

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

SECOND REGULAR SESSION

January 2 to April 3, 1980

THIRD SPECIAL SESSION

May 22, 1980

THIRD CONFIRMATION SESSION

July 17, 1980

FOURTH CONFIRMATION SESSION

July 24, 1980

FIFTH CONFIRMATION SESSION

September 12, 1980

**REPORT, HEARING TRANSCRIPT AND
RELATED MEMORANDA OF THE JOINT
SELECT COMMITTEE ON INDIAN LAND
CLAIMS**

HOUSE

Wednesday, February 20, 1980

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

Prayer by the Reverend Royal J. Parent of St. Martin of Tours Church, Millinocket.

Rev. PARENT: Father in heaven, you guide and govern everything with order and love. Look upon the assembly of our state leaders and fill them with the spirit of your wisdom. May they always act in accordance with your will and the decisions before the peace and well-being of all, excluding no one and considering the needs of all whether young or old, gifted or deprived.

Father in heaven, pour out on all of us the spirit of understanding, truth and peace. Help us to strive with all our hearts to know what is pleasing to you and when we know your will, make us determined to do it. Amen.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

Papers from the Senate Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Authorize Cutting of Trees on State Park Lands" (H. P. 1623) (L. D. 1733) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" (H-783) in the House on February 12, 1980.

Came from the Senate with the Bill and accompanying papers indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

Mr. Hall of Sangerville moved that the House insist.

Whereupon, Mrs. Hutchings of Lincolnville moved that the House recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will order a vote. The pending question is on the motion of the gentlewoman from Lincolnville, Mrs. Hutchings, that the House recede and concur. All those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

Whereupon, Mr. Hall of Sangerville requested a roll call vote.

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

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

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentlewoman from Lincolnville, Mrs. Hutchings, that the House recede and concur. All those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA—Aloupis, Austin, Bachrach, Birt, Bordeaux, Bowden, Brown, A.; Brown, D.; Brown, K.L.; Bunker, Call, Conary, Cunningham, Curtis, Damren, Davis, Dellert, Dexter, Drinkwater, Dudley, Fillmore, Garsoe, Gavett, Gillis, Hanson, Higgins, Hunter, Hutchings, Immonen, Kiesman, Lancaster, Leonard, Lewis, Lougee, Lowe, Lund, MacBride, Martin, A.; Masterman, Matthews, McHenry, McPherson, Morton, Nelson, A.; Paradis, E.; Payne, Peltier, Peterson, Rollins, Roope, Sewall, Sherburne, Smith, Sprowl, Stetson, Stover, Strout, Studley, Tarbell, Torrey, Vincent, Wentworth, Whitemore.

NAY—Baker, Barry, Beaulieu, Benoit, Berry, Berube, Blodgett, Brannigan, Brennerman, Brodeur, Brown, K.C.; Carrier, Carroll, Carter, D.; Chonko, Cloutier, Connolly, Cox, Davies, Diamond, Doukas, Dow, Dutremble, D.; Dutremble, L.; Elias, Fowle, Gowen, Gray, Gwadosky, Hall, Hickey, Hobbins, Howe, Hughes, Jacques, P.; Jalbert, Joyce, Kane, Kany, Kelleher, LaPlante, Lizotte, Locke, MacEachern, Mahany, Marshall, Mas-

terton, Maxwell, McKean, McSweeney, Mitchell, Nadeau, Nelson, M.; Nelson, N.; Norris, Paradis, P.; Paul, Pearson, Post, Prescott, Reeves, P.; Rolde, Simon, Theriault, Tozier, Tuttle, Twitchell, Vose, Wood, Wyman, The Speaker.

ABSENT—Boudreau, Carter, F.; Churchill, Fenlason, Huber, Jackson, Jacques, E.; Laffin, Leighton, McMahon, Michael, Reeves, J.; Silsby, Small, Soulas, Tierney, Violette.

Yes, 63; No, 71; Absent, 17.

The SPEAKER: Sixty-three having voted in the affirmative and seventy-one in the negative, with seventeen being absent, the motion does not prevail.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Hall of Sangerville, the House voted to insist.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Relating to Confidentiality under the Lottery Law" (H. P. 1692) (L. D. 1802) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on February 11, 1980.

Came from the Senate with the Bill and accompanying Papers Indefinitely Postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mr. Stover of West Bath, the House voted to recede and concur.

Messages and Documents

The following Communication:

February 8, 1980

Mr. Ed Pert
Clerk of the House
State House
Augusta, ME 04333
Dear Mr. Pert:

Enclosed please find a copy of the annual report on the operation of the State Government Internship Program as required by the Maine State Statutes, Chapter 14, paragraph 294.

Sincerely,
S/KATHRYN H. GODWIN,
Director

Bureau of Public Administration

Was read and with accompanying Report ordered placed on file.

Orders

On motion of Mr. Cox of Brewer, it was ORDERED, that Representative Paul Boudreau of Waterville be excused February 19 to 22 for personal reasons.

AND BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that Representative Sherry Huber of Falmouth be excused February 21 and 22 for legislative business.

