

# 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**

STATE OF MAINE  
One Hundred and Ninth Legislature  
Second Regular Session  
JOURNAL OF THE SENATE

January 8, 1980

Senate called to order by the President.

Prayer by the Rev. Larry Fairbanks, of the First Church of the Nazarene of Augusta.

Reverend FAIRBANKS: Let us pray! Almighty God it is with grateful hearts that we pause this morning to thank you for your love and many blessings to each of us.

Thank you especially for the blessings of friendships, our families, and our freedom. May we never take these blessings for granted.

We offer a special prayer this morning for our fellow Americans, who are being held hostage in Iran. We pray for their safety, and for their mental well-being, until they can be freed.

Give special guidance and wisdom to our President this day, as he leads our Nation; to our Governor as he leads the State; and to each Senator and Representative, as they represent the people of this great State. At the end of this day may we look back with satisfaction because we have served the people of Maine with the best of our abilities, and we have done what is pleasing in the sight of God. Amen.

Reading of the Journal of yesterday.

Papers from the House  
Non-concurrent Matter

Bill, "An Act to Prohibit Radar Detectors." (H. P. 1634) (L. D. 1754)

In the House January 2, 1980, referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs and Ordered Printed.

In the Senate January 3, 1980, Indefinitely Postponed, in non-concurrence.

Comes from the House, that Body having adhered.

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

Senator CONLEY: Mr. President, I move the Senate Adhere.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Cumberland, Senator Conley, moves that the Senate Adhere.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Carpenter.

Senator CARPENTER: Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate: I would move that the Senate Recede and Concur and would speak very briefly to the motion.

As I look at this Bill and I really think that you ought, just for a second, just disregard what the Bill would do, or who sponsored the Bill, or whatever reasons you have for being opposed to it, remember back to the many debates we've had in this session about Bills that perhaps we didn't favor, personally, but felt were at least worthy of a public hearing. I know that it has already been said to kill this Bill prior to sending it to a public hearing, sets a very, very bad precedent. I happen to favor the Bill, but I don't really think that's the point.

I really think that if the Bill is able to get in, however it got in, and this one didn't come through the Legislative Council procedure, I realize that, that we shouldn't examine the merits of the Bill, we should decide whether or not we're going to start summarily killing pieces of Legislation, because we don't like the content of the Bill, prior to at least letting it have a public hearing.

I realize that I'm flying in the face of both my beloved leader, and probably the other ranking Members of this Chamber, in doing this, and it's not my Bill, I don't have any particular affinity for the Bill, I just think we're really making a very serious mistake this morning if we don't at least allow this to go to committee, let the committee kill it. There's a procedure where it will never get out for debate, we're all very well aware of that, I don't suspect that if

the Bill goes to hearing, that it probably will come out and be enacted in this Legislature.

I think that the whole issue involved here is not one of content of the Legislation, but rather one of principle. I have heard probably everybody that will speak on this issue this morning at one time or another, stand on this floor, and defend the right of any Legislation that is once in, to at least have a public hearing.

I just think you're going to be very inconsistent, I think this could very well be something that we will all point to later on down the road, and say, well you know we did it once, we can go ahead and do it again. So I would hope that you would vote with me this morning to Recede and Concur, and at least allow this piece of Legislation to have a public hearing. Thank you.

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

Senator CONLEY: Mr. President, and Members of the Senate I have the greatest respect for my colleague and friend from Aroostook, Senator Carpenter. However, on this one particular issue, I strongly disagree with him.

Put the merits of the Bill, whatever it is aside, there are 33 Members of this Senate, and I'm sure that there are many Members of this Senate that submitted Legislation, which they considered to be of an emergency nature, before the Legislative Council, to be entertained as to whether or not it would be admitted in this Special Session of the Legislature.

Now those are the rules that you and I, as individual Legislators, elected by the public to serve them, those are the rules that we have to live by. Now my position as a Member of the Legislative Council was to allow all 300 Bills into this session. That sounds a little bit wild, and I notice that the President kind of shook a few times when I said that, but, you know, putting common sense together, I stated: Well, if we can handle 2,000 Bills during a period of 100 days, and we had roughly about 300 Bills or 300 ideas of Legislation presented to the Council, for entertainment, it seemed to me we ought to be able to handle that within a 50 day period or less.

