

# 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 Ninth***  
***Legislature***

**OF THE**  
**STATE OF MAINE**

**Volume II**

**First Regular Session**

**May 7, 1979 to June 15, 1979**

**INDEX**

**First Confirmation Session**

**August 3, 1979**

**INDEX**

**First Special Session**

**October 4-5, 1979**

**INDEX**

**Second Special Session**

**October 10-11, 1979**

**INDEX**

**Second Confirmation Session**

**December 7, 1979**

**INDEX**

## HOUSE

Wednesday, October 10, 1979

This being the day designated in the Proclamation of the Governor for the meeting of the One Hundred and Ninth Legislature in extra session, the members of the House of Representatives assembled in their hall at ten o'clock in the morning and were called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Reverend Stephen Holmes of the Winthrop Congregational United Church of Christ.

Rev. HOLMES: Let us pray. Almighty God, we ask that you search the depths of our hearts in such a way that the deliberations of this day are true to the directions and inclinations of your will.

You have made us in your image as a gifted servant. With our gifts let us create the conditions which serve the needs of your people as best we possibly can. You have made us a people of faith; we shall not let fear stir our hearts.

Let us now go about our task with open minds and steadfast assumptions, trusting in the guidance of your Holy Spirit. Amen.

The members stood at attention during the playing of the National Anthem by the Hall-Dale High School Band of Farmingdale.

A roll call was taken. 138 members answered to their names and accordingly a quorum was found to be present.

Those who were absent were: Messrs. Delert, Howe, Immonen, Laffin, MacEachern, McPherson, Mrs. Payne, Rolde, Roope, Soulas, Vose, Whittemore.

On motion of Mr. Garsoe of Cumberland, it was

ORDERED, that a message be conveyed to the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives is present for the consideration of such business as may come before the House.

Thereupon, Mrs. Mitchell of Vassalboro was appointed to convey the message and subsequently reported that she had performed the duty assigned her.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is pleased to recognize the Consul General of Japan and his wife in the balcony, Shutarō Takahashi. Could he please stand to accept the greetings of the Maine House. (Applause, the members rising)

He is visiting the State of Maine and Governor Brennan and has already met with the Governor. We are very pleased that he was able to join us this morning.

On motion of Mr. Tierney of Lisbon Falls, it was

ORDERED, that a Committee of seven be appointed to wait upon His Excellency, the Governor, and inform him that a quorum of the House of Representatives is assembled in the Hall of the House for the consideration of such business as may come before the House.

The Chair appointed the following members:

Mr. BRANNIGAN of Portland  
Mrs. CURTIS of Milbridge  
Mr. ELIAS of Madison  
Mr. DOW of West Gardiner  
Mr. HANSON of Kennebunkport  
Mrs. HUBER of Falmouth  
Mrs. HUTCHINGS of Lincolnville

Subsequently, Mr. Brannigan for the Committee reported that it had attended to the duty to which it was assigned.

At this point, a message was received from the Senate, borne by Senator Pierce of Kennebec, informing the House that a quorum was present and that the Senate was ready to transact such business as might properly come before it.

## Messages and Documents

The following Proclamation:

State of Maine  
PROCLAMATION  
By the Governor

WHEREAS, there exists in the State of Maine an extraordinary occasion whereby Maine citizens are faced with the prospects of sharply increased prices and possibly inadequate supplies of the petroleum products essential to heat most homes during the coming winter; and

WHEREAS, adequate home heating is a necessary part of shelter and the lack of home heating poses a genuine and immediate threat to life, health and safety; and

WHEREAS, many Maine citizens, particularly the elderly and other low-income citizens, will need to help to meet the anticipated high cost of fuel during the coming winter; and

WHEREAS, the Project Fuel Task Force drafted a proposal to provide such assistance, to relieve the hardships caused by higher prices and to encourage energy conservation which has received legislative consideration but which requires further deliberations; and

WHEREAS, there exists a need for the Legislature to act in a timely fashion on this proposal;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Joseph E. Brennan, Governor of the State of Maine, by virtue of the constitutional power vested in me as Governor, convene the Legislature of this State, hereby requesting the Senators and Representatives to assemble in their respective chambers at the Capitol at Augusta on Wednesday, the Tenth Day of October, 1979, at ten o'clock in the morning, in order to receive communications and enact an emergency fuel assistance plan.

Given at the Office of the Governor at Augusta, and sealed with the Great Seal of the State of Maine, this Fifth day of October in the Year of Our Lord Nineteen Hundred and Seventy-nine.

S/JOSEPH E. BRENNAN

By the Governor  
S/LINWOOD F. ROSS  
Deputy Secretary of State

A true copy

Attest: S/JAMES S. HENDERSON  
Deputy Secretary of State

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

At this point, a message was received from the Senate, borne by Senator Conley of Cumberland of that body, proposing a Joint Convention of both branches of the Legislature to be held at 10:30 a.m. in the Hall of the House for the purpose of extending to His Excellency, Governor Joseph E. Brennan, an invitation to attend the convention and to make such communication as he may be pleased to make.

Thereupon, the House voted to concur in the proposal for a Joint Convention and the Chair appointed Mr. Garsoe of Cumberland to convey a message to the Senate to that effect.

Mr. Garsoe subsequently reported that he had delivered the message with which he was charged.

The following paper appearing on Supplement No. 1 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

From the Senate: The following Joint Order (S. P. 651)

ORDERED, the House concurring, that three hundred and twenty-five copies of the Legislative Record for this Special Session be printed, one copy for each of the members of the Senate, House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House, and the remainder to be deposited with the State Law Librarian for exchange and library use; and be it further

ORDERED, that suitable index be prepared for such Legislative Record under the direction of the Director of Legislative Research.

Came from the Senate read and passed.

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

At this point, the Senate entered the Hall of the House and a Joint Convention was formed.

## In Convention

The President of the Senate, Joseph Sewall, in the Chair.