On motion of Mr. D. Dutremble of Biddeford, the following Joint Resolution: (H. P. 1857)
JOINT RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO EXAMINE

THE PRICE INCREASES IN PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

WHEREAS, the Legislature of this State is empowered by the Constitution to protect the general welfare of the citizens of Maine; and

WHEREAS, it appears that citizens of Maine have been, during the past year, overcharged by major oil companies, for petroleum products which are a necessity of life; and

WHEREAS, the citizens of Maine feel a sense of frustration due to their apparent inability to gain recourse against this profiteering; and

WHEREAS, existing law may provide that recourse; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That we, the members of the 109th Legislature on behalf of the people of the State, urge and request the Attorney General of the State to examine these recent price increases made by the major oil companies and determine whether any violations of existing law have occurred; and be it further

RESOLVED: That if, after investigation, it is determined that violations have occurred,

the Attorney General take appropriate action to recover, on behalf of the citizens of the State, the maximum amount of damages or fines as restitution for these overcharges, to be returned to the General Fund; and be it further

RESOLVED: That if funds are returned to the General Fund, the Legislature determine and appropriate and equitable method of returning the money to the citizens of this State; and be it further

RESOLVED: That a suitable copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the Attorney General.

The Resolution was read.

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

Mr. GARSOE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: At best, I believe this effort is premature. As we all know, one of the prerogatives of service in this body is that you can call the attorney general's attention to any matter that you think is in the public's interest and get his full and complete cooperation. That would be an avenue to explore, I insist, before we start introducing joint resolutions. And as of now, I am told, no approach to the attorney general has been made to effect the intent of this resolution. I consider it out of place and I request a division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Dutremble.

Mr. DUTREMBLE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would certainly hope that a resolution that is sent down to the attorney general from 151 members would have a little more impact than a legislator going down there by himself asking him to pursue this matter. You are talking about avenues which pursue. I would think that when you look, you are talking about this whole thing being a little bit premature when this has been going on for two, three, four or five years now, I think this may be not premature but a little bit late.

The Maine people right now are severely taxed by the prices that these oil companies have been charging and we don't know how many of these prices that the people are paying are overcharges. I think it is very important that the legislature of this state start taking care of the people it represents. We represent a million people here. Everybody here represents a certain portion of the people in this state and it amounts to the total amount of the population of this state. If we can't show these people that we will protect them and help them when they need it, then I don't know what we are doing here.

We are in a bind. Time after time we are getting messages from the Governor that say we don't have enough funds to carry on the functions of the state, and here we have company after company draining the state of this money.

Just recently, last week, a major oil company admitted to overcharging by millions of dollars, \$77 million to be exact, and what do they plan to do with it? They say they are going to keep their prices at the level that they are now and return to the federal government a certain portion of the money. I believe the figure was \$27 million. That money was not taken from the federal government, it was taken from the states. The State of Maine needs that money. Maybe if we hadn't had all these price increases, we wouldn't be so concerned about the 2 cent gasoline tax that we are trying to get for our highway fund today.

We have a Maine statute that specifically forbids profiteering in this state specifically, and that is a law that has been broken. I would hope that the laws of this state apply not only to the working people of this state but also to the people who have a lot of money, who can defend themselves.

I would certainly hope that you would go along with this resolution and vote against the indefinite postponement.

Mr. Speaker, I request a roll call vote.

The SPEAKER: The motion to indefinitely postpone has not been made. The pending question is adoption of the resolution.

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 Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Brannigan.

Mr. BRANNIGAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to second the remarks of the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Dutremble. I think it is time that we take some kind of action. We don't have a lot of avenues to follow. People in my own district are feeling very strongly about this issue, people in filling stations dealing with our own people in the fuel allocation area of our state government are very pleased with the way they have been treated by the fuel allocation people but feel that these people are weak in their relationship to the major oil companies. This is a terrible position for us to be in and I feel that any way we can begin to move, any way that we can make even a gesture will be of value at this time.

I hope that we will vote in favor of this resolution.

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

Mr. TARBELL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would just simply like to remind the members of the House that the attorney general takes the same oath of office to uphold the Constitution and laws of the state that we do when we are sworn in, seated in this body, and it is his job and the job of the law firm, which is the Attorney General's Office, to enforce those laws, to investigate those laws. They have a Criminal Division, they do have profiteering, anti-trust law that this legislature has participated in, in addition to the federal laws that exist, and it just seems to me that the obligation already exists. If legislators do have complaints or if citizens have complaints, the proper avenue is to take those personally to the attorney general.

If you had been reading the newspapers, there has been an investigation over the last several years by our current attorney general and by our former attorney general when we served here in the 108th Legislature.

It just seems to me that this measure before us does indicate our frustration and conveys that to the people of Maine, but as a practical matter, I can't see it is going to serve any real utility in terms of investigation and enforcing the laws over and above what can be done and probably is being done now.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Vassalboro, Mrs. Mitchell.

Mrs. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I heartily concur with the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Tarbell, that is already the obligation of the attorney general, but I disagree, this is far more than a matter of venting our frustrations. It is a matter of saying that the priority of this legislature is that the attorney general look into this issue. It is simply a matter of our suggesting, our telling, our priorities to the attorney general, so I urge the passage of this resolution.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I realize there are a lot of people that would like to have their name before the public on this particular gripe and I have the same gripe. But I rise for a point of information, I don't know if you know it or not, but the federal government regulates the price, so you would be dealing not with the oil companies but the

federal government.

The stations in my area are selling their gas about four or five cents under what the federal government allows them to sell for, they set up a percentage, and it is based on what you sold gas for, I think it is in 1977 or 1978. In other words, what your margin profit was then is allowed to continue today. It is very strictly federally regulated.

In my place of business, the federal man has been there about every six weeks. You have to post the top price and what you pay for it has to be available for him and so forth. Then he writes you a letter back and tells you, well, your price should be five cents higher than it is now, based on federal regulations. I don't believe this state is big enough to take over control of the regulation of gasoline from the federal government.