But there's something about this Bill that makes me cringe. Not the merits, it's already been ruled unconstitutional in Connecticut by the Supreme Court. What bothers me is that they look upon this example as an emergency, emergency piece of Legislation. Something that has been into this legislative branch time and time again, and has been thrown in the ashcan where it belongs.

I'm just getting a little carried away with some of the antics that are being carried on, on some of Maine's highways today. I stated the other day I didn't love the Commissioner of Public Safety as much as I loved our Governor. That's not quite true, I really do, I have a great deal of affection for him. In fact, I kid him quite frequently, if anybody has every felt the barb of Jerry Conley, they know it's always in good taste, I was kidding him.

In fact, I heard the other day that the Commissioner of Public Safety would like to have another airplane. They've already got their own air force, you know. They're flying down the highways now, monitoring the speed. Well, I said don't give them one, give them 6, then they can fly formation down the highways and do a better job.

I wonder how many of you, as you travel back and forth on Route "95", or "295" or whatever it is, at least I travel it quite frequently, you know, remember back a few years ago that this State was awarded a plaque from Washington, commending the State for its design of a section of "95" highway, up in the Winslow, Waterville area, and we took great pride in the beauty of the "95" System that was constructed.

I go down South now and I feel like throwing up, because of the Maine State Police and what

they've done to the esplanade from Gardiner all the way down through South to where the guard rails commences on 6A, thanks to the good Senator from York, Senator Danton, and former Senator Marcotte. It's a disgrace, what's happening to our esplanade. We spent thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars building massive transit, in a sense of providing these highways. We spent thousands and thousands of dollars to make them beautiful, so that the visitors who come to this State, but more important that the natives of this State can enjoy it. We've got State Troopers who can't wait to tear it up, going from one lane to the next.

It's nothing that I haven't talked to the Commissioner of Public Safety about. I have told him once more, Arthur, and you can expect to hear the wrath of one Gerard P. Conley, from Senate District "9". I hope he's listening this morning! I am tired of going down "95" to follow a State Trooper, who in the past have been following me, but I learned the hard way that we have a speed limit of 55, and the Conley policy is to adhere to 55, and I hope that the State Police will and I hope that the Commissioner of Public Safety will also.

The fact is that every time I go down 95 and I ride somehow or another in back of a State Trooper, he disappears. I say where is he, and he's gone down into the gully, tearing up his tires and he's back onto the Northbound lane going 55 miles per hour, and no place else.

Mr. President, I think that the State Police are doing an excellent job in bringing the offenders of speeding into the courts. In fact, the records and the statistics will show that they have practically done away with speeding in the State of Maine, but I think we can go just a little too far. I think this piece of Legislation is one that we do not have to entertain. I think we've wasted enough time on it. Therefore, I would urge the Senate to vote against the pending motion to Recede and Concur.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair would interrupt debate to note the presence in the rear of the Chamber of the Senior Senator from the State of Maine, the Honorable Edmund S. Muskie, and would ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to escort Senator Muskie to the rostrum.

The Sergeant-at-Arms escorted Senator Muskie to the rostrum.

(Off Record Remarks)

Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE: Thank you, Mr. President. I must say I wondered whether I was in Maine or in Washington for just a few minutes. Such indignation has a proper place in the United States Senate, well I often practice it, it is a good technique, and it sometimes works.

Well, it is good to be back, to meet with you again. I have just spent an hour in the House, talking and taking questions and I sure do not want to repeat it here and interrupt, you know, the favorable environment for Senator Conley's motion. I wouldn't want him to make that speech all over again in order to recover the momentum that he may have built up with his impassioned speech.

On the other side, I sort of wandered into a discussion of energy, the federal budget, inflation, these are high priorities in Washington and I am not going to try to repeat what I said there, I assume it will be in the record. In any case, the press may cover it, I am never sure of that, nor am I always sure that I want them to, at least not in the way that they do, at times.

