

# 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 Eighth  
Legislature***

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

**Volume I**

**January 5, 1977 to May 25, 1977**

KJ PRINTING  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

**HOUSE**

Wednesday, January 19, 1977

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

Prayer by the Reverend Roger Smith of Augusta.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

**Papers from the Senate**

From the Senate:

Bill "An Act Appropriating Funds for the Save Loring Committee" (Emergency) (S. P. 48) (L. D. 97)

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

In the House, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs in concurrence.

Bill "An Act Concerning Insurance Coverage for Deaf and Mentally Retarded Persons" (S. P. 47) (L. D. 96)

Came from the Senate referred to the Committee on Human Resources and ordered printed.

In the House: On motion of Mr. Talbot of Portland, was referred to the Committee on Business Legislation in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

**Reports of Committees**

**Divided Report**

**Tabled and Assigned**

Majority Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-1) on Bill "An Act to Revise the Board of Bar Examiners Law" (S. P. 5) (L. D. 10)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. COLLINS of Knox  
MANGAN of Androscoggin  
CURTIS of Penobscot  
— of the Senate.

Messrs. SPENCER of Standish  
HUGHES of Auburn  
DEVOE of Orono  
TARBELL of Bangor  
ENDERSON of Bangor

Mrs. BYERS of Newcastle  
Messrs. HOBBS of Saco  
NORRIS of Brewer  
BENNETT of Caribou  
— of the House.

Minority Report of the same Committee, reporting "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "B" (S-2) on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following member:  
Mr. GAUTHIER of Sanford

Came from the Senate with the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-1)

In the House: Reports were read.  
On motion of Mr. Spencer of Standish, tabled pending acceptance of either Report and specially assigned for Tuesday, January 25.

**Messages and Documents**

The following Communication:

PAULA H. ELKINS  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
291 OCEAN HOUSE ROAD  
CAPE ELIZABETH, MAINE

January 11, 1977

The Honorable Edwin Pert  
Clerk of the House  
State House  
Augusta, Maine 04333  
Dear Mr. Pert:

Pursuant to 34 M.R.S.A. Section 525-A, I herewith submit the 1976 annual report of the

Maine Correctional Advisory Commission.  
Thank you for your efforts in seeing to distribution.

Signed: Yours very truly,  
PAULA H. ELKINS  
Chairman

Maine Correctional Advisory Commission  
The Communication was read and with accompanying papers ordered placed on file.

**Petitions, Bills and Resolves**

**Requiring Reference**

The following Bills and Resolves were received and referred to the following Committees:

**Election Laws**

Bill "An Act Relating to Removal of Non-voters' Names from Voting Lists" (H. P. 87) (Presented by Mr. Garsoe of Cumberland) (Ordered Printed)  
Sent up for concurrence.

**Fisheries and Wildlife**

Bill "An Act to Allow the Taking of Suckers with Bow and Arrow" (H. P. 88) (Presented by Mr. Nadeau of Sanford) (Ordered Printed)  
Sent up for concurrence.

**Public Utilities**

Bill "An Act Relating to Extending Distance Requirement on Connection of Private Sewers" (H. P. 89) (Presented by Mr. Mackel of Wells) (Ordered Printed)  
Sent up for concurrence.

**State Government**

RESOLVE, Authorizing the Bureau of Public Lands to Convey by Sale the State's Interest in Certain Real Property in Warren and Cushing, Knox County (H. P. 90) (Presented by Mr. Gray of Rockland) (Ordered Printed)  
Sent up for concurrence.

**Taxation**

RESOLVE, Reimbursing Certain Municipalities on Account of Property Tax Exemptions of Veterans (H. P. 91) (Presented by Mr. Mackel of Wells)

RESOLVE, Reimbursing Certain Municipalities on Account of Taxes Lost Due to Lands being Classified under the Maine Tree Growth Tax Law (H. P. 92) (Presented by Mr. Mackel of Wells) (Ordered Printed)  
Sent up for concurrence.

**Orders**

Mr. Kelleher of Bangor presented the following Joint Order and moved its passage: (H. P. 95):

WHEREAS, allegations have been made that certain utilities have failed to pay millions of dollars in federal income taxes collected from ratepayers; and

WHEREAS, this situation is alleged to exist because of accounting methods and tax breaks which utility companies are permitted to use under federal law; and

WHEREAS, it is claimed that "these loopholes have allowed present power companies to collect \$7.1 billion from their customers over the past 21 years for income taxes that were never paid;" and

WHEREAS, it is further claimed that both electricity rates and taxes are rising because the power companies are further boosting their profits by not paying their share of taxes; now, therefore be it

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Joint Standing Committee on Taxation shall study the process whereby Public Utilities can take advantage of federal laws allowing deferment of tax payments to determine if rate

structures properly reflect such adjustments; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Committee shall complete this study no later than 90 days prior to the next regular session of the Legislature and submit to the Legislative Council within the same time period its findings and recommendations, including copies of any recommended legislation in final draft form; and be it further

ORDERED, upon passage in concurrence, that a suitable copy of this Order shall be forwarded to members of the committee.