On motion of Senator Huber of Cumberland, it was

ORDERED, that a Committee be appointed to wait upon The Honorable Joseph E. Brennan, Governor, and to inform him that the two branches of the Legislature are in Convention assembled in the Hall of the House of Representatives, and extend to him an invitation to attend the Convention and present such communication as he may be pleased to make.

The Chairman appointed:

Senators:

HUBER of Cumberland  
PERKINS of Hancock  
NAJARIAN of Cumberland

Representatives:

PEARSON of Old Town  
JALBERT of Lewiston  
CARTER of Winslow  
KELLEHER of Bangor  
CHONKO of Topsham  
DIAMOND of Windham  
MORTON of Farmington  
HIGGINS of Scarborough  
BOUDREAU of Waterville  
SMITH of Mars Hill

Senator Huber, for the Committee, subsequently reported that the Committee had attended to the duty assigned to it, and the Governor was pleased to say that he would forthwith attend the Convention.

Whereupon, Governor Joseph E. Brennan entered the Convention Hall amid prolonged applause, the audience rising.

The Governor then addressed the Convention as follows:

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of this Joint Convention:

My remarks this morning will be brief. There is no reason for me to elaborate at length on why we are here.

Last week, we asked you to come back into session because we expected you would have the opportunity to vote on some much needed energy assistance legislation.

It was the consensus of opinion then that no bill should go to the floor until we had had an opportunity to see if we could work out a position on which all could agree.

But I want you all to know your presence here, by standing by, was a powerful impetus to the conduct of those discussions.

I want you to know, too, that I appreciate the inconvenience to many, and hardship to some of you, that convening again now means.

But, again, your presence is indispensable to any hope for constructive action.

Little has changed since last week. Winter is still coming. Yesterday's snow was a stark reminder of what is to come.

There are thousands of elderly men and women, and thousands of children from the neediest homes in the State, who still look at us for assistance.

We are still the only hope they have for meaningful, perhaps life sustaining, help.

We still anticipate the average fuel bill will be about \$330 a household, 60 percent more than last year.

And the news this week warns of further price increases from the OPEC nations.

Our responsibilities remain the same.

The bill I have sent up today represents a good faith effort to achieve a compromise, between objections raised by some of you over the level of funding, and our obligation to provide an adequate level of assistance.

I started at \$6.2 million, with ceilings of \$250 and \$125 per household, even recognizing an overall per family increase of \$330.

My plan began with limits because of both restraints on our resources, and our recognition that paying less than the full increase would encourage conservation.

I have listened to your objections. I believe that the concerns some of you raised were legitimate and reasonable.

State revenues did drop below estimates during July and August.

And so, I acted to address these concerns by reducing both the maximum allotment, and the overall appropriation in this revised bill.

But, I am pleased to be able to announce this morning that our revised preliminary estimates show that September revenues are ahead of expectations. In fact, while the final figures aren't ready yet, it appears that September revenues will exceed estimates by more than \$2.5 million.

This puts revenues for September 5.4 percent above estimates for the month.

It dramatically improves our financial picture for the first quarter of the fiscal year.

It should resolve any lingering doubts about the State's ability to pay for this program.

To those who object, and say that this can be done through our General Assistance Program, I say that many of our elderly won't ask for general assistance.

To many of them, that program has the same demeaning connotations that it has to many of you.

A program specifically geared to the elderly won't be the same as welfare to many of them, and they will be more likely to ask for the help we make available.

To those who object that we have not mandated that the program be administered by local communities, I say that our plan gives communities the option of administering it, but recognizes that many cities and towns are not prepared for that kind of undertaking.

And again, it would be shortsighted not to pass this assistance.

We will lose federal matching dollars that would be available to us, and we will end up spending more State dollars to buy the same amount of oil.

Today will be a very telling day in the history of the 109th Legislature. For, either this Legislature will meet the urgent and real needs of those citizens who need help, or this Legislature will go on record as having turned its collective back on older men and women, and our neediest children, and thousands of other people, who happen to be poor.

In the absence of clear leadership from Washington, this Administration has tried to act.

I have done what I can. Now you must keep faith with your obligations.

This is a nation that bails out billion dollar corporations like Boeing. This is a nation that has tolerated a tax system which has allowed some of our wealthiest citizens to pay no taxes.

These are government subsidies for those who are strong and can stand alone.

Here, we are asking for help for many of those who cannot stand alone.

Several weeks ago, in meetings with your leadership, I asked that consideration of any emergency aid plan be conducted in an ecumenical spirit, because the needs to be met were so important to be defeated by partisan consideration.

If we fail to enact this bill for partisan political reasons, there will be no victories for either party.

But there will be defeats. And they will be felt by those who go cold this winter.

I hope we won't let that happen.

The concept of the bill already has the support of both parties.

The money is there.

Let us demonstrate, by our action, that we

care.

As you vote today, remember the least powerful, the least influential, the most vulnerable, of our fellow citizens.

The people of Maine will have to live with our decisions. And we will have to live with our consciences.

At the conclusion of the Governor's address, he withdrew amid applause, the audience rising.

The purpose for which the Convention was assembled having been accomplished, the Chairman declared the same dissolved and the Senate retired to its Chambers, amid applause of the House, the members rising.

#### In the House

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

#### (Off Record Remarks)

#### Petitions, Bills and Resolves Requiring Reference

Bill "An Act Providing Funds for Emergency Home Heating Assistance for Certain Elderly and Low-Income Households and for the Winterization, Citizens' Assistance and Housing Rehabilitation Technician Programs and Correcting an Error in the Energy Inventory Reporting" (H. P. 1589) (L. D. 1601) (Presented by Mr. Martin of Eagle Lake) (Cosponsors: Mr. Pearson of Old Town, Mr. Carter of Winslow, Mr. McMahon of Kennebunk)

Under suspension of the rules, and without reference, to any committee, the Bill was read twice.

Mrs. Lewis of Auburn offered House Amendment "B" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "B" (H-740) was read by the Clerk.

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

Mrs. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: If you will adopt House Amendment "B", \$2 million will be distributed among all the communities of the state according to population, that money to be used in the general assistance programs that the communities have.