I am not against this thing. If you think you can get any political ride from it, I am all for it, go ahead, but I think some people are intelligent enough to know that the state doesn't control it, is not going to control it and by this inquiry is not going to find out about it. So I suggest you check with the federal people and you can find out what the regulations are for different areas of the State of Maine and all about it. It doesn't need to be done by the attorney general, it can be done by yourself personally if you are interested.

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In the Bangor paper this morning, on page 14, the bottom of the editorial page, there is a comment that says when someone butters you up, you had better watch out for the bite. I think the American people, the people that are nearer to us, the people of the State of Maine, are extremely skeptical of what is happening in Washington dealing with the national oil companies and the OPEC nations. And as a humble member of this house and a citizen of this state, I don't know who the federal government is looking after, whether it is looking after the best interests of Eddie Kelleher or it is looking after the best collective interests of the national oil companies.

I can agree to some extent with the remarks made by my colleague from Penobscot County, but I differ on the opinion of his when he states that there is very little the State of Maine can do in regulating the national oil companies, and that is true, but I think there is one thing the Attorney General's Office of this state can do on behalf of the State of Maine and behalf of the other 49 sister states that we have, if they have the desire and the urging and the ability to look in and explain why each week our prices continue to rise, particularly on gasoline, and sometimes in conjunction with the increases from the OPEC nations and sometimes the prices increase without any encouraging for increasing prices from the OPEC nations.

I am extremely skeptical that we as citizens of this state are getting a fair shake from the State of Maine companies that are supplying us through their national suppliers.

I would urge the House to support it, not for any political reasons but just basic, practical reasons of, how do you answer your constituents when you and I can't even attempt to answer them on the increased prices of fuel, oil and gasoline every single week. I don't know the answers. I know the federal government has price controls, or some limits to price controls, dealing with energy in this nation, but I am not sure that the controls are in the best interest of Eddie Kelleher or they are in the best interest of the citizens in Aroostook County, Washington County or York County. I honestly think that they are ripping us off, and until the Attorney General's Office can justify any reasons to my thinking, then I honestly believe that we should support this order. I think the people in America are getting ripped off not only by the national oil companies but, in some

instances, by the United States Congress and the administration. I just don't feel comfortable with how it is being handled.

You know, they have the greatest alibi in the world — they blame the OPEC nations. Well, I think some of the justification in terms of blame should be aimed directly at them because their profits are enormous and they are coming from you and I.

You may not be listening to what I am saying this morning and that is up to you, but I know that your own constituents are concerned; they don't feel they are getting a fair shake. They know that none of us in this room can give them honest and concrete answers because we don't know. We have got the largest law firm in the State of Maine right downstairs. They have got the faith of the State of Maine behind it because it is this body and the other body that supplies them with the dollars to conduct their business, and I say the best business they can do for the people of Maine at this moment is to see whether we are getting a fair shake. Do you want to know something? I don't think we are, and let them prove Eddie Kelleher wrong.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Stetson.

Mr. STETSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It seems to me that to hide behind a resolution of this sort is to create a rather cruel hoax on the people of Maine to suggest to the people of Maine that our attorney general can do something for them. I think that the people of Maine are sick and tired of spool spinning here in Augusta. The people of Maine are a little bit disillusioned with state government as well as with the federal government.

I have listened to the debate very carefully and I hear the good gentleman from Bangor argue that his people are frustrated and he is frustrated, so aren't we all frustrated, but let's not add to that frustration by a senseless resolution which will accomplish no good. It would be telling the people of Maine — oh, here we are doing something that is going to help you when we know darn well it is not going to.

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

Mr. PEARSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I can tell you that in Old Town, and I suspect in most of the areas of the state, we are paying 96 cents a gallon to 98 cents a gallon here in Augusta in the apartment that I rent for fuel oil. If Mr. Stetson thinks that I am hiding or anybody is hiding behind a resolution, he is mistaken.

Time after time after time I go into stores and into people's homes and they say to me, how are we going to do it, what is happening, what is causing this to be 98 cents a gallon? I say to them time after time after time, I don't know. I am just wondering if Mr. Dutremble's resolution isn't one way of finding out at least part of the answer so that I can be responsible and go back to my people at home and say to them, well at least we have looked into the matter and we think maybe we have even achieved something. Who knows, there might be something that comes out of this. We might find that somebody along the lines, while they are all blaming OPEC, OPEC isn't all to blame, and that there is some blame to be placed on price gouging and obscene profits that are being made not only by the national oil companies but perhaps even by some of the local oil companies who are trying to make a dollar while they can.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Dutremble.

Mr. DUTREMBLE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I just wanted to make a couple of remarks here. First of all, Mr. Stetson's remark about senseless resolutions, I have not yet become an expert on senseless resolutions. If anybody here has become, I would like them to share with the body how they did become an expert on it.

The people of Maine are being ripped off, they have been bled, they have been bled every day, every week, and they want people to do something about it.

This resolution here will help the Maine farmer, it will help the Maine fishermen, it will help the Maine worker, it will help everybody. All it will do is authorize the attorney general to conduct his investigation.

I want to remark to what Mr. Dudley said. Mr. Dudley, this is not intended to go after the local dealers but the state's major oil companies. It is not political, it is what people want. If that is being political, let's do it. The people want us to do it, so let's do it. Everybody is saying that people want us to do it, then why aren't we doing it. I don't understand this. Maybe that is why there is such a delay here, not only at the state level but at the national level. Every time somebody tries to do something, the issues aren't really discussed. Is it political, is it premature? The issue is the high prices, not whether this thing is premature, not whether it is political.