But I would like to say just a word or two about the situation in the Middle East, as I perceive it and it's gravity as I perceive it. I do not have any vision of the future or of its outcome to share with you, and I am not sure that anybody does, but I want you to know, because I haven't had much occasion to comment, in the

last couple of weeks at least, on developments there, what my reaction to them, and to the President's policies, is.

With respect to Iran it seems to me that lacking a clear and viable military option for dealing with that situation, that we have been proceeding in the right way to build up pressure wherever we could, against the Iranian policy and the Iranian action.

Initially of course we were restrained and inhibited by fears for the safety of the hostages. I think that if that safety is likely to be imperilled in the future it is more likely to come as a result of show trials, as they are called in these countries, or some approximation of them. We know what can be done with brainwashing, and what "show trials" can be made to appear. For the Iranians to indulge in them, I think or to threaten to indulge in them, provoke a new kind of problem for us, a new kind of crises, which the President quite clearly has indicated he will do everything within his power and our ability, our capacity, the options available to us to restrain.

Secondly, of course, he has resorted to every international institution available in the world order to bring pressure against the Iranians. The World Court, the Security Council, nations friendly and unfriendly around the world have pretty much rallied behind the principle of diplomatic immunity, and that has been a useful exercise, notwithstanding the repeated insistence on the part of militants around the embassy and what passes for a government in Iran today, that they are not influenced by these events.

I do not think any nation, especially one as vulnerable in so many ways as Iran, can be insensitive or for long insensitive to this kind of international opinion and disapproval. So hopefully, as we continue the sanctions to build up pressures in every way that we can, they will combine with other developments to finally achieve our objective.

The internal situation within Iran of course generates pressures on us, it generates pressures on the Khomeini. It is unclear whether anybody but the militants have control over what happens to the hostages. Khomeini has very little to say on a continuing basis, only time to time. He carefully husbands the appearance that he is in control and that he makes the decisions, whether or not he is, in fact, in every way, whether he could by his own decision release the hostages is a question to which I do not think that there is a clear answer at this point. Of course, he is being challenged internally by his own political opposition and religious opposition, these must bring pressures upon him.

Then, of course, there is the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan next door—next door. You can not be insensitive to the long range implications to that action. If the Soviets are completely successful taking over control of Afghanistan and wiping out all insurgency, the potential for future Soviet expansionism and adventurism is greatly broadened. It can have a chilling effect upon diplomatic foreign policy objectives of every nation in that area, that includes all of the oil producing countries of the Middle East, Saudi Arabia, Oman, Kuwait, the Arab Emirate, all of them, Iran, Iraq, Pakistan.

I suppose two weeks ago, very few Americans would have conceived that a place by the name of Afghanistan, could be remotely connected with a serious American security interest. I often wonder how many Americans would have been able to place it on the face of the globe, locate it geographically. Now, suddenly, it emerges and it is important—it is important, one, that the Soviets not succeed to the point where their success emboldens them to build upon the kind of success.

It is important that we respond by building up our own hold and presence in the Middle East. It is important that we make clear in conjunction with every other nation on the face of

the earth whom we can rally to our point of view, make clear to the Soviet Union that this kind of behaviors aren't acceptable.

Now I come from the early days of the cold war when I can remember the Soviets using the veto in the Security Council on an almost daily basis. Yesterday they cast their 113th veto of a proposal that all foreign forces withdraw from Afghanistan, and only one member of the Security Council joined them in the veto, East Germany. Thirteen nations, members of the Security Council, supported the resolution. That is a dramatic change in the influence of the Soviet Union in the United Nations, as it has developed in recent years.