Presently, every community in our state has a general assistance program, so not one penny of this would have to be used for administration. And if you will look at the Governor's proposal, you will notice that there is almost \$200,000 to be used for administration. That would heat quite a few homes in this state.

I listened to the Governor carefully this morning, and I am pleased that we have such a compassionate person as our Governor. However, I would have to take issue with him or anyone else who would think that because a person doesn't want to set up a bureaucracy, that that person is necessarily against helping poor people.

I am very much in favor of helping poor people, but I want to help those who really need it and help them on the local level. There isn't anyone who knows the need of a community better than the local people, and I don't think there is one person in this state who is going to go hungry or freeze this winter unless it happens to be that person's choice, because every one of us is going to be sure that we help our neighbor.

In the Governor's speech the other day, he spoke particularly to that, to helping our neighbors, and that is something that many people are famous for. There is no question that our neighbors will be helped. However, I do feel that the general assistance in the towns is going to have to be heavily drained, so it is essential that we send a few extra dollars to every community to help them.

A side effect of this proposal would be to hold down property taxes, because if the general as-

sistance does have further drain on it, then it means that the only way the towns can make up that extra money is by property taxes.

I would urge you to consider this amendment. I honestly feel it is the best way to go. If, in January, we find that our people need more help than this gives them, we can address it.

The winterization program, I think, is fine, but I think that is an entirely different issue and I feel that that can be addressed properly when we have time enough to really consider it in January.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would urge you to vote for this amendment.

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

Mr. TIERNEY: Mr. Speaker, I move the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "B" and request to speak to my motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lisbon Falls, Mr. Tierney, moves that House Amendment "B" be indefinitely postponed.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. TIERNEY: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: While I am sure the gentleman from Auburn and her bipartisan supporters on this bill have offered this in all good faith, I feel that it has four essential elements which merit all of us to vote for its indefinite postponement. The four problems are fairly clear.

The first is that this general assistance program would result in 487 different energy programs around the state — each town would be allowed to use its own standards for giving it, and I think that that type of inefficiency penalizes people unjustly with state dollars, depending simply on where they live.

Number two, the problem is that this is not a fuel program at all; it is a general assistance program. As you know, general assistance can be used for a wide variety of things and many of the things are not related to fuel.

Number three, and perhaps worse, is that this approach benefits those individuals who are most adept at manipulating our current welfare system. Those individuals who present themselves on the selectman's doorstep every Monday morning with a whole list of complaints and problems will get this money. Those senior citizens who have dignity and do not wish to go down to the town to get aid in a very public and often times humiliating fashion will never get this aid, and the money which Mrs. Lewis wishes to get to them will not, in fact, be received.

Lastly, ladies and gentlemen, it discriminates terribly between the towns since the distribution is based primarily, as a matter of fact exclusively on population and there is no indication of income. This proposal, then, essentially helps the people in Cape Elizabeth to the same extent as the people in Durham or in Cutler or in some of our less wealthy communities.

This is obviously discriminatory; it makes very little sense. In a sense, it is a form of general revenue sharing back to the communities which should not be supported at this time.

While I certainly value the gentleman's honest commitment to the proposition, I feel it should not receive our support and I urge you to vote with me in favor of indefinite postponement.

Mr. Speaker, I request a division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Garsoe.

Mr. GARSOE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As another proponent of local involvement in matters of this kind, and having put out a program in August directed somewhat along these lines, I am going to support the motion for indefinite postponement.

This bill just hasn't been worked out to the point where it would be an equitable vehicle. I think the gentleman from Lisbon Falls, my friend Mr. Tierney, has made a good case against it.

But, I want to commend the gentlelady from Auburn for having introduced this measure because it gives the opposite point of view from that that we have been hearing from the Governor.

Now, the Governor keeps referring to "this bill, this bill, this bill" as being the only device by which we can oppress the problems which our people face this winter.

It should be perfectly obvious, and I think Representative Lewis has made it perfectly obvious, that there are many ways to approach the problem that we face. You are going to be faced today with the opportunity to support more than just this bill.

I hope we can send this quietly on its way. And if I may be allowed to digress, Mr. Speaker, I hope I am not out of order, I am telling my people that we don't intend to caucus until we have disposed of this matter. Frankly, a caucus would be a chance for some breast feeding and some pleasures to mire ourselves in cement, and I don't think that would be worthwhile. I am hoping that we can dispose of the bill before us, get it out to any other body that might wish to deal with it. I have been assured that there will be an opportunity to caucus at an appropriate time.

**THE SPEAKER:** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Harrison, Mr. Leighton.

**MR. LEIGHTON:** Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Before I forget, I would like to request a roll call.

It is going to be a hard, cold winter. Up where I come from in Harrison, even the people who don't intend to pay are thinking twice about buying this coming winter.

I had said originally in our Republican caucus that I was going to oppose both plans. However, in a spirit of compromise, I would like to say at this time that I can now support the plan that has been put forth by my good friend Representative Lewis of Auburn. I can support her plan because it will create no new bureaucracy. All the money is going to go to the needy. There will be no federal guidelines to the program that allows other transfer of payments to be left out in computing income as we have had in so many of these other programs which allow upper middle class people, in my opinion, oftentimes to go on the dole without need.

Her program would be administered by local elected officials, and I don't really see how anybody can argue with that. It seems to me that when we do, we argue against democracy. The overseers of the poor are municipal officers.

I think in a large sense, this special session could be called the Autumn harvest of 1979. It seems to me that we are harvesting the fruits of years of government intervention in our economy. The fruits of that harvest, it seems to me, consist of shortages, low productivity, a debauched currency, a raging inflation that sucks the life blood from those on fixed incomes, particularly our elderly and our poor.

Pine Tree Legal and others like them have said that our elderly and our poor are suffering from the high cost of energy; I agree. But wasn't it just a short time ago that these same people were telling us that our elderly and our poor were suffering from the high cost of food? I agree with that. Thus was born our food stamp program with all its attendant bureaucracy and abuse.

It was just a short time ago that they were telling us that our elderly and our poor were suffering from the high cost of housing, and that was true. Thus was born the myriad of mortgage and rent subsidy programs with all its attendant bureaucracy and its attendant abuse.