If we are here representing the people, then, by golly, let's represent them.

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

Mrs. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I don't really think this is too bad a resolution; however, I think it is directed to the wrong person. I think it should be directed to the Department of Energy and I am wondering if we have lost faith with the Department of Energy, that they aren't doing the job that they were created to do.

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

Mr. GARSOE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I just want to point out that the comments we have heard here this morning about our obligation to our constituents would have long ago been met if had we, on the first request, had gone to the attorney general. I just want you to know that this hasn't happened yet because I called him this morning. Why do we need such a document as this to get you to do your job? He said no one has mentioned it to him. That is why I say it is premature, that is why I say I don't believe it is really necessary and that is why I say I don't believe it will be effective.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Limerick, Mr. Carroll.

Mr. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: One of the OPEC nations refused to go along with OPEC group and kept their price down. They did this for quite some time, until finally they discovered the oil companies were soaking it to us just the same and were charging just as if they had raised their price, so then the OPEC nation raised their price.

We are being ripped off good and proper, ladies and gentlemen, and my constituents don't send me down here to be a yes man for the young man downstairs, they send me down here to wake him up. I think he is asleep at the switch. He must be sleeping if he is waiting for a complaint with all the outcry that has been throughout the state of the overcharge. They put it in the papers about their profits, their big profits, they are gloating, the oil companies are the biggest thieves we ever had.

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

Mr. SPROWL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have been trying to sit here very calmly, had no intention of speaking. Maybe I am one of those bad guys who is going to be investigated; I am in the oil business.

I think if I was seeking re-election, I would do what some of the rest of you are doing, I would jump right on the bandwagon, people are frustrated, let's go after the bad guys, and it is always 'they' we are going after. Mr. Kelleher and Mr. Dutremble are just saying 'they' and I

feel that I may be 'they' along with hundreds of other oil dealers in the State of Maine. Oil dealers are going out of business almost daily, they really are. It is costing us more money to operate all the time, our percentage of profit is going down.

Eight years ago, I was paying 11½ cents a gallon for oil, retailing it at 18 cents a gallon. I didn't have any investment, I have 90,000 gallon storage, I had \$12,000 tied up. I still have 90,000 gallon storage, I have \$70,000 to \$80,000 tied up. I have 800 oil customers and I used to carry them all winter and glad to do it, no one owed me over \$100 or \$150. Perhaps I had \$20,000 on accounts receivable at the end of January. My accounts receivable were not as much this January as they were last year at the same time because a lot of people are burning wood — thank goodness for the conservation effort.

My sales are down and I have told people that I could not carry them as I have in the past, so my accounts receivable were only \$105,000 this year as compared to eight years ago when I was talking about \$20,000 accounts receivable. Last year I think they were \$127,000. I don't have that money, I have to go to the bank and pay the interest. I think we should go after the banks — gee, I don't know why they are charging me 14, 15 or 16 percent interest on this oil money, I can't understand it — ripped off. I feel frustrated as heck, too, because I am in the oil business.

I feel I just have to get up and defend those of us who are in a Catch 22 position. We want people to conserve but yet we would like to stay in business. I don't know that this Resolution is going to put us out of business. I would just as soon be investigated by the Attorney General, but I just think perhaps the taxpayer out there is the one that is going to pay again. He is going to pay for the investigation, he is going to pay for the staff to go out and investigate us. I think it is the taxpayer who is the real loser. I don't think any of us in the State of Maine, us oil dealers, are trying to gouge the public.

How are you going after the OPEC nations, Mr. Carroll, for the OPEC nations are our problem? They probably are but we would like to buy some of our oil from Mexico, that is not part of the OPEC nations. Mexico's oil is higher, right next to us, right next to these United States, so can we really blame the OPEC nations?

Mr. Cohen really needs something to do down there in that Attorney General's Office. Let's send him to the OPEC nations or Mexico to investigate.

Really, let's be realistic, let's not try to get up and rant and rave and try to make publicity, let's really not try to seek our own election or re-election. I am not running for re-election, so I don't have to do that, and I don't feel that this is the way that some of the rest of you need to seek re-election.

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In answer to some of the questions that were raised by my friend, and he is my friend from Hope, Mr. Sprowl, I don't think this House should accept the fact that anyone is trying to cloud an issue because any particular individual in this House is running for re-election. Obviously, a lot of us are and I don't think that that is an issue at all. I don't even think it is a fair issue to raise, I don't think it is a fair issue in terms of trying to cloud what the intention of the Resolution is, and if I were Mr. Sprowl and if I were in the oil business or if I were representing Dead River or C. H. Brown or any other oil company in this state, I would welcome this Resolution with open arms to show (1) we have nothing to hide; (2) we are encouraged by the interests of the Maine Legislature, representing a million people, which collectively we all do in this body, and (3) to lay aside, if it is humanly possible, any skepticisms that have arisen by us as

individuals or our constituents.

I will tell you why some of the small companies, in my opinion, are going out of business, because it is the major giants, and they are giants in terms of the level of competition in comparison to you, Mr. Sprowl, in this state, that they are able to squeeze you out. It is just like the milk industry 20 years ago when you had a number of dairies that is now at the level of four or five.

