomas has indicated, the matter of accreditation. I think we want to be sure that any graduate of a Maine medical school is going to pass board exams that are nationwide in standards. I hope that it is not visualized here that a second rate type of individual is going to receive a diploma to serve the health needs of the state. What we are really saying, of course, is that we want the University of Maine medical school to turn out general practitioners, and everybody for and against the bill in its present form has indicated it.

It says again in the statement of fact that the majority of the faculty shall be practicing physicians. Now, is this right or is it wrong? In order to turn out qualified practitioners who can pass the board exams not only in Maine but elsewhere, there should be no stipulation as to the type of faculty. This is determined by the program of the University's medical school and should be of such a type, the faculty should be of such a type, that it would turn out the right type of product to be universally accepted to practice the profession.

I think that we do, above all, need to consider this bill as everybody I think who has debated the issue has said, and that is how we can deliver health care to the people of Maine the best way possible? The problem is to get people to go into these areas and want to stay there. Perhaps some form of incentive would be desirable, and possible very, very much less expensive. If we were to say we will guarantee for five years that a doctor will have a minimum income of \$30,000 a year, I wonder how many people would move into the country to take up the medical profession and serve the rural area. I think it would be adequate to take care of our needs, and the expense, as indicated by those who have cited Massachusetts and the other extremely high costs, would be far less.

So let's not confuse ourselves on this particular bill by being for or against medical health delivery. This is what we are all after. I don't believe it is fair to pass this bill and put it on the Appropriations Table. I think it should be thoroughly discussed on its merits and contrasted against other methods of delivering health care to the people of the State of Maine.

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

Mr. KATZ: Mr. President, let me explain briefly to the Senate a couple of alternative systems which are presently in place. First, on your calendar today you probably didn't notice that there was a bill concerning the Osteopaths' Student Loan Fund. This is a small program and it has the kind of forgiveness feature that the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Merrill, mentions. The osteopathic student, and there are none in New England, no schools in New England, is loaned money, and if he returns to Maine he is forgiven all or part of his loan. It is a good program, and it is working. Considering the size of the program, it is a very, very successful one. By and large, osteopaths tend to settle in smaller towns and practice family medicine.

Second, we have a program on-going at the University of Vermont. The present cost to Maine, including the student's contribution and the state's contribution, adds up to \$5,975 a year. This is on a two year contract, and there is no question that this cost will be raised. Actually the taxpayers pay anywhere from \$3500 to \$5000 a year, and the Maine student pays the rest. There is no return requirement.

The New England Board of Higher Education is the agency responsible for negotiating these out of state contracts for us. We are presently negotiating with medical schools for the second year of this biennium, or about to get into real serious negotiations. Tufts, which is a top-notch school with a national reputation, has made a firm offer to us for a combined cost of \$8100 a year. Part of this we will assign to the student and part of this will come to the legislature as an appropriation. Now you say but Tufts is in Medford. Actually the medical school is in downtown Boston. Tufts presence in the State of Maine now is overwhelming. When you take a look at the AHEC program at the Maine Medical Center you are taking a look at Tufts Medical School. Tufts is about to get deeply involved in Eastern Maine General. It is an outstanding institution.

When I asked the Dean whether he would be willing to undertake a contractual relationship that would accomplish these three things he said yes: one, access for Maine youngsters. Two, continuing education in Maine for Maine physicians. The third one is constant interest in upgrading the teaching capacities of the Maine hospital, and the answer was yes. Here is an institution in Boston which presently is up to here in medical education in Maine, and I am deeply concerned that we are overlooking the obvious with established institutions which are deeply interested in Maine.

Tufts, for example, has for a long time been the recipient of substantial sums of money from the Bingham Fund, the Bingham Foundation, and their orientation is in Maine. When I was sitting at the table with the Dean of Tufts, along with somebody from New Hampshire, the New Hampshire person asked whether Tufts would be interested in performing these services to New Hampshire, and the answer was rather negative because they have a firm commitment to Maine because of their association with the Bingham Foundation.