But if you will notice, friends, as we have applied the band-aids of subsidy to these kinds of economic problems, the economic plight of our elderly and our poor hasn't gotten better; it is getting worse.

These programs, each one of them, are riddled with abuse, but even if that weren't so, these programs still wouldn't work because, you see, our elderly and our poor don't suffer per se from increases in energy or increases in the price of food or increases in the price of housing. These people are suffering from the age old malady of old fashion inflation. You see, their dollars have been robbed of their purchasing power. Dollars that they put into programs like social security, the Maine State Retirement system, savings bonds, pensions, or, for that matter, in a mattress, when they get them back, they are not the dollars that they put in.

Take the instance of savings bonds. What do they pay — 5 or 6 percent — who cares, what difference does it make? Whatever was put away in 19-when-ever in savings bonds is now being eaten away by an inflation that rages at some 15 or 16 percent, depending on whose figures you use.

I think it is pretty much axiomatic, I think we all know that when we increase a subsidy or increase payments to the people on social security or on AFDC, or any other sort of an increase, I think everyone knows, the man on the street knows, it is predictable, it is axiomatic that this cost of living is going to increase by a greater increment than the benefit received.

You see, and I don't doubt but what the Governor's programs — I shouldn't say that — the programs of the Democrat party and the programs of the Republican party will result in the same end. The benefit received will be less than the inflation created by this deficit finance, federal dollars in the program.

There is a lot of demagoguery about inflation, and I for one am sick of it. When there is not enough economic literacy in the land it is a small wonder. Economics is known as the dismal science. When I went to school in the fifties, everyone wanted to be a school teacher or an engineer. It seemed to me in the sixties and seventies that everyone wanted to be a storefront lawyer or a social worker. No one studies economics in our elementary schools, it is not taught in our high schools. As far as I know, the only people in the world that know anything about economics are those people who studied it in college, a very few thousand out of our some 200 million people.

Webster's definition of inflation is quite clear. While I don't have it committed to memory, I have got it right here. If you will bear with me — Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary defines inflation as "a disproportionate and relatively sharp and sudden increase in the quantity of money or credit or both relative to goods available for purchase. Inflation always produces a rise in the price level."

Inflation is not new. It helped bring down the Roman Empire; it almost sabotaged the American Revolution. I think you all must remember in your history class saying "it is not worth a continental." In most of the world now they are saying "it is not worth a dollar."

Inflation opened the door for Napoleon in France; it gave Germany Adolph Hitler — different times, different places, different people, but comment in each situation was that each government was devaluing its currency.

When our federal government runs a deficit, they, in effect, print new money to finance this deficit. The end result is an increase in the existing money supply and the whole money supply is devalued or watered down in just that instance.

When we talk about oil — I have got a whole bunch of newspaper clippings here. When we talk about the increase in the price of oil, I think we ought to read our own newspapers because it is not just an increase in the price of oil, the problem of OPEC nations enlarged by it has been the decreasing value of the dollar abroad. This is the unit of exchange in international circles for wood. This has been a large part of the increase in the price of wood.

Defining inflation, inflation isn't caused by the increase in price of one commodity, because if you had a staple and constant money supply, obviously the prices of other commodities would have to come down because there would be a staple supply of money and the net cost of living would be no higher. So, we see it is a federal problem and it is a legitimate question.

I don't want to take too much of your time — what can we do about it here at the state level? Well, by gosh, we can tell it like it is. We can recognize our enemy, we can work to educate people, we can petition the Congress to balance the budget. We are all political creatures, and as we talk to our counterparts in Congress, we can tell them that we don't approve of their actions. When we meet in committee and we are talking about federal funds, we can ask the legitimate questions — were these ways to deficit financing? Are these dollars worth what they say they are? Will this help inflation or will this worsen it?

Someone could buy the Governor a textbook on basic economics.

I could go on, and I am sure most of you wish that I wouldn't, but I just want to say that the Governor said, when he called this session, that there was a problem and that he wasn't going to wait for a federal solution. It seems to me that we cannot hear, and rather than acting like responsible state legislators, we try to be congressmen. We have pinpointed in on what federal monies are going to be available, what the feds are going to do, what the federal guidelines are going to do — I am tired of that.

Why don't we go with Representative Lewis' amendment that says what the state is going to do with state dollars, state raised real dollars, that represent a real giving of our worldly goods to those who are really in need.

**THE SPEAKER:** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Livermore Falls, Mr. Brown.

**MR. BROWN:** Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We are gathering here today for a very solemn occasion, and that is to provide assistance to those who will truly be in need this winter as they face a possible crisis situation.

I think a majority of those of us gathered here today do not disagree that the need is there — it is there, it is imminent. The thing that we disagree on, however, is, how is it going to be implemented?

Ladies and gentlemen, we have a choice before us this morning and that choice is very clear. Do we continue to expand the bureaucratic bungling with its attendant quota requirements, eligibility guidelines and other incessant nonsense that has become such an abused part of our society or do we pass a plan that will help those who are truly in need and do we develop a method through which we are ensuring the highest possible cost effectiveness of our monetary system?

As most of you know, that can only be done by forsaking the "business as usual" method of providing assistance and sending whatever funds that legislature may appropriate directly to the local officials, those who are in the best position to know the needs of their citizens.

With respect to the comments made by the good gentleman from Lisbon Falls, Mr. Tierney, he is suggesting that our local officials do not have the aptitude to recognize these problems and deal with them effectively. I disagree with that entirely.

I represent four relatively small towns, three of them very rural, and I can assure you that I think those towns have as their elected officials some of the finest people in the State of Maine. They are interested in this plan; this is the one that they think will work.

The message regarding the choices before us from constituents is loud and clear. They want no part of the "business as usual" that has penetrated our society. They want to return the authority to the local people where it belongs, and

the amendment before you will do just that.