Let me tell you something, in my humble opinion, I think there are four or five oil companies in this state who, in some instances, keep some small companies alive to use them as alibis for themselves, that is what I think. I would like to give Mr. Cohen downstairs an opportunity to prove that my thinking is wrong.

I don't have any trust at all in the national oil companies personally because how do you explain the exorbitant profits that they made the last two or three years? Is it because they are benevolent people, because they have feelings towards the consumers? If they did, they wouldn't be making the sizable profits they are making today and investing their money other than drilling oil. They are drilling in our pockets, yours and mine.

I am going to run for re-election and I don't think this is the issue that is going to re-elect Ed Kelleher to Seat 121 or defeat him, nor do I think it is going to elect or defeat anyone of you in here.

I honestly am not comfortable with this situation. Representative Dutremble has offered a Resolution in good faith. My friend from Cumberland has talked to the Attorney General downstairs and he said nobody has talked to him on the issue. Who has to talk to him? Has one of us as individuals or citizens got to go downstairs and ask that gentleman to take an interest in an issue that is confronting us daily that is like air? We have to have oil, we have to have air to breathe, does he have to be encouraged by it? He is a good man and I am sure that he is doing a good job and I would think that he would be encouraged by the interest of this House.

I urge the adoption of the Resolution.

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

Mr. LEIGHTON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hadn't anticipated that this would be on the calendar when I came in today and I can see that emotions are red hot and I, myself, will try to keep calm.

It seems to me that we ought to prioritize our investigatory monies, if we have such monies, which I have some reason to doubt. I can agree with some of the speakers who think we are being ripped off. I can't necessarily agree that we are being ripped off by any producers of commodities. I think we are being ripped off by our own federal government, which allows the kind of deficit spending, which creates the kind of inflation, which creates the kind of oil prices we have today. The facts are that the oil has not inflated anymore than any other commodity and those are the facts of the matter. Over a six month period, they may have inflated over some other commodity, but if you will take a look at the price of a Chevy since 1946 versus the price of a gallon of oil, I think you will find that they both reflect the proportionate devaluation of our currency because of deficit spending.

With respect to OPEC, I think it should be pointed out that the international medium of exchange for oil is the dollar, and as we debase our own currency against the advice of many of the OPEC nations, who have pleaded with us to conserve and to conserve particularly the integrity of our currency for their own protection they have had to raise the price of the commodity in proportion to the decrease in the value of our currency. As a matter of fact, there has been a move in the last year or so among some oil producing nations to move away from the dollar as a medium of exchange,

I think, which is a pretty worrisome thing for us as our once proud national currency becomes something less than that and as in our own nation we move towards a barter situation.

Mr. Sprowl, gasping about for some villain to name in this thing, knowing that it wasn't his own industry, and I agree, talked about the banks. Let's not blame them either. Let's remember that in the budget and fiscal policy of our federal administration, they have chosen to rely wholly on fiscal policy and not on budget policy. They choose to monetize our national debt by running a constant budget deficit while relying on the federal reserve board to do the job, constantly raising the discount rates so the interest rates that you have to pay your local banks go on and on and on and they are going to continue to go on up as long as we run the federal deficit.

I would suggest to each and every one of you that if you have no expertise in the science of economics, and it is a science of economics, you owe it to yourselves, you owe it to your constituents and you owe it to your country to find out a little bit about economics. Why don't you take a course? Really, it is a very serious thing, it goes right to the heart of most of the problems we have in this country today. Our number one problem is inflation, and if you don't know what causes it, you owe it to yourselves and your children to find out.

Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston moved the previous question.

The SPEAKER: For the Chair to entertain a motion for the previous question, it must have the expressed desire of one third of the members present and voting. All those in favor of the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken, and more than one third of the members present having voted for the motion for the previous question, the previous question was entertained.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is, shall the main question be put now? This is debatable with a time limit of five minutes by any one member. Is it the pleasure of the House that the main question be put now? The Chair will order a vote. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

75 having voted in the affirmative and 56 in the negative, the main question was ordered.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House now is on adoption of the Joint Resolution. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

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

Mr. SPROWL: Mr. Speaker, may I be excused from voting because of a conflict of interest?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will grant the gentleman from Hope, Mr. Sprowl, permission to be excused from voting.

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is on adoption of the Joint Resolution. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Austin, Bachrach, Baker, Barry, Beaulieu, Benoit, Berry, Berube, Bowden, Brannigan, Brennerman, Brodeur, Brown, A.; Brown, D.; Brown, K. C.; Carrier, Carroll, Carter, D.; Chonko, Churchill, Cloutier, Connolly, Cox, Curtis, Davies, Dexter, Diamond, Doukas, Dow, Drinkwater, Dutremble, D.; Dutremble, L.; Elias, Fowlie, Gillis, Gowen, Gray, Gwadosky, Hall, Hanson, Hickey, Higgins, Hobbins, Howe, Hughes, Jacques, P.; Jalbert, Joyce, Kane, Kany, Kelleher, Kiesman, Lancaster, LaPlante, Lizotte, Locke, Lougee, Lowe, MacEachern Mahany, Marshall, Martin, A.; Matthews, Maxwell, McHenry, McKean, McPherson, McSweeney, Michael, Mitchell, Nadeau, Nelson, M.; Nelson, N.; Norris, Par-

adis, P.; Paul, Pearson, Post, Prescott, Reeves, P.; Rolde, Rollins, Roope, Sherburne, Simon, Stover, Strout, Studley, Theriault, Tierney, Tozier, Tuttle, Twitchell, Vincent, Violette, Vose, Wentworth, Wood, Wyman, The Speaker.