The Order was read.

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Being a member of the Public Utilities Committee, and being interested in the utilities themselves, occasionally I come across material that is sent to me by the utilities and also by public interest groups.

I have an interesting document here in my hand, and it is called "Phantom Taxes in Your Electric Bill." In reading it, over the past few years, the utilities across the nation have collected, through the ratepayers, many billions of dollars in lieu of paying the federal government, but in actuality, when it comes time to present their tax receipts to the government, it is many dollars less than what they have actually collected. And in this particular document here, it reviews 150 major utilities across the nation, and Maine is represented by one utility, which is rather small in comparison to others, which is the Central Maine Power Company. This research book indicated that they collected (meaning Central Maine Power), somewhere around \$7 million, and in this document they say the utilities, through tax breaks and tax loopholes, are paid \$3.8 million, leaving a reasonable amount of money that didn't go to the federal government; yet it was collected through the ratepayers, the subscribers of this utility, just for that purpose.

When this was brought to my attention, I thought it was important enough that maybe this House should look at it, but more in particular, the Taxation Committee that we have here, and my Order so directs them to justify, for example, is this in fact a case.

I am sure that the utilities themselves would be more than glad to rush before the Taxation Committee to prove in fact that they are not collecting many millions of dollars unfairly. And I think, with due respect to the utilities themselves and to the consumers of this state, that we should give them the chance, but more importantly, we should give the Taxation Committee the chance to see if this document here is factual.

It is a rather interesting little book, and I am trying to get more of them because I think it would be of great interest to you and your constituents to see that you are probably being charged more on your utility bills for federal taxes than perhaps what the utilities are paying.

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

A Joint Resolution (H. P. 93) in memoriam: The Honorable Harry R. Courtois, a Member of the 1955-1956 Legislature is presented by Mr. Hobbins of Saco.

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

On Motion of Mr. Nadeau of Sanford, it was ORDERED, that Carl Smith of Mars Hill be excused for duration of his illness.

**Second Reader**

**Failed of Engrossment**

Bill "An Act Concerning Days on which Alcoholic Beverages may be Sold" (H. P. 16) (L. D. 25)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Connors.

Mr. CONNORS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As a member of the Liquor Control Committee, and I must say a new member of it, I was one who signed it on the minority "ought not to pass." I just feel that we should continue with the present law the way it is. It seems to me that we should be able to get by one or two days a year without alcoholic beverages having to be sold within the state.

I hope that you will vote no on the majority "ought to pass" report and that we can accept the minority "ought not to pass" report, and in doing so, I ask for a roll call.

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

Mr. RAYMOND: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Concerning this bill, the Liquor Control Committee in the last session, in the 107th, passed a bill allowing the wholesalers the same right that we are asking now for the retailers. As we know, the economy is quite bad, but if we are to give permission to a wholesale outfit to sell beer on election day, the retailers should be allowed to do the same thing. I think it is discrimination not to give them permission to do so.

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

Mrs. TARR: Mr. Speaker, I would pose a question through the Chair. I thought the bill that he was referring to, the wholesalers could deliver it, but I didn't think there was any drinking involved. Anyway, I would support Mr. Connors.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Nadeau.

Mr. NADEAU: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: To clarify the gentleman's question, this would allow anyone to go into a bar or restaurant and have a drink of some kind of alcoholic beverage on election day.

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

Mr. JOYCE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Today, the question is really consumption, not sale.

I was going to go to the committee, but the beer barons crowded me out. I stand to urge you to vote with Mr. Connors on the "ought not to pass". You are going to turn the clocks back about 50 years.

I will tell you what you are talking about on this bill, you are talking about the 'alky days' when they used to pass you a half a pint if you would go down and vote. Talk to some of the old timers here; they will tell you what it is about. In my day, it was the 'Sneaky Pete' that they would give you, and for a swig of the 'Sneaky Pete,' that 99 cent wine, you could get a guy to vote the way you wanted him to.

Now, we have just come through some very close elections, so close that we haven't decided some of them. Think of the element of the drunken voter in that booth — we would have some real cliff hangers. Your people don't want this out there.