There are alternatives which are top-notch, which are quality, and which have great promise for giving the kind of health delivery system we want. We have never succeeded in medical education in

incorporating this business of forgiving loans, and I think it is absolutely essential that we do this, but it is not necessary to have the medical school in Maine in order to recapture our money.

The last hard figures I have run into as to the cost of medical education actually came from the University of Pennsylvania School of Veterinary Medicine, and that was within the last few weeks. They have documented their actual costs of one student for one year of something over \$16,000, and this was taking care of dogs, cats and cows rather than people. When you add up the total cost, there is no way out of it, it is expensive. And our contracts with Vermont, and if we establish contracts with Tufts, we will find the host institution picking up part of the costs on a cooperative basis.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I have listened to the debate and I respect those who feel that the medical school is the answer to our problems. I wish I did. But let me tell you in closing that I have a feeling again that the legislature is in the posture of overpromising, overpromising on the benefit of programs which I think we cannot deliver at the costs that are being presented. I think that those who emotionally support a program in the feeling it will solve all the problems of access for Maine youngsters, will solve the problem of delivery of health services in all the rural communities in the state, reduce the cost of medical service to the state & and by the way, I am reminded of the fact that the Vermont papers were filled about three months ago with the shocking statement that the cost of delivery of medical service in Vermont is shockingly high.

One last thought. I have had it up to here for three years with talking to people all over the country and reading everything I could find on this extraordinarily controversial subject, and let me close with a quote, as nearly as I remember it, from a Ford Foundation Report for the University of California at Berkeley. I have read it enough times so maybe I can quote it exactly. "It seems to us," the report said, "that the concept of a medical school within a state is a good deal like" — it is talking about the benefits to the taxpayer: vis-a-vis benefits to the student — "is a good deal like a statewide lottery system, in which every taxpayer in the state is forced to buy a ticket, but the chances of winning are restricted to just a very few." It is controversial.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington, Senator Wyman.

Mr. WYMAN: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I think the good Senator from Cumberland, Senator Merrill, covered this very well. There are few bills that go through this legislature but we can pick something about them and go into detail and explain why they shouldn't be passed, but I think the nub of the whole matter is that we just don't have the doctors here and, as the good Senator said, we don't have the ratio of doctors to the population. On this bill, there is apparently some intention to amend it and improve it, so when you vote I hope you will think of the health of the people in Maine, which is the most important point of all, so that we can move this bill along and at least accept the thought to pass report of the committee.

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

Mr. BERRY: Mr. President, a question

through the Chair if I may: Is it permissible to ask the body of the Senate to refer to another bill which is germane to the subject?

The PRESIDENT: The Chair would reply in the affirmative.

Mr. BERRY: Then, Mr. President and Members of the Senate, if this should pass this morning, I would ask the members of the Senate to refer to Legislative Document 1776 before the next vote is taken.

The PRESIDENT: A roll call has been requested. In order for the Chair to order a roll call, it must be the expressed desire of more than one-fifth of those Senators present and voting. Will all those Senators in favor of a roll call please rise in their places until counted.

Obviously more than one-fifth having arisen, a roll call is ordered. The pending motion before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Cummings, that the Senate accept the Majority Ought to Pass Report of the Committee. A "Yes" vote will be in favor of acceptance of the Ought to Pass Report; a "No" vote will be opposed.

The Secretary will call the roll.

ROLLCALL

YEAS: Senators Berry, E.; Cianchette, Clifford, Conley, Cummings, Curtis, Cyr, Danton, Gahagan, Graham, Greeley, Johnston, Marcotte, Merrill, Pray, Trozky, Wyman.

NAYS: Senators Berry, R.; Carbonneau, Collins, Corson, Graffam, Hichens, Huber, Jackson, Katz, McNally, O'Leary, Reeves, Roberts, Speers, Thomas.

A roll call was had. 17 Senators having voted in the affirmative, and 15 Senators having voted in the negative, the Majority Ought to Pass Report of the Committee was Accepted, the Bill Read Once and Tomorrow Assigned for Second Reading.