NAY — Aloupis, Birt, Bordeaux, Bunker, Call, Canary, Cunningham, Damren, Davis, Dellert, Dudley, Fillmore, Garsoe, Gavett, Hunter, Hutchings, Immonen, Jackson, Leighton, Leonard, Lewis, Lund, MacBride, Masterman, Masterton, Morton, Nelson, A.; Paradis, E.; Payne, Peltier, Peterson, Sewall, Small, Stetson, Tarbell, Torrey, Whittemore.

ABSENT — Blodgett, Boudreau, Carter, F.; Fenlason, Huber, Jacques, E.; Laffin, McMahon, Reeves, J.; Silsby, Smith, Soulas.

EXCUSED — Sprowl.

Yes, 101; No, 37; Absent, 12; Excused, 1.

The SPEAKER: One hundred and one having voted in the affirmative and thirty-seven in the negative, with twelve being absent and one excused, the Joint Resolution is adopted.

Sent up for concurrence. (Later Reconsidered)

Special Sentiment Calendar

In accordance with House Rule 56, the following Joint Orders (Expressions of Legislative Sentiment) recognizing,

Robert O. Wyllie, Director of the Bureau of Social Welfare, who is retiring after 25 years of faithful service to this State; (H. P. 1856) by Mr. Kelleher of Bangor.

There being no objection, the House Paper was passed and sent up for concurrence.

Consent Calendar

Second Day

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

(H. P. 1662) (L. D. 1771) Bill "An Act to Establish Time Limitations for Applications for Attendance at Certain Approved Secondary Schools under the Education Laws" (C. "A" H-794)

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

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act Establishing Expenditure Limits for Federal Funds Expended by State Departments and Agencies for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1981" (Emergency) (S. P. 757) (L. D. 1944)

Bill "An Act to Amend the Lobbyists Disclosure Law" (H. P. 1855) (L. D. 1955)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Second Reading, read the second time, the Senate Paper was passed to be engrossed in concurrence and the House Paper was passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

Finally Passed

Emergency Measure

RESOLVE, Authorizing Execution of Leasehold Agreement Between Department of Educational and Cultural Services and the City of South Portland Establishing a Greenbelt and Public Park Area on the Southern Maine Vocational-Technical Institute Campus as Part of the Spring Point Shoreway (S. P. 674) (L. D. 1778) (C. "A" S-412)

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. 114 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Resolve was finally passed, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act to Permit the Department of Transportation to Acquire Railroad Operating

Equipment (S. P. 666) (L. D. 1720) (C. "A" S-411)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed.

Mr. Roope of Preque Isle requested a roll call vote.

The SPEAKER: 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 Auburn, Mrs. Lewis.

Mrs. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I wonder if somebody could explain this bill a little bit to us. Does this put the state in the railroad business? This is what I have been told and this is the way it appears, that it could be. I wonder if someone could explain that, please.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Limerick, Mr. Carroll.

Mr. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is permissive legislation. The State Department of Transportation is authorized to accept railroad equipment if necessary. They also are authorized to act as a mediator between a private corporation and the federal government in regards to getting funds to purchase the railroad equipment. We are not necessarily in the railroad business but we are trying to help industries in the State of Maine that need help when it comes to being able to market their products. I think that this is extremely important, it is permissive legislation.

We have an amendment on here to make sure that the state does not expend our scarce funds, that these will be federal funds. I am sure that this is good legislation. If I were not sure, I would certainly not be standing here today urging you to pass it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Roope.

Mr. ROOPE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to pose a question also. If this is permissive legislation and if there is this ability to lease railroad cars, how come we can't possibly do it, private corporations do it themselves instead of having the state lead the way?

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Limerick, Mr. Carroll.

Mr. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We have legislation on the national level that helps the rural areas throughout the country in regard to marketing their products, enabling them to stay in business and continue to live in the area they love, the area that their ancestors settled in. This is under the Rural Act that was passed in Congress and is going to be funded in Congress. This enables the Department of Transportation to accept federal equipment or federal money for the purpose of leasing to people in the State of Maine. It does not put us in the railroad business and competing with the railroads. The railroads do not supply this need and once it has been known that railroads are not supplying this need, then the availability of railroad stock would certainly be made available, if we have it and if we can get it, on the federal level.

I would urge the people here today to support this legislation. There are plenty of other times in the past that we have said, oh, let private industry do it and then we wake up and find some

other state has gone ahead and helped their industries grab up the market. A prime example of this is the potato industry in Aroostook County. Idaho has grabbed off your market. Canada is subsidizing their farmers in shipping Canadian potatoes here. They are breaking the back of your potato market.

We need some strong, aggressive legislation in the field of agriculture to salvage the potato industry in Aroostook County, and this is one of the small baby steps in that direction.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask to be excused from voting because of a conflict of interest.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, will be granted that request.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested. The pending question is on passage to be enacted. All those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Bachrach, Baker, Barry, Beaulieu, Benoit, Brannigan, Brenerman, Brodeur, Brown, K. C.; Carroll, Carter, D.; Chonko, Cloutier, Connolly, Cox, Davies, Dellert, Diamond, Doukas, Dow, Dudley, Dutremble, D.; Dutremble, L.; Elias, Fowlie, Gwadosky, Hall, Hickey, Hobbins, Howe, Hughes, Hutchings, Jacques, P.; Joyce, Kane, Kany, LaPlante, Lizotte, Locke, MacEachern, Mahany, Martin, A.; Maxwell, McHenry, McKean, McSweeney, Michael, Mitchell, Nadeau, Nelson, M.; Nelson, N.; Norris, Paradis, P.; Paul, Pearson, Post, Prescott, Reeves, P.; Rolde, Rollins, Simon, Theriault, Tierney, Tozier, Tuttle, Twitchell, Vincent, Violette, Vose, Wood, Wyman, The Speaker.