The Council will today or tomorrow, I gather, consider a resolution which cannot be vetoed, it needs to be supported by only nine members of the Council to take the matter to the General Assembly and there is no veto in the General Assembly. So the Soviet Union faces the prospect, and it seems to me a very clear prospect, denunciation by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Now, you say so what, why should the Soviet Union care? Of course the Soviet Union cares. When a nation's influence on the policies, the activities of other nations around the world, depends on how it is viewed, the Soviet Union has been carefully nurturing positive image in those areas of the world where it considered its influence to be important to its own long term interests, and now it has put those in jeopardy. In this action is an aberration in the contexts of Soviet policy for the last ten to fifteen years. It certainly is in the context of the road that the United States and USSR have been travelling toward accommodation. It's not been a matter of serving mutual, a matter of mutual trusts, these developments of the last ten years, but we have had a common agreement identifying areas of accommodation that would be in the national interest of each country, now suddenly they have turned 180°.

The most frightening aspect of it to me is not that they have done so, but they seem surprised that we should be concerned. In other words, their view seems to be that Afghanistan on our border obviously is an area of our sphere of interest. You, as associate super power, ought to understand that you have to do what you have to do to control the areas adjoining your own borders. Yet, I can't help wonder what their reaction would be if we had done the same thing to Cuba 2 weeks ago.

So it's a grave change in international policies tied to energy. It's tied to the foreign policies of nations which are among the most unstable in the world. It affects an area of great vulnerability for us.

So, I think the President is right in the actions he has taken, and he is considering others. These actions will inevitably impact upon Americans. When we assume tough policies, those tough policies are tough only because they are supported, if they are, by the American people willing to accept sacrifices.

In the grain embargo, or partial grain embargo, the denial of 17 million tons of U.S. grains to the Soviet Union, that's a tough policy for the Soviet Union. It may not deter them, or cause them to reverse their policy, but it's going to hurt them, with an impact, I'm sure, on their future policies.

Because it's tough and because it conceivably will impose sacrifices upon some Americans, we begin to hear criticisms of it. I don't care what tough policy you talk about, I heard one commentator on Sunday say there was nothing in the President's speech, which represented steel on steel. What does he mean by steel on steel? Does he mean declaring war? Would that impose no sacrifice on any American? Young people would have to fight the war. Taxpayers would have to pay for it.

Tough policies are tough to the extent that a President identifies them, and then has the support to make them credible. If after he

adopts a tough policy, we begin to cry about how tough they are on us, how credible is the policy?

So we're moving through a period, to face the gravest act of aggression we have seen since the early days of the cold war. We're going to have to move through it with wisdom, with firmness, with substantial changes in our policies, domestic and foreign, re-examination of our role in the Middle East and other parts of the world, of the resources we are willing to apply to deal with the problems that emerge. I think we can do it wisely, firmly, with restraint, and with a kind of civil discourse among ourselves that is our tradition.

It doesn't mean that everyone should rubber stamp the President's views. There's plenty of room for honest difference of opinion about the courses that we should follow, and there ought to be. There ought to be debate, but it ought to be positive in its tone. It ought to be constructive in its contribution. It ought not to dismiss policies simply because they are tough.

Denying the Soviets 17 million tons of grain is going to hurt the Soviet Union, that, I take it is what people are inclined to want to do, for good reason.

So Washington is relatively peaceful right now, we're out of session. The country is reasonably safe right now, we're out of session. But shortly we'll be back, and these are the kinds of problems we'll be sharing with you.

I appreciate the opportunity, Mr. President, to come back from time to time to discuss them. I always enjoy a feeling of freedom about being candid, and honest, and open, when I come back to talk to Maine people, whether it's in this institution, or on the streets of our towns and cities. So I appreciate your making me welcome, and allowing me to intervene in the midst of a fiery discourse. Thank you very much.

The Sergeant-at-Arms escorted Senator Edmund S. Muskie from the Senate Chamber, amid the applause of the Senate.

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

Senator CARPENTER: Mr. President, I'm really sorry that my leader has left the Chamber momentarily. I don't intend to take a lot of time this morning discussing the merits of the Bill. I obviously can't match the emotion of the Irish ire of the good Senator from Cumberland, Senator Conley.

I just want to say a couple of things. First of all, don't be misled. The good Senator has debated the entire Bill, debated the merits of the Department of Public Safety, debated the merits of the conditions of highways between here and Portland, has debated practically everything under the sun under the guise of the State Police except the principle involved in this Bill.