The President laid before the Senate the third tabled and Specially Assigned matter:

Bill, An Act Relating to Specially Designed Registration Plates for the Maine National Guard. (H. P. 733) (L. D. 909)

Tabled — May 2, 1975 by Senator Speers of Kennebec.

Pending — Enactment.

Mr. Speers of Kennebec then moved that the Bill be Indefinitely Postponed.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. President, when the vote is taken, I request it be taken by a division, and I would like to speak briefly in opposition to the motion to indefinitely postpone this bill.

This bill is a proposal to enable the National Guard to request and at the approval of the Secretary of State's Office to permit the creation of a special license plate. I would suggest that the National Guard of the State of Maine is a highly trained, well-equipped organization which has served the state well both in war time and also in peace time. Today it is ready in any emergency, fire, flood, riots, and that sort of thing, as well as in routine community projects to help the citizens of the state.

Since 1970 they have saved the state and communities nearly \$900,000 in helping the Bureau of Parks and Recreation, Inland Fish and Game, Bureau of Veterans Services, Crippled Childrens Society, the

Bureau of Civil Emergency Preparedness, and the State Y.M.C.A. Camp on various construction projects. This has been done in lieu and in replacement of going out of state to do their training.

The proposal is a self-paying one. It actually would earn a little bit of money for the state. We have received information from the Motor Vehicle Division of the Secretary of State's Office that the proposal is a reasonable one and it can be administered by them with no problem.

The National Guardsmen are interested in performing services whenever and wherever they can. They would like to be identified. They have high esprit, and this L. D. is one way in which we can assist them and let them know that we think highly of the work that they are doing. The plate would be good for their spirit and their unit morale and should encourage enlistment for them. I suggest that it is appropriate at this time for us to back this proposal, which is not an unreasonable one and not so much unlike the one provision that enables us to carry license plates identifying our association with the State Legislature. Thank you.

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

Mr. CONLEY: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I couldn't concur any more strongly than the words expressed by the Majority Floor Leader of this Senate, Senator Speers. I think if anything needs a proper burial it is this bill. Next week or the week after perhaps we will be considering the boy scouts and the girl scouts and a few other trivial organizations around here.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Somerset, Senator Cianchette.

Mr. CIANCHETTE: I am very interested in this, and I admit I don't know a lot about it. It would like to understand better why we should vote to kill this bill. I see no good reason for that, and I would like to have it explained.

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

Mr. SPEERS: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I think the good Senator from Cumberland, Senator Conley, expressed one very cogent reason for not considering this particular piece of legislation.

I would like to say that I would consider it almost an insult to the men and women of the National Guard to say to them that because we appreciate so greatly the work and the time you have put into this organization, we, the people of the State of Maine, are going to be so gracious as to give you a special license plate. I would think that the worth of that organization is considerably more than that small gesture.

If we wish to consider this, I would say we could equally well consider special license plates for the American Legion and special license plates for any number of other organizations that may come along that would be equally worthy of public recognition, but very quickly we would end up with vehicles on the highway with all kinds of different kinds of license plates, and I just don't feel that that is at all necessary.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Somerset, Senator Cianchette.

Mr. CIANCHETTE: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I would like to thank the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Speers, for the explanation. I really have trouble understanding the discrepancy here in our license plate procedures. Maybe I don't understand what these special plates are but I understand for \$5.00 or some such fee as that each year, you can have one of these vanity plates and you can put any kind of name on the doggone thing you want. I understand these people are asking to pay the same price for one of uniformity for those people that belong to that organization. Isn't it a little inconsistent to allow the vanity plates where someone wants to put the name Ted, Mary, or Peter, or Hobnob or any crazy numbers, digits, or letters they want on there for a fee of \$5.00, if that is the right figure, and these people are willing to pay the same price for a little uniformity to give themselves a little esprit de corps? I can't see anything wrong with that, and I think it would be good.