NAY — Aloupis, Austin, Berry, Berube, Birt, Bordeaux, Brown, A.; Brown, D.; Brown, K. L.; Bunker, Call, Carrier, Churchill, Conary, Cunningham, Damren, Davis, Dexter, Drinkwater, Fillmore, Garsoe, Gavett, Gillis, Gray, Hanson, Higgins, Hunter, Immonen, Jackson, Kelleher, Kiesman, Lancaster, Leighton, Leonard, Lewis, Lougee, Lowe, Lund, MacBride, Marshall, Masterman, Masterton, Matthews, McPherson, Morton, Nelson, A.; Paradis, E.; Payne, Peltier, Peterson, Roope, Sewall, Sherburne, Small, Smith, Sprowl, Stetson, Stover, Strout, Studley, Tarbell, Torrey, Wentworth, Whittemore.

ABSENT — Blodgett, Boudreau, Bowden, Carter, F.; Curtis, Fenlason, Gowen, Huber, Jacques, E.; Jalbert, Laffin, McMahon, Reeves, J.; Silsby, Soulas.

Yes, 72; No, 64; Absent, 15.

The SPEAKER: Seventy-two having voted in the affirmative and sixty-four in the negative, with fifteen being absent, the bill is passed to be enacted.

Signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

An Act to Permit Participating Local Districts of the Maine State Retirement System to Amend Retirement Benefits for Policemen and Fire Fighters Prospectively (H. P. 1665) (L. D. 1774) (H. "A" H-784)

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

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, on House Paper 1857, Joint Resolution requesting the Attorney General to Examine the Price Increases in Petroleum products, having voted on the prevailing side, I now move reconsideration and would ask the House to vote against my motion.

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

Mrs. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if there should be a fiscal note on this. I didn't realize that it meant that the Attorney General

was supposed to investigate the major oil companies, which would be various parts of our country, and if this is going to require him to travel around the country, I am wondering if we shouldn't consider the expense of that?

Is this properly before us without a fiscal note?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that I cannot answer that question; the matter is on reconsideration and the matter is not in our possession for action until the motion to reconsider were to prevail. At that time, the gentleman could pose her question if she so desires.

Mrs. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, maybe you can instruct me. Would it be wise to table this to find out or what would be the proper way to go?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that that matter is not for the Chair to decide. The Chair would advise the gentleman and let me respond in this fashion—the gentleman can move to table if she so desires, that is entirely up to her, but the point is, the chair cannot rule on whether or not the matter before us, if it were to need a fiscal note, until the motion to reconsider were to prevail. If the motion to reconsider were to prevail and the matter were back before us for passage, then the Chair could make that ruling. However, at this time it is not before us and even if the matter were to be tabled, the Chair couldn't rule on it anyway.

Mrs. LEWIS: Maybe I can find out myself from the Finance Office and perhaps would be kind enough to table this.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mrs. Masterton.

Mrs. MASTERTON: Mr. Speaker, I move that this be tabled for one day.

Whereupon, Mr. Tierney of Lisbon Falls requested a vote.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mrs. Masterton, that this matter be tabled for one legislative day pending the motion of Mr. Kelleher of Bangor to reconsider. All those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

56 having voted in the affirmative and 65 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The pending question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Kelleher, that the House reconsider its action whereby the Joint Resolution was adopted. All those in favor will say yes; those opposed will vote no.

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

Reference was made to (H. P. 1811) Joint Order relative to "An Act Converting Lakeville Plantation into the Town of Lakeville and Removing Lakeville Plantation from the Maine Forestry District"

In reference to the action of the House on February 14, 1980, whereby it insisted and asked for a Committee of Conference, the Chair appointed the following members on the part of the House as Conferees:

Mr. DUDLEY of Enfield
Mr. PEARSON of Old Town
Mr. CHURCHILL of Orland

Orders of the Day

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

An Act to Validate Proceedings Authorizing the Issuance of Bonds and Notes by School Administrative District No. 37 (Emergency) (S. P. 659) (L. D. 1697)

Tabled—February 15, 1980 by Mr. Connolly of Portland.

Pending—Motion of the same gentleman to Reconsider Failing of Passage to be Enacted. Mr. Kelleher of Bangor requested a roll call

vote.

The SPEAKER: 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 in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

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

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Connolly, that the House reconsider its action whereby this bill failed of passage to be enacted. All those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Bachrach, Baker, Barry, Beaulieu, Berube, Birt, Blodgett, Brannigan, Brenerman, Brodeur, Brown, D.; Brown, K. C.; Call, Carroll, Chonko, Churchill, Cloutier, Connolly, Cox, Damren, Davies, Davis, Dexter, Doukas, Dow, Drinkwater, Dudley, Dutremble, D.; Elias, Gray, Gwadosky, Hall, Howe, Hughes, Hunter, Hutchings, Jackson, Jalbert, Joyce, Kane, LaPlante, Leonard, Lewis, Lizotte, Locke, Lund, MacEachern, Mahany, Martin, A.; Masterman, Masterton, Matthews, Maxwell, McHenry, McKean, Michael, Mitchell, Nadeau, Nelson, N.; Norris, Paradis, E.; Paradis, P.; Paul, Payne, Prescott, Reeves, P.; Rolde, Roope, Sewall, Simon, Small, Sprowl, Stover, Strout, Studley, Tarbell, Theriault, Tierney, Torrey, Tozier, Tuttle, Vincent, Violette, Vose, Wentworth, Wood, The Speaker.