I know a lot of people say, how come such a fine gentleman as Mr. Joyce is up speaking against the bill about my youth from Portland, Representative Jensen? Because of his tender years, he has not seen the evil of something like this.

I think, really, down deep we know that we don't need to put up with that inebriated person trying to get into that 2 x 2 voting booth. So let's make quick work of this one.

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

Mrs. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am one who in-

dulges, but I do not want to indulge on election day. We had sober people who came to vote on election day in our district, 89 and 91, and they didn't do the right thing.

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

Mr. JENSEN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do hope the gentlelady from Brunswick was referring to the seat in question from West Bath, not the seat from Brunswick.

I would thank my good friend from Portland, Mr. Joyce. My tender years are certainly here, but I really hadn't understood how old he was. I wasn't aware that he was around before Prohibition when this kind of thing first started. I am sure he saw that kind of thing first hand.

However, I think the kinds of things we were talking about when this thing was first enacted many decades ago and what you are talking about today are two entirely separate things. If you are seriously worried about somebody going out and buying a couple hundred votes with a couple hundred drinks, then I am afraid I just can't argue with you. I don't agree with it; I don't think that kind of thing happens in this day and age.

Given the relative simplicity of voting in today's day and age, I hardly think the way people go out and vote is going to be affected by this kind of legislation. If somebody goes out, they vote, they happen to go out that evening to have supper in a restaurant, a salesman happens to be driving through town, stops in a hotel, he can't go out and have a drink with his meal. That is the primary reason I put the bill in.

One of the things that was brought out at the hearing was the number of people who, because of this law, presently are not allowed to work on election day in restaurants, in bars, in small stores and things of that sort. I had one gentleman tell me that by and large in his small store, something like half the business, half of his profit came from the sale of beer and wine. I hardly think that by enacting such legislation you are seriously going to infringe upon the sensibilities of today's electorate or today's citizens in general.

I would hope that when you vote, you vote to repeal this archaic law, archaic provision. If there is a reason to have it on the books, I would like to hear it. I haven't heard it so far.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call, it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All those desiring a roll call vote will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken, and more than one fifth of the members present having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on passage to be engrossed of L. D. 25. All those in favor of this Bill being passed to be engrossed will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Aloupis, Bachrach, Biron, Boudreau, P.; Brennerman, Brown, K. L.; Cote, Diamond, Dow, Fowlie, Goodwin, H.; Gray, Green, Henderson, Hobbins, Hutchings, Jacques, Jensen, Kany, Kelleher, Kilcoyne, Lizotte, MacEachern, Marshall, Maxwell, McHenry, McKean, Quinn, Raymond, Truman, Twitchell, Valentine.

NAY — Ault, Austin, Bagley, Beaulieu, Bennett, Benoit, Berry, Berube, Birt, Blodgett, Boudreau, A.; Brown, K. C.; Bunker, Burns, Byers, Carey, Carrier, Carroll, Carter, D.; Carter, F.; Chonko, Churchill, Clark, Connors, Cox, Curran, Davies, Dexter, Drinkwater, Durgin, Elias, Fenlason, Flanagan, Garsoe, Gibbs, Gill, Gillis, Goodwin, K.; Gould, Greenlaw, Hall, Hickey, Higgins, Howe, Huber, Hughes, Hunter, Immonen, Jackson, Joyce, Kane, Kerry, Laffin, LaPlante, LeBlanc,

Lewis, Littlefield, Locke, Lougee, Lynch, Mackel, Martin, A.; Masterman, Masterton, McBreairty, McMahon, McPherson, Mills, Mitchell, Moody, Morton, Nadeau, Najarian, Nelson, M.; Nelson, N.; Palmer, Peakes, Pearson, Peltier, Perkins, Peterson, Post Powell, Prescott, Rideout, Rollins, Shute, Silsby, Spencer, Sprowl, Strout, Stubbs, Talbot, Tarbell, Tarr, Teague, Theriault, Tierney, Torrey, Tozier, Trafton, Tyndale, Whittemore, Wilfong, Wood, Wyman, The Speaker.

ABSENT — Bustin, Connolly, Devoe, Dudley, Dutremble, Gauthier, Jalbert, Lunt, Mahany, Norris, Smith, Stover.

Yes, 32; No, 107; Absent, 12.

The SPEAKER: Thirty-two having voted in the affirmative and one hundred and seven in the negative, with twelve being absent, the motion does not prevail.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Nadeau.

Mr. NADEAU: Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I now move we reconsider our action whereby this Bill failed passage to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Nadeau, moves that the House reconsider its action whereby the Bill failed of passage to be engrossed. All in favor of reconsideration will say yes; those opposed will say no.