Recognition is an important factor to some people. Why do people serve in the National Guard? Aren't we being a little selfish and a little ridiculous here not to allow something like this to happen, if these people have the interest to ask for it and they are willing to pay the bill which in fact will bring a little additional revenue into the state? I just don't understand the inconsistency and I certainly am not going to support the indefinite postponement.

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

Mr. McNALLY: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I must agree with the good Senator from Somerset, Senator Cianchette. I have just been rooming in a place where the lady has the name of her cat on her license plate it is "Bummer". This particular bill says that, "the Secretary of State upon certification by the Adjutant General, Maine National Guard, that 25% of active and retired members of the guard," will buy these plates. Why? So that they can be made with no cost to the state or no gift from the state. There is enough of them going to be used so that they set cut up the dyes and make the plate. As sure as the world I am afraid that some of these private ones are a little costly.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. President, the comments just made are correct. As a matter of fact, the fiscal note indicates that there would be \$4,300 additional revenue created by passage of this bill. That might or might not be the case, depending upon how many people decided they wanted to obtain these plates.

The only other item I would like to mention is that we are not talking about the American Legion or the VFW, two very fine private organizations to which I happen to belong, we are not talking about that at all, we are talking about the Maine National Guard, a state organization, and it seems to me that it is appropriate to have a uniform plate. These folks would like this little identification, and I think it is appropriate for us to so recognize. Mr. President, I would request a roll call.

The PRESIDENT: A roll call has been requested. In order for the Chair to order a roll call, it must be the expressed desire of more than one-fifth of those Senators present and voting. Will all those Senators in favor of a roll call please rise in their places until counted.

Obviously more than one-fifth having arisen, a roll call is ordered. The pending motion before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Speers, that this Bill, L. D. 909, and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. A "Yes" vote will be in favor of indefinite postponement; a "No" vote will be opposed.

The Secretary will call the roll.

ROLL CALL

YEA: Senators Collins, Conley, Cummings, Danton, Huber, Jackson, Reeves, Speers, Thomas, Trotzky.

NAYS: Senators E. Berry, R. Berry, Carbonneau, Cianchette, Clifford, Corson, Curtis, Cyr, Gahagan, Graffam, Graham, Greeley, Hichens, Johnston, Katz, Marcotte, McNally, Merrill, O'Leary, Pray, Roberts, Wyman.

A roll call was had. 10 Senators having voted in the affirmative, and 22 Senators having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Bill was Passed to be Enacted and, having been signed by the President, was by the Secretary presented to the Governor for his approval.

The President laid before the Senate the Fourth tabled and Specially Assigned matter:

HOUSE REPORTS — from the Committee on Liquor Control — Bill, "An Act to Restrict Liquor Control Commission Records of Liquor Violations to Violations which are Less than 5 Years Old." (H. P. 81) (L. D. 1244) Majority Report — Ought Not to Pass; Minority Report — Ought to Pass.

Tabled — May 5, 1975 by Senator Danton of York.

Pending — Acceptance of Either Report. (In the House — Passed to be Engrossed.)

On motion by Mr. Graffam of Cumberland, the Minority Ought to Pass Report of the Committee was Accepted in concurrence, the Bill Read Once and Tomorrow Assigned for Second Reading.

The President laid before the Senate the fifth tabled and Specially Assigned matter:

Senate Reports — from the Committee on Taxation — Bill, "An Act Relating to Motor Vehicle Excise Tax." (S. P. 293) (L. D. 1018) Majority Report — Ought Not to Pass; Minority Report — Ought to Pass.

Tabled — May 5, 1975 by Senator Speers of Kennebec.

Pending — Motion of Senator Cianchette of Somerset to Indefinitely Postpone Bill and Accompanying Papers.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: This is a bill that was debated at some length before, and I don't think that any of the arguments need to be repeated particularly. It is an attempt to make the taxation equitable between foreign corporations and domestic corporations, particularly as those excise taxes apply to trucks. I would ask that a division be held.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Somerset, Senator Cianchette.