NAY — Aloupis, Austin, Berry, Bordeaux, Bowden, Brown, A.; Brown, K. L.; Bunker, Carrier, Carter, D.; Conary, Cunningham, Dellert, Diamond, Fillmore, Fowlie, Garsoe, Gavett, Gillis, Hanson, Hickey, Higgins, Immonen, Jacques, P.; Kany, Kelleher, Kiesman, Lancaster, Leighton, Lougee, Lowe, MacBride, Marshall, McPherson, McSweeney, Morton, Nelson, A.; Pearson, Peterson, Rollins, Sherburne, Smith, Stetson, Twitchell, Whittemore, Wyman.

ABSENT — Benoit, Boudreau, Carter, F.; Dutremble, L.; Fenlason, Gowen, Hobbins, Huber, Jacques, E.; Laffin, McMahon, Nelson, M.; Peltier, Post, Reeves, J.; Silsby, Soulas.

Yes, 87; No, 46, Absent, 18.

The SPEAKER: Eighty-seven having voted in the affirmative and forty-six in the negative, with eighteen being absent, the motion does prevail.

On motion of Mr. Connolly of Portland, tabled pending passage to be enacted and later today assigned.

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

Bill, "An Act to Develop Elderly Congregate Housing in Maine" (S. P. 724) (L. D. 1873) (H. "A" H-789 to C. "A" S-413)

Tabled—February 15, 1980 by Mrs. Martin of Brunswick.

Pending—Motion of Mrs. Berube of Lewiston to Reconsider Passage to be Engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-413) as amended by House Amendment "A" (H-789) thereto.

Mr. Brodeur of Auburn requested a vote.

The SPEAKER: All those in favor of reconsideration will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

49 having voted in the affirmative and 64 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

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

Bill, "An Act to Allow the Commissioner of Marine Resources to Exercise Limited Authority over the Conservation of Atlantic Salmon" (H. P. 1630) (L. D. 1740) (C. "A" H-785)

Tabled—February 19, 1980 by Mr. Fowlie of Rockland.

Pending—Passage to be Engrossed.

On motion of Mr. Fowlie of Rockland, retable pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Friday, February 22.

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

An Act Relating to Maine Educational Advisory Organizations (H. P. 1646) (L. D. 1756)

Tabled—February 19, 1980 by Mr. Garsoe of Cumberland.

Pending—Passage to be Enacted.

On motion of Mr. LaPlante of Sabattus, retable pending passage to be enacted and tomorrow assigned.

The Chair removed from the table the second tabled and Unassigned Matter:

An Act to Amend the Pay Schedule of Physicians to Include Actuaries (S. P. 707) (L. D. 1843)

Tabled—February 19, 1980 by Mr. Martin of Eagle Lake. (Bill ruled in violation of Joint Rule #20)

Pending—Fiscal Note Required Prior to Further Action.

On motion of Mr. Howe of South Portland, under suspension of the rules, the House reconsidered its action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed.

The same gentleman offered House Amendment "B" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "B" (H-795) was read by the Clerk.

Mr. HOWE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am sure the House knows, this bill was ruled out of order yesterday because it lacked a fiscal note. It now has a fiscal note and I did move to suspend the rules in order to so amend the bill.

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

Mr. GARSOE: Mr. Speaker, does this hit a new high in fiscal notes? Does this truly meet the concept of a fiscal note?

The SPEAKER: I haven't looked at it.

Mr. GARSOE: I wish the Chair would read it before he would let it go.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would pose a question to the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Howe, who prepared the fiscal note?

Mr. HOWE: Mr. Speaker, the fiscal note was prepared by Mr. Lord of the Legislative Finance Office based on a memorandum from the Commissioner of Business Regulation.

The gentleman from Cumberland's question wasn't very specific about the fiscal note that he seemed concerned about, but I have a hunch that he was concerned about the fact that the additional cost says it could be \$1,000 or several thousand dollars for a position. The reason for that is that this bill doesn't actually assign a pay range. The bill moves the actuaries to a new pay table but it will still require action by the administration to assign a specific pay range, and since we don't know just what that range is yet, it is impossible to put on a precise price tag.

I would point out that this cost will accrue entirely to a dedicated revenue account at the Bureau of Insurance which is fairly sizable.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would like to respond to the question posed by the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Garsoe.

After reading the fiscal note, the Chair is insulted by the way in which the fiscal note is prepared. It is the exact opposite to what was responded to in the material that the Chair had in his possession yesterday. It is an inaccurate statement on the part of someone to satisfy the requirements of the fiscal note demand by the rules and if, in fact, \$1,000 is what is now required, the Chair feels that the Chair was misled by the information that was given yesterday to the members of the House. It is an absolute travesty upon the process and I certainly hope that the amendment in its present form will be indefinitely postponed.

On motion of Mr. Tierney of Lisbon Falls, tabled pending adoption of House Amendment "B" and tomorrow assigned.

(Off Record Remarks)

On motion of Mr. Howe of South Portland, adjourned until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.