Governor Brennan, in his message to the State last Tuesday evening, said that for too long the people have looked to government to solve the problems of people. He suggested that it is time people started looking after people. I enthusiastically concur. The message before you does just that. It is people sharing with those people who are less fortunate than us, and it is doing so through a means which is directly responsive to the people with no administrative costs and no middleman. Ladies and gentlemen, the choice is very clear — we do nothing and go home or we pass the amendment before us so that we can provide assistance to those who are in need.

I urge you to vote no on the indefinite postponement question before you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Presque Isle, Mrs. MacBride.

Mrs. MacBRIDE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have received a good deal of input from my people. This weekend, wherever I went everyone was talking to me. When I got home, there was a letter waiting for me from a very nice, middle income family. They are very fine, compassionate people. They both work and they have children and the wife also talked to me on the phone as a followup. I would just like to share this letter with you because I think it is a letter that does show how a lot of our middle income people are feeling.

She says in part: "There are so many people eligible for food stamps, free lunches, free day care service for their children, low income housing, all sorts of college aid, and now aid for oil bills, also low interest rates in purchasing a home which is not available to our young people. But these same young people and their parents are paying for all of these programs.

"Please understand that we all have great compassion for the truly poor people, but we are fast creating another generation of young people who think the world, or rather the middle class, owes them everything — and why not? Their parents have been getting all these handouts for a long time now.

"We all work very hard and plan and save over the year for our children's future and their education, and also try to instill values. Then they look around and see their high school friends on AFDC, food stamps, low interest rates, free college educations, and now, being out in the working world themselves, they find they, too, are burdened, as we are, supporting the privileged poor.

"Sorry to get this off to you, Mary, but being our voice in Augusta, you are our hope for a better tomorrow, or should I say one that is more fair."

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley.

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: First, I would like to commend the lady from Auburn, Mrs. Lewis, for this amendment. Although I don't agree with it in its entirety, I think it is an option open to us that we shouldn't close out.

I am one of those who will only support something that would be taken care of on the local level, so I think something like this maybe should be kept open if we are to get anything out of Augusta, because I don't think there is going to be a two-thirds vote right this minute for any bill, not even this one.

I accept this amendment as being a fair, honest effort to try to get something. I would want to change Section 1 some. I don't think it should be given just to general assistance, I think it should be given in some way to reimburse the towns on a percentage basis for what they spend for oil or fuel. In a lot of cases, it would be wood or other means of keeping warm, and I think this amendment could be amended in Section 1 to take care of it.

We don't know just exactly how much money

it would be at this time, but we could give the towns back a percentage of what they had to give out for oil, each town. Some towns would have very little and others — I kind of looked over my towns that I represent and some of them feel as though they would have one or two, and one town thought probably they would have as many as 10 people that would have to have oil, those that should have it, would qualify and so forth. It will vary from town to town, that I understand, so I think we should use some means of percentage, say maybe 70 percent of what the towns had to spend for these people that didn't have heat.

Without this amendment, I don't see anything else before me that I could vote for. However, I could support this amendment as amended.

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

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

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

Mr. TIERNEY: Mr. Speaker, just to clarify what you are voting on, if you are in favor of the position which I have presented you with, you will be voting yes; if you are in favor of Mrs. Lewis' position, you will be voting no.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Lisbon Falls, Mr. Tierney, that House Amendment "B" be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Bachrach, Baker, Barry, Beaulieu, Benoit, Blodgett, Boudreau, Bowden, Brannigan, Brenerman, Brodeur, Brown, K. C.; Carrier, Carroll, Carter, D.; Chonko, Churchill, Cloutier, Connolly, Cox, Davies, Diamond, Dow, Dutremble, D. L.; Dutremble, L. A.; Elias, Fowlie, Garsoe, Gillis, Gowen, Gwadowsky, Hall, Hickey, Hobbins, Huber, Hughes, Jacques, E.; Joyce, Kane, Kany, Kelleher, LaPlante, Locke, Lund, Mahany, Martin, A.; Masterton, Maxwell, McHenry, McKean, McMahon, McSweeney, Michael, Mitchell, Morton, Nadeau, Nelson, M.; Nelson, N.; Norris, Paradis, Paul, Pearson, Post, Reeves, P.; Smith, Strout, Tarbell, Theriault, Tierney, Tuttle, Violette, Wood, Wyman, The Speaker.

NAY — Aloupis, Austin, Berube, Birt, Borda, Brown, A.; Brown, D.; Brown, K. L.; Bunker, Call, Carter, F.; Conary, Cunningham, Curtis, Damren, Davis, Dexter, Doukas, Drinkwater, Dudley, Fenlason, Fillmore, Gavett, Gould, Gray, Hanson, Higgins, Hunter, Hutchings, Jackson, Jacques, P.; Klesman, Lancaster, Leighton, Leonard, Lewis, Lougee, Lowe, MacBride, Marshall, Masterman, Matthews, Nelson, A.; Peltier, Peterson, Prescott, Reeves, J.; Rollins, Sewall, Sherburne, Silsby, Small, Sprowl, Stetson, Stover, Studley, Torrey, Tozier, Twitchell, Vincent, Wentworth.

ABSENT — Berry, Dellert, Howe, Immonen, Jalbert, Laffin, MacEachern, McPherson, Payne, Rolde, Roope, Simon, Soulas, Vose, Whittemore.

Yes, 74; No, 61; Absent, 15.

The SPEAKER: Seventy-four having voted in the affirmative and sixty-one in the negative, with fifteen being absent, the motion does prevail.

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

Mr. MORTON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This vote that we have before us is going to be on engrossment, and I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that it be a roll call.

We heard the Chief Executive of the State of Maine address us this morning in the area of this bill. He gave us a very excellent speech, compassion, and certainly we know that the Governor does not lack in sympathy for those who are in need. And I think it is fair to say that there are very few, if any, people in either branch of this legislature who lack in that sympathy.

I am here this morning to merely put the whole picture in context so that we will all understand where we are.

When this program was first presented in the earlier special session at the \$6 million level, we went through the normal process and put it before the Appropriations Committee. The Appropriations Committee, theoretically at least, and I think from a practical nature, attempts to have as much up-to-date financial information as it possibly can. And I am here stating to you now that in my opinion, no matter what level of funding is attributed to this fuel process, that we are appropriating from a deficit, a potential deficit perhaps, but certainly I will leave it up to you to determine that level of potentiality.