Mr. CIANCHETTE: Mr. President, just a quick review. I talked with Charles Wyman, who is Director of Motor Vehicles, this morning on the telephone and asked him about his thoughts on this. And he said that a lot more people are going to be

getting away without paying their taxes if you enact such a law as that. I think that sums it up.

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

Mr. SPEERS: Mr. President, I would ask for a roll call.

The PRESIDENT: A roll call has been requested. In order for the Chair to order a roll call, it must be the expressed desire of more than one-fifth of those Senators present and voting. Will all those Senators in favor of a roll call please rise in their places until counted.

Obviously more than one-fifth having arisen, a roll call is ordered. The pending motion before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Somerset, Senator Cianchette, that this Bill, L. D. 1018, be indefinitely postponed. A "Yes" vote will be in favor of indefinite postponement; a "No" vote will be opposed.

The Secretary will call the roll.

ROLL CALL

YEAS: Senators E. Berry; Carbonneau, Cianchette, Clifford, Conley, Corson, Cummings, Cyr, Graham, Greeley, Hichens, Huber, Johnston, Katz, Marcotte, Merrill, O'Leary, Pray, Reeves, Thomas.

NAYS: Senators, R. Berry; Collins, Curtis, Danton, Gahagan, Graffam, Jackson, Roberts, Speers, Wyman.

ABSENT: Senators, McNally, Trotzky.

A roll call was had. 20 Senators having voted in the affirmative, and 10 Senators having voted in the negative, with two Senators being absent, the Bill and accompanying papers were Indefinitely Postponed.

Sent down for concurrence.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Somerset, Senator Cianchette.

Mr. CIANCHETTE: Mr. President, having voted on the prevailing side, I now move reconsideration on this Bill and ask the Senators to vote against my motion.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Somerset, Senator Cianchette, now moves that the Senate reconsider its action whereby this Bill was indefinitely postponed. Will all those Senators in favor of reconsideration say "Yes"; those opposed will say "No".

Viva voce vote being taken, the motion did not prevail.

The President laid before the Senate the sixth tabled and Specially Assigned matter:

Bill, "An Act to Establish County Commissioner Districts in Cumberland County." (H. P. 223) (L. D. 279)

Tabled May 5, 1975 by Senator Berry of Cumberland.

Pending Passage to be Engrossed. (In the House — Passed to be Engrossed.)

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Speers of Kennebec, retabled and Specially Assigned for May 8, 1975, pending Passage to be Engrossed.

The President laid before the Senate the seventh tabled and Specially Assigned matter:

Bill, "An Act to Increase the Veteran's Property Tax Exemption." (H. P. 1174) (L. D. 1172)

Tabled — May 5, 1975 by Senator Speers of Kennebec.

Pending — Passage to be Engrossed.

(In the House — Passed to be Engrossed as amended by House Amendment "D" (H-224)

(In the Senate — House Amendment "D", Adopted.)

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

Mr. COLLINS: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I am a bit confused about this bill, and it is not because I am getting hungry. This bill started out as a bill to increase the veteran's property tax exemption to \$12,000. It was cut down to \$7,000 and now to \$5,000. \$5,000 with a just value measurement, which I take it to be fair market value.

We have heard frequently in this legislature concern about the placing of greater burdens on our real property taxpayers. The Senator from Cumberland, Senator Graham, spoke recently about the erosion of our tax base in our cities and towns. One of the most gifted orators that has ever graced this chamber spoke about renaming a certain committee as the exemptions committee.

I think that the great majority of our veterans in this state want to be considered citizens first and veterans second. We must remember that their service was to the United States of America, not to their towns or to their state, although, of course, indirectly it was to all of us, and the rewards and continuing appreciation for this service should be primarily at the federal level of government.

As taxpayers to the federal government, we have expressed appreciation through GI bills, free medical care, pensions for those in need and for their widows and orphans, veterans preferences for jobs, points, in various federal situations, and at the state level veteran preference points for jobs, educational privileges for the wives and children of veterans who were prisoners of war, and of course we have had on our statute books for many years the \$3,500 local property tax exemption.