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

Sent to the Senate.

#### Passed to Be Enacted Emergency Measure

An Act to Appropriate Funds to the Legislative Apportionment Commission (H. P. 94) (L. D. 106)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 134 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

By unanimous consent, ordered sent forthwith.

#### Orders of the Day

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

Joint Order — Relative to Senate and House Services, Supplies and Equipment. (S. P. 21)

— In Senate, read and passed.

Tabled — January 13, 1977 by Mr. Carey of Waterville.

Pending — Passage in concurrence.

On motion of Mr. Palmer of Nobleboro, retabled pending passage in concurrence and specially assigned for Tuesday, January 25.

The following paper from the Senate was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

RESOLVE, Appropriating Funds to the Biddeford High School Band to Play at the Inauguration of the President of the United States at Washington, D.C. (Emergency) (S. P. 55)

Came from the Senate, under suspension of the rules and without reference to a Committee, the Bill read twice and passed to be engrossed.

In the House, under suspension of the rules, the Bill was read twice and passed to be engrossed without reference to any committee in concurrence.

By unanimous consent, ordered sent forthwith to the Engrossing Department.

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

House Order — Relative to a Request for a Supreme Court Ruling With Regard to the Validity of Certain Election Procedures and

Certain Ballots for Representative from House District 29.

Tabled — January 18, 1977 by Mr. Tierney of Lisbon Falls.

Pending — Passage.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lisbon Falls, Mr. Tierney.

Mr. TIERNEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Article 6, Section 3, of the Maine Constitution allows the Senate, the Governor and this House to require our Supreme Judicial Court to give us answers to questions that we ask them or important issues of law upon solemn occasions. Today, the House of Representatives propounds the first important question of law and, indeed, it is a solemn occasion, the step is not taken lightly.

Hours of research have been done and hours of hearings have been held by both the Commission on Governmental Ethics and Election Practices and their own special committee on elections. All of their work has distilled the question into the questions we now have before us and are about to send to the Supreme Court. Before that step is taken, I feel several issues should be made clear. First, both Mr. Gordon Cunningham of New Gloucester and Mr. Michael Gibbs, who sits with us now, of Gray, are outstanding individuals, either one of whom will bring honor and distinction to this body should this issue finally be resolved.

Second, there are certain issues which have been raised during the course of this testimony and this research which are not encompassed and addressed by the questions that we propound today.

We know, for example, that individuals in District 29, who were under legal guardianship, voted in that election. We know that many technical errors were made, not of a substantive nature, at the polls in that district. We know that the campaign treasurer of Mr. Cunningham, a state employee who works at Pineland, went into the ballot booth, together with a Democrat, to give assistance to residents of Pineland. There is no fraud being alleged by any of the parties, no improper activities are even being alleged or intimated in any way and yet, because we are dealing with the most fundamental works of all American citizens, the right to vote, I am asking you to remember these issues today. I am also asking you to remember these issues in the weeks and months ahead as we continue to look again and scrutinize our election laws. Nothing can be more important to a democracy than the method by which we select our elected officials.

One final reminder — while we ask these questions to the court, the ultimate responsibility is still ours. Many of us might wish that some commission of our creation might take this burden from our shoulders or perhaps some court would be able to make a final determination for us, but that is not to be. Article 4, Section 3 of our Constitution clearly leaves the final decision to us, each House must be a judge of its own membership.

As a House, we are groping for a fair, equitable and, yes, non-partisan way in resolving this issue. I think the questions we send to the court today are a long step in that direction.

Thereupon, the Order received passage.

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

Mr. LAFFIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is my third year up here and I have never been refused anything by the leadership or the members of this House, but today, the leadership of this House took it upon themselves to pass judgment on a resolution that I wanted to submit, that they were right and the body would be wrong. I say that it is up to this body to decide and not the leadership of this House.

The Speaker of this House and the two majority and minority leaders do not, and I repeat, they do not know the problems of Westbrook and they do not know the problems of a lot of other places, but the important thing is that I am a representative of the people just as much as they are. In fact, I represent two districts, because it takes twice as many people to vote in Westbrook as it does in a single membership district because we are in a double, multiple district, or whatever they call it, and I feel that I have the right and I have an obligation to the people of Westbrook when they ask me to do something, to come up here and do it.

Whether you agree with it or not is not the question, that is not the point. You can vote against it, but I should be given the courtesy to present it to this body for their consideration and not the consideration of leadership, because I pay very little attention to the leadership. I pay very little attention to it now, as I have the last two years.