Why do I say this? I think it is a fair question that everyone should ask. You have a right to know what I consider to be the facts.

The Governor, this morning, pointed out that the financial situation with respect to revenues is in a state of flux, and I completely agree with him. In the Appropriations Committee, it was pretty much the general agreement that we do not in any way attempt to make changes in revenue estimates. Therefore, starting with the figures that we used at the last session of the legislature to set up the budget, I want to make it crystal clear that the figures you are about to hear are based on the revenue estimates of the Executive that were used when we considered the budget and developed the appropriations bills.

Here are the facts; they are incontrovertible. If there is any chance for opinion, I will indicate it.

When we ended the year on June 30, we had a surplus of \$18.9 million. Since that time, this legislature has adopted a first-year payment for the retirement system from the General Fund, \$6.6 million, which has now been signed by the Governor and is law. That brings the \$18.9 million down to \$12.3 million.

It is a fact that there is no provision in the biennial budget for the second-year funding for Indian education; approximately a \$2 million figure.

We have appropriated \$31.5 million of federal revenue sharing money. It is a fact that presently that money is coming in approximately \$700,000 a quarter short of what is anticipated to reach \$31.5 million. The net result of that is in the first year a shortage in revenue sharing of approximately \$1.5 million, but that can be almost all made up by dollars that were left over from last year's revenue sharing, so that is a break-even. With those same figures, quarterly shortages translate through almost a \$3 million shortage in the second year of the biennium — that is \$5 million.

Incidentally, as an aside, I hope you all sometime find out that the reason for that shortage in revenue sharing in great part traces back to the elimination of the uniform property tax as a state tax.

It is an incontrovertible fact that the second year of teacher retirement is still before us, and buying corrections by the select committee and the actuary that they choose, based on our present actuarial figures, that is still \$6.4 million.

The next incontrovertible fact is that the collective bargaining agreement for state employees ends on June 30, 1980. I question whether this legislature will be faced with a zero figure in that area. The best estimates that I can give are \$18.4 million for these shortages, and that is more than \$12.3. So it looks to me personally, and this is only my personal



opinion, you can take it for what it is worth, that we are looking at a deficit.

We have been advised in the Appropriations Committee that there are certain things that probably will have to be recommended as emergencies to be taken from these same funds for this year's biennium in the area of additional general assistance, additional nursing home and boarding home money, and additional dollars for the fuel in state buildings, totaling about \$2.5 million. These figures are given to us by responsible department people.

I think the fact that no matter what size bill we operate on here today, ladies and gentlemen, we are talking about appropriating from a deficit.

When we started out with this, the Appropriations Committee's sentiment was to provide help for the elderly. This was initially seen as an accepted thing to do and it followed the first line of the chart which we have all been looking at from the first day of this as far as the Governor's program was concerned, so you are talking about that top line and it was seen as an effective practice, and it was a program for only those who owned and rented. This would have cost the general fund about \$3 million. This, at one time, was supported by a bipartisan majority on the Appropriations Committee. I was an exception to that; I wasn't included in that bipartisan majority on the Appropriations Committee.

Within 24 hours, we had a crash course in how tightly the state is constrained when any federal dollars are used. We learned that the same \$3 million, skillfully matched with federal dollars, would protect our concern from the elderly poor and include all the categories requested by the Governor.

I will tell you right now that the program which was presented by the Governor, at the rather skillful and I think persistent work of a former colleague of ours, Mr. Greenlaw headed up that task force, was a pretty good job of maximizing the use of federal dollars. When you get faced with that sort of thing, you have to show that you are responsible, that you take care of the maximum number of people possible. So, the feeling was that it was necessary to come around and include not only those who owned their own homes and who rented and provided their own fuel, covered under the definition of households, but also those AFDC and the so-called working poor.

I would point out that this whole problem has been identified by an empirically developed program, albeit with a high degree of skill, but it is still only a model, an empirical model, it has not yet taken place and the problem that it faces has not yet taken place.

Just for a little bit of background information for everyone — the program has obviously been developed from programs that were there before, all federal programs. In 1977, we had a program which helped about 23,000 people at a maximum of \$250 down to a minimum of \$50. In 1978, we had a program that was helping about 12,000 people at a maximum of \$250, had fewer applications, it was a late program and, unfortunately, it was a first-come, first-serve program because it was so late. In 1979, we handled approximately 15,000. The department wasn't able to give me the exact figure this morning. It was again on a first-come, first-serve basis, and the problem with these earlier programs, they gave no credits for bills that had been paid, so one of the big problems I kept hearing about as we discussed this was the fact that conscientious people, many of them elderly, had paid their fuel bills back in January or February when the dollars became available, with no dollars for them in the program. That program, ladies and gentlemen, spent \$3,122,500 last year, including administration.

I have been disturbed a little bit this weekend to read in the paper that the program that is being discussed this year, in this legislature, by the Appropriations Committee and the Repub-

lican members of the caucus is not doing as much as last year was done for the elderly or for people who are in need. I would just point out that that was a \$3,122,000 program. Any of the programs that I hear currently being discussed are in the neighborhood of thirteen, fourteen or fifteen million dollars. You know, you are talking apples and oranges, and that is not my phrase, it is a phrase that was used by a very high placed and experienced member of the Governor's Cabinet.

So, we are addressing a much greater problem this year than was addressed last year no matter which bill you take.

One of the great things that was brought out at the public hearing was this problem of failure to reach those who really needed it but didn't know how to go after it, and it was definitely a problem of outreach. That is one of the things that I voted against the previous motion for, because there is no provision for outreach in the general assistance program. There are those of you who feel that outreach is superfluous, and I say it is absolutely necessary to have outreach if you are going to serve the people that you are aiming the money at here in the legislature.