I recognize that the value of the property tax exemption is shrinking because of inflation, but we must remember that a new wave of eligible exemptions is about to strike our cities and towns as 67,000 World War II veterans approach the status of senior citizens, which now happens at age 62. I hope I don't feel that senior at age 62. We must stop to think what a change in the direction suggested here will mean not only today but in the many years ahead, and think what happens when we shift the incidence of taxation as we are proposing to do it here.

Part of my confusion is caused by the fact that, according to the representatives of veterans organizations, this proposal to increase the exemption to \$5,000 to just value actually, on the whole, decreases the amount of exemption that will be available over all the state to veterans. So there seems to be a contradiction on the face of the bill as to what it will or will not do.

I submit also that we are moving in a direction of uniform property valuation for communities all over the state. At the present time it does seem unfair to me that a veteran in Brownville Junction should pay absolutely no property tax whereas the veteran in Bangor should pay \$100 to \$200 property tax on a home of identical real just fair market value. It would seem to me that we would be moving in the direction of justice if we were to correct our laws so that true, just fair market value was the true measurement in the granting of any exemption.

The other night I sat down to chat about this with three veterans, two from World War II and one from the Korean Conflict, and without revealing any ideas of my own I asked them for their commentary about this pending legislation. One said, "I will take anything they will give me." The second said, "The present exemption seems fair enough, when you consider that many veterans did no more for their country than did many civilians." The third said, "I don't know, but I hate to think of transferring the burden of local property taxation to my mother, my sister, and my daughter and son-in-law. I ask the Senate to think about this.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. President, because I have shared the concerns of the previous speaker, particularly about the incidence of taxes upon other people not veterans in the communities, and the fact that the state should take an interest, if anybody does at all, as well as the municipalities, I have prepared an amendment which I would like to offer at this time. It is under Filing Number S-119, and it is Senate Amendment "A" to L. D. 1172. What it is designed to do is to provide that the increase in exemption, the loss of taxes, as it were, to the municipalities because of the bill, if it gets enacted, would be paid for by the state rather than by the municipalities.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Penobscot, Senator Curtis, now offers Senate Amendment "A" to L. D. 1172 and moves its adoption. The Secretary will read Senate Amendment "A".

Senate Amendment "A", Filing No. S-119 was Read.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Speers of Kennebec, tabled and Tomorrow Assigned, pending Adoption of Senate Amendment "A".

Mr. Berry of Androscoggin was then granted unanimous consent to address the Senate:

Mr. BERRY: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: Last evening at slightly after ten o'clock I received a phone call at my home that all law enforcement officers within the area were being called back to duty. There was a jail break, as many of us know, in the Androscoggin County Jail. One deputy was shot through the chest and proceeded to drive himself to the hospital. Two subjects escaped from the jail. Rather than go into great detail, the point I would like to make is that the alarm went out, and not within an hour or half an hour, but within minutes, the State Police of the State of Maine responded to our community. On behalf of the people that I represent, and as a Senator and Councilman in the City of Auburn, and as a parent, I would like to extend my thanks to a dedicated law enforcement agency that will provide the safety and security to the people in a community such as Auburn.

Committee of Conference

On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill, "An Act Relating to Sales Tax Interest and Penalties" (H. P. 1550) (L. D. 1867), the President appointed the following Conferees on the part of the Senate:

Senators:

JACKSON of Cumberland
MARCOTTE of York
DANTON of York

The PRESIDENT: The Chair would like to advise the Senate that it is the plan at the present time to go into double sessions commencing on Monday, May 19, which is two weeks from yesterday. In other words, we will be coming into session in the morning at 9:30 or 10 o'clock, and recessing and coming back in again at 5 o'clock in the afternoon. There will be during that week still approximately twelve to fifteen bills which have not been advertised for public hearing, and I would certainly urge all those Senate chairmen to see to it that those twelve or fifteen bills are advertised as early during the week of Monday, May 19, as possible, so we can get every committee on an executive session basis and get these bills out of committee and before the legislature.

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

Thereupon, on motion by Mrs. Cummings of Penobscot,

Adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.