When I presented a Resolution against amnesty for draft dodgers, that was my prerogative to do so, and I did so because the people of Westbrook asked me to do it and I was refused to let that go before the floor of this House.

I would like to state some of the reasons why — because the debate would be three hours. Well, that is tough, that is what we are up here for. Do we live by a clock? You do not get any more money if the debate is two hours or five hours. We are up here to serve the people and many times we will lose and many times you will not agree with me, but at least this body has always given me the courtesy and their respect to at least present what I have to say. When you take that away, then you can't let it go for me and let someone else come in. You do it for one and you have to do it for all.

Regardless of whether you agree with what I have to say, that is not the issue. The issue is that this is where it is supposed to come. They come up and say, we have no control over this. Well, we can let the duly elected President know how we feel about an issue. We can let him know that we are for this or we are against it. We can let our Representatives know. If our people at home tell us that we want something, we fight for it here and pass it on to Washington — isn't that our job?

I may not have too much education, I may not have a lot of degrees behind my name, but I know what the people of this state want and I know what the people of Westbrook want, and when I have been deprived of that position, then I might as well not hold this seat. I am of no value to my people back home if I can't fulfill their wishes; whether you agree or you don't has no bearing whatsoever.

They say someone else is going to put one in against it — fine and good, they have that right also, but if I am going to be deprived of it, then the members of this House should know that you are going to be deprived too.

I have three more resolutions. They wanted to know, what are they? In other words, they are going to pinpoint and pick what is good for you people to vote on or resolutions. Well, they are not picking on mine, because I am letting you know just what they did. I could not get six fotes. I don't even know where that rule came from. The leadership here makes up rules every day. I don't know what they are doing from one day to the next and I will not be put in their pocket.

It is not important right now what the resolution was; it was yesterday. Nobody told me that I could not have it printed, nobody told me that I could not present it to the members of this body for their consideration and not the Speakers and not the majority and the minority leaders, I was not told that. You have to get permission around here from the leaders and from the Speaker to

do anything — well, I don't. I never have and I never will.

I asked Mr. Cote if he would cosponsor my resolution and gladly he accepted. We did it in good faith. We do not meet in private rooms and discuss what is going to be good for this legislature and what is going to be good for the people of Maine and what is not going to be good for the people of Maine. What is good for the people will be decided on the floor of this House and not in the Speakers' office and not in the majority and minority leaders' offices, and that is what they are doing.

I was told, you will be shot down by them, you will never get anything. Well, they never gave me anything in two years, so I do not expect anything anyway.

I feel that if I can't present something to this legislature and convince them that it is good for the people in Maine, then I should not have it passed in the first place.

When the leadership is going to pick out what they are going to allow to come before this body, I do not want any part of it. I have three more resolutions that they are not going to find out, and if they have not already checked with the Legislative Research, I will tell them not to tell them.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would like to make note of the following points, certainly not wishing to debate with the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Laffin, but simply to remind him and other members of the House of the rules and procedures under which we operate.

The Chair would call your attention to Joint Rule 34, which deals with memorials and I quote: "No memorials shall be in order for introduction unless approved by a majority of the Legislative Council." This joint rule has been a part of our joint rules ever since I have been a member of this body. Under the terms of the orders and the reason why this was structured this way is an attempt and desire to try to determine whether or not we should be dealing only with state business or something else.

The reason that the memorial was not given the request granted by the gentleman from Westbrook was simply because there was one order introduced by him and one other to be introduced by another member doing the counter thing, and the leadership and those people who were here last evening, I went around with the memorial and asked whether or not they wanted to let it be introduced, and they felt very strongly that this body could not have a direct impact upon the President since the resolution drafted by the gentleman was going to the members of the legislative delegation from the State of Maine and of course, the question of amnesty was to be decided by the President of the United States.

Mrs. Lewis of Auburn was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mrs. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question to the gentleman from Lisbon Falls, Mr. Tierney. I thought that he referred to Article 4, Section 3 in the Constitution and that seems to me to be dealing with apportionment. I don't understand how that could refer to the House deciding its own law and perhaps he could direct me to the proper part of the Constitution because I would like to check it.

The SPEAKER: Mrs. Lewis of Auburn has posed a question to the gentleman from Lisbon Falls, Mr. Tierney, who may answer if he so desires.

The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. TIERNEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Unfortunately, I do not have a Constitution in front of me. If the numerical order was wrong, that is fine, but there is no question, however, that each House is the judgment of its own members, and I am sure that the gentledady is not questioning that.

(Off Record Remarks)

On motion of Mr. Bennett of Caribou,  
Adjourned until three o'clock tomorrow after-  
noon.