Briefly, the program that I think is acceptable to me today is a program which is exactly the same as the Governor's program as far as those to whom it is addressed. It addresses the total number of households, 49,500. The difference is that it costs \$3 million, together with the winterization, and it has benefits with a maximum of \$170 rather than \$200 and a maximum of \$75 for renters rather than \$100, payable in approximately the same way of two payments, one in December and one in January. I feel as though it is a responsible program, it is somewhat more than half of the need that the Governor has described at \$330.

I might point out to you that the minimum you could build a program around this model is \$145 for households and \$70 for renters. That is about the minimum in order to maximize the use of federal dollars with the lowest state cost. But I think a figure above the \$145 is certainly acceptable and that is why we have come up with \$170.

I do not feel that we are turning our collective backs on the people of Maine if we adopt a program which is somewhat less expensive than the Governor's program. It meets the category that the Governor is concerned about. I understand the concern that he has about the level of availability of funds, and I know that there are many sincere people in both the House and the Senate who think we are vastly inadequate at \$300. I submit that any figure below \$330 perhaps is inadequate.

I would remind you again that the figures were developed empirically. They are drawing a picture of a situation that is not yet upon us. We will be here in January and can attack this situation again at that time. I think a somewhat reduced program is a responsible one. I am not going to offer the amendment at this time. I presume that sometime today you will have the opportunity to vote on it.

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

Mr. TIERNEY: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I enjoyed tremendously the remarks of the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Morton, and he reminded me of a forester who looks at all of the trees in the unorganized territory and sees them stretching out before him. Only the difference between the forester and Mr. Morton is that the forester goes out with crews and teams and equipment and tried to do the job that has to be done. Mr. Morton has picked up a single axe, chopped down a single tree and hopes that the crash of that tree falling will waken the rest of the state, because he has not told you his entire story.

The story that this state and the nation has to face in the months ahead is that millions and

millions of dollars, some tax dollars, some not tax dollars, will be leaving our country in the form of higher energy costs, and those higher energy costs are the single-most inflationary factor on our economy. They do not one thing to increase our productivity, and those costs are going to leave us regardless of what the members of the Maine Legislature do here and now.

He has looked at the narrow point of view and said we may have financial problems if we enact this bill, and that is essential where he has missed the entire picture. What this state has to do and what this legislature has to do is to face up to this inflationary and compassionate manner. The way of doing that is to engross the bill which we have before us and then to enact it, because if Mr. Morton has his way and we do not meet this in an honest fashion, the economic dislocation which will result from the increased energy costs could be very difficult, and the costs will still fall on the backs of the taxpayers.

Ladies and gentlemen, if the senior citizens of this state cannot live in their homes, where are they going to go? They are going to go to nursing homes, they are going to go to boarding homes. And who, ladies and gentlemen, pays for that?

If children and families and old people and poor people are unable to keep healthy, where are they going to go? They are going to go to physicians and they are going to go to hospitals and, ladies and gentlemen, who is going to pay for that?

If poor people are unable to keep warm and put food on their tables, where are they going to go? They are going to go to general assistance. Ladies and gentlemen, who is going to pay for that?

The program which Joe Brennan has put before the people of this state and this legislature tries to meet this problem in an honest, straight forward manner. It says that we as a legislature and as a state have a moral and ethical obligation to minimize the economic dislocation which has resulted from the increased cost of energy, and I am going to support that program and I hope that every member of this House does the same. I think that the amount of money that we can appropriate now is probably the best investment which we could make with our money if we are really looking at the whole problem, the whole forest that this state will be facing in the months ahead.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Garsoe.

Mr. GARSOE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to just point out that Mr. Morton has given us a factual dollars and cents appraisal of the situation we are in. Yet, my good friend from Lisbon Falls stands here before you and is contending, if I heard him right, that \$30 is going to keep people out of nursing homes, that \$40 is going to make the difference between survival and not surviving, and I say that is not correct.

The writing is on the wall. You are going to send this out of here and I would like to get on about it, but I would like to have you remember Mr. Morton's words, that sometime later on you may have a chance to vote on a different version.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to escort the gentleman from Lisbon Falls, Mr. Tierney, to the rostrum for the purpose of acting as Speaker pro tem.

Thereupon, Mr. Tierney of Lisbon Falls assumed the Chair as Speaker pro tem and Speaker Martin occupied his seat on the floor of the House.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The gentleman from

Farmington, Mr. Morton, and the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Garsoe, have raised a point which I think must be responded to. It is a very simple point, one I hope is not missed by anyone in this body or anyone in this state and that is the question of appropriating for the deficit. In case you don't know, that is a violation of state law in the State Constitution. That is impossible, it would be violating the Constitution of this state to attempt to do that. No one has argued that we will not have enough money in January. We just have so much money available; and every single year that I have been here, we have had to take the budget, the demands from the departments and the people and citizens of this state and as some members say, "cut the cloth to fit the pattern available." I would like to put it another way. It is very much like a pie, it depends how much you cut and what you give to people.

The Governor has made it very clear today, last week and the last few months and I think it is very simple — it is a question of how this state, this legislature, this Governor is going to set priorities; it is a question of how you are going to allocate the dollars we have; it is a question of how you are going to do it. All the Governor has said to us is that his first priority now is helping those people with their oil bills, their electricity bills, if they heat with it, their kerosene bills, or wood if that is their source of energy. It would seem that need is greater than any other need that this state now has. When the time comes, and it will, the cuts have to be made, they will be made. The Governor has indicated already that he will make recommendations for this legislature in January if that is necessary, if worse came to worse.

I can tell you one thing, though I feel for some, I can't cry over people who lost money in the stock market last night but I can feel for those people who don't have enough money to buy heating oil for this winter.

The second question, and I think this is the paramount one, is the question of a program. A lot of you voted for a previous amendment, which was defeated. I beg of you, those who voted for it, at some point in the course of the day to do what your own towns have done with general assistance. I have some figures available for your information and what impact that would have on most of your communities, because in part this gives you the reason why we must do something before we leave here and in part it also tells you why you can't vote for the plan that the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Morton, says he is going to talk about later.