Now I have looked through my list of L. D.'s, about dissolving Patten Academy, about establishing a boundary between Rockport and Rockland, both of which were allowed in by the Legislative Council, of which my colleague from Cumberland is a member, they don't look like emergencies to me.

I would hope that if you vote this morning, and I'm sure you will to go along with the Senator from Cumberland, and adhere on this Bill that perhaps tomorrow we can go through this list of L. D.'s, and pull out all the Bills which don't meet our criteria of emergencies.

I wish somebody on the Legislative Council or from the rostrum or somebody would give me a definition of what an Emergency Bill is. We establish rules, we say that the Bills will come in, in the Second Session in a number of ways.

Now here we have a situation where a Bill has come in through one of those ways. Now somebody and probably accompanied by many other people are going to decide that the Bill

isn't even worth a public hearing. I think it's wrong, I think the principle of it is wrong.

If the Senator from Cumberland or anyone else in this Chamber wants to debate the merits of this particular L. D., I would only ask that he or she do so after the Bill has been properly processed through this Chamber, and through the Committee structure which we've set up.

I think it's wrong to stand here this morning and discuss the merits of this Bill, which I have not done. I think it's a Red Herring, to talk about the State Police and the Commissioner and the fact that the State Troopers go too fast. I was very pleased to hear that speeders in this State are becoming an endangered species. I don't particularly think they are, and I drive a lot. But let's get back to the principle, which I have heard on this floor by Members of my own party, by my own floorleader, by members of the opposition party, and I believe by their own floorleader that a Bill once in, deserves a public hearing. That is what I really wish you would vote on this morning. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

Senator PIERCE: Mr. President, and Members of the Senate: After hearing our good senior Senator from Washington, and enjoying him, it really seems almost too bad to get back to the mundane things of the real world, but I suppose we have to here today.

I think there is probably only one thing in one area that perhaps I could out do the Senator from Cumberland, if I wanted to, that is, I can talk louder, I could yell louder, but as Senator Muskie pointed out, he has already used that technique so well that I obviously can't use it here today. I hesitate to get into things as logic and common sense because we all so often see them fail.

I think the Senator from Aroostook has hit the nail right on the head. What we really have here is a matter of principle. Whether or not every Bill that comes before us is going to get a public hearing.

It seems to me that I have heard, especially from the bleeding hearts so often, time after time, that every Bill has to have a public hearing. Why is this one different? Because it has that touch of law and order. So we're not going to debate the merits.

Well, unlike my good friend from Cumberland, who would have voted for almost all the Bills that the Legislative Council voted to let in, I suspect that I voted against most of them. I would have been happy to let none of the Bills in. So if we want, we could take the book, as Senator Carpenter pointed out, and we could go through them, and let's get rid of some of this garbage right now. Why send it all to committee? There are a lot of them I don't agree with already, I know what's going to happen to them. So perhaps we could do that.

But I would just point out that my Governor, your Governor, our Governor has asked to have this Legislation placed before us. If we don't go along with him at this time, if we don't support him at this time, I'm going to have to re-think my entire session on whether or not I'm going to get into his corner anymore, if he's not going to be a winner. It seems to me that today is the day when we should stand up and be counted. Who is going to support our Governor and who isn't?

Mr. President, I would ask for the Yeas and Nays on this very important issue when the vote is taken. Thank you.

The PRESIDENT: A Roll Call has been requested. Under the Constitution, in order for the Chair to order a Roll Call it requires the affirmative vote of at least one-fifth of those Senators present and voting.

Will all those Senators in favor of ordering a Roll Call, please rise and remain standing until counted.

Obviously more than one-fifth having arisen

a Roll Call is ordered.

The pending question before the Senate is the Motion by the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Carpenter, that the Senate Recede and Concur with the House on L. D. 1754.

A Yes vote will be in favor of the Motion to Recede and Concur.

A No vote will be opposed.

The Doorkeepers will secure the Chamber. The Secretary will call the Roll.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Carpenter, Clark, Collins, Devoe, Emerson, Gill, Hichens, McBreairsty, Perkins, Pierce, Shute, Sutton, Teague, Troitzky.