He would argue that is only \$50 or \$30 less than what the Governor now says he wants, but there is one big difference beyond the dollar question and that is, this is a program that is going to run through months. This is a program and that is it, ladies and gentlemen, senior citizens of this state, you've got what you've got and you are not getting more unless the federal government gives it to you. That is an unacceptable alternative for the Governor of this State and unacceptable from my point of view.

The issues are simple. It is not a problem of money, it is not a problem, in my opinion, of deliverance because it can be done. It is a question of how we want to set priorities.

I can't finish my comments, however, without making some remarks about government intervention. Maybe if we had had government intervention with the oil companies, we wouldn't be in this mess today. Maybe if companies had been prevented from donating hundreds of thousands of dollars to various political campaigns in the last ten years for people who ran for President of this country, we wouldn't be in trouble. The problem started there and that problem continues today.

I am convinced that before we leave we must act, it must be done. People tell me, "Your Governor won't compromise." Look at the figures and look what has happened and I think that bears fruition.

I hope we engross this bill, I hope we enact it because to me not to do so would be a serious mistake. There may be amendments that can be offered that make some sense. I haven't seen one yet, though. Maybe there is hope before the day goes by or before the week goes out as we stay here I hope to enact a program.

At this point, Speaker Martin returned to the rostrum.

**SPEAKER MARTIN:** The Chair would thank the gentleman from Lisbon Falls, Mr. Tierney, for presiding as Speaker pro tem.

Thereupon, the Sergeant-at-Arms escorted Mr. Tierney to his seat on the floor, amid the applause of the House, and Speaker Martin resumed the Chair.

**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. All those in favor of this bill being passed to be engrossed will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL

**YAY**—Bachrach, Baker, Barry, Beaulieu, Benoit, Berry, Birt, Blodgett, Brannigan, Brennerman, Brodeur, Brown, K. C.; Call, Carrier, Carroll, Carter, D.; Chonko, Churchill, Cloutier, Connolly, Cox, Davies, Diamond, Doukas, Dow, Dutremble, D. L.; Dutremble, L. A.; Elias, Fowlie, Gowen, Gwadosky, Hall, Hickey, Hobbins, Hughes, Jacques, E.; Jacques, P.; Jalbert, Joyce, Kane, Kany, Kelleher, LaPlante, Locke, Mahany, Martin, A.; Masterton, Maxwell, McHenry, McKean, McMahon, McSweeney, Michael, Mitchell, Nadeau, Nelson, M.; Nelson, N.; Norris, Paradis, Paul, Pearson, Post, Prescott, Reeves, J.; Reeves, P.; Strout, Theriault, Tierney, Tozier, Tuttle, Twitchell, Vincent, Violette, Wood, Wyman, The Speaker.

**NAY**—Aloupis, Austin, Berube, Bordeaux, Boudreau, Bowden, Brown, A.; Brown, D.; Brown, K. L.; Bunker, Carter, F.; Conary, Cunningham, Curtis, Damren, Davis, Dexter, Drinkwater, Fenlason, Fillmore, Garsoe, Gavett, Gillis, Gould, Gray, Hanson, Higgins, Huber, Hunter, Hutchings, Jackson, Klesman, Lancaster, Leighton, Leonard, Lewis, Lougee, Lowe, Lund, MacBride, Marshall, Masterman, Matthews, Morton, Nelson, A.; Peltier, Peterson, Rollins, Sewall, Sherburne, Silsby, Small, Smith, Sprowl, Stetson, Stover, Studley, Tarbell, Torrey, Wentworth, Whittemore.

**ABSENT**—Dellert, Dudley, Howe, Immonen, Laffin, MacEachern, McPherson, Payne, Rolde, Roope, Simon, Soulas, Vose.

Yes, 76; No, 61; Absent, 13.

**THE SPEAKER:** Seventy-six having voted in the affirmative and sixty-one in the negative, with thirteen being absent, the motion does prevail.

By unanimous consent, ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

#### (Off Record Remarks)

On motion of Mr. Hall of Sangerville,  
Recessed until two-thirty o'clock in the afternoon.

#### After Recess

2:30 P.M.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The following paper appearing on Supplement No. 2 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

#### Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Providing Funds for Emergency Home Heating Assistance for Certain Elderly and Low-Income Households and for the Winterization, Citizens' Assistance and Housing Rehabilitation Technician Program and Correcting an Error in the Energy Inventory Reporting" (Emergency) (H. P. 1589) (L. D. 1691) which was passed to be engrossed without reference to a committee in the House on October 10, 1979.

Came from the Senate passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-400) in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mr. Tierney of Lisbon Falls, the House voted to Insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

By unanimous consent, ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

#### House at Ease

Called to Order by the Speaker.

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

The following Communication:

THE SENATE OF MAINE

Augusta

October 10, 1979

The Honorable Edwin H. Pert

Clerk of the House

109th Legislature

Augusta, Maine 04333

Dear Clerk Pert:

The Senate today voted to Insist and Join in a Committee of Conference on, Bill, "An Act Providing Funds for Emergency Home Heating Assistance for Certain Elderly and Low-Income Households and for the Winterization, Citizens' Assistance and Housing Rehabilitation Technician Programs and Correcting an Error in the Energy Inventory Reporting Law" (H. P. 1589) (L. D. 1691).

The President appointed the following members of the Senate to the Committee of Conference:

Senators:

KATZ of Kennebec

PERKINS of Hancock

CLARK of Cumberland

Respectfully,

S/MAY M. ROSS

Secretary of the Senate

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

Reference was made to (H. P. 1589) (L. D. 1691) Bill, "An Act Providing Funds for Emergency Home Heating Assistance for Certain Elderly and Low-Income Households and for the Winterization, Citizens' Assistance and Housing Rehabilitation Technician Programs and Correcting an Error in the Energy Inventory Reporting Law" (Emergency)

In reference to the action of the House on October 10, 1979, whereby it Insisted and asked in a Committee of Conference, the Chair appointed the following members on the part of the House as Conferees:

Messrs. TIERNEY of Lisbon

CARTER of Winslow

MORTON of Farmington

(under suspension of the rules)

On motion of Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston, adjourned until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.