NAY — Ault, Chapman, Conley, Danton, Huber, Katz, Martin, Minkowsky, Najarian, O'Leary, Pray, Redmond, Silverman, Trafton, Usher.

ABSENT — Cote, Farley, Lovell

A Roll Call was had.

14 Senators having voted in the affirmative, and 15 Senators in the negative, with 3 Senators being absent, the Motion to Recede and Concur does not prevail.

Is it now the pleasure of the Senate to Adhere?

The Motion prevailed.

#### Joint Orders

An expression of Legislative Sentiment recognizing that:

Claude Dumond has served the past 25 years as Municipal Manager of the Town of Fort Kent and through his outstanding, loyal and devoted service has contributed immeasurably to that community. (H. P. 1656)

Comes from the House, Read and Passed.

Which was Read and Passed, in concurrence.

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Finance Officer be authorized and directed to pay each member of the Legislature prior to February 1, 1980, a \$200 allowance for constituent services as authorized by the Maine Revised Statutes, Title 3, section 2. (H. P. 1655)

Comes from the House, Read and Passed.

Which was Read and Passed, in concurrence.

#### Communication

State of Maine

#### OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

January 4, 1980

To the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred and Ninth Legislature of the State of Maine:

SUBJECT: Unorganized Territory Educational and Services Tax.

The following list of Municipal Cost Components is submitted in accordance with 36 M.R.S.A., Section 1604.

Public Safety	\$ 150,000
Forest Fire Protection	1,567,539
Land Use Regulation Commission	300,000
Secretary of State	3,000
Property Tax Assessment	259,880
County Reimbursement for Services	1,235,685
Education	2,318,253
Human Services —	
General Assistance	175,000

Total \$6,009,357

The Municipal Cost Components for 1980, computed for services and reimbursements to be rendered in FY 1981, was provided me by the Bureau of the Budget, Department of Finance and Administration, based on data it received from State agencies.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH E. BRENNAN

Governor

(H. P. 1664)

Comes from the House, Read and Ordered Placed on File.

Which was Read, and Ordered Placed on File, in concurrence.

#### Senate Papers

Senator Najarian of Cumberland presented, 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. 675)

Which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs and Ordered Printed.

Sent down for concurrence.

Senator Gill of Cumberland presented, RE-SOLVE, 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. (Emergency) (S. P. 674)

Which was Referred to the Committee on State Government and Ordered Printed.

Sent down for concurrence.

Senator Emerson of Penobscot presented, Bill, "An Act Relating to Winter Closing of Town Ways." (S. P. 673)

Which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Ordered Printed.

Sent down for concurrence.

#### Study Report — Audit and Program Review

The Committee on Audit and Program Review to which was referred the study and review of the Maine Sunset Law, pursuant to Title 3, Section 505, have had the same under consideration, and ask leave to report that the accompanying Bill, "An Act Relating to Periodic Justification of Departments and Agencies of State Government under the Maine Sunset Law" (S. P. 672) (L. D. 1764) be referred to the Committee on Audit and Program Review for public hearing and printed pursuant to Joint Rule 17.

Which Report was Read and Accepted and the Bill referred to the Committee on Audit and Program Review.

Sent down for concurrence.

#### Senate at Ease

The Senate called to Order by the President.

(Off Record Remarks)

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

Senator CONLEY: Mr. President, with respect to L. D. 1754, I move that the Senate reconsider it's action whereby the Senate moved to Adhere, and would urge the Senate to vote against me.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Cumberland, Senator Conley, moves that the Senate reconsider it's action whereby it voted to Adhere on Bill, "An Act to Prohibit Radar Detectors." (H. P. 1634) (L. D. 1754)

Will all those Senators in favor of Reconsideration, please say Yes.

Will all those Senators opposed, please say No.

A Viva Voce Vote being had.

The Motion to Reconsider does not prevail.

Senator Conley of Cumberland was granted unanimous consent to address the Senate, Off the Record.

Senator Katz of Kennebec was granted unanimous consent to address the Senate, Off the Record.

On Motion by Senator Pierce of Kennebec, Adjourned until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.