

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 Fifth
Legislature***

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

Volume III

June 16, 1971 to June 24, 1971

Index

1st Special Session

January 24, 1972 to March 10, 1972

Index

**KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE**

trouble down at the other end of the hall because some of the Senators felt that it was a little bit too inclusive.

Therefore, in an attempt to compromise without taking any further time, I merely watered the language down. The MIBA under this amendment would no longer have any authority to enter into management decisions of the board, but merely would recommend decisions that they thought would avoid a default. The amendment that I just indefinitely postponed would, in fact, have given the MIBA the authority to interject their own decisions directly into management decisions of a business that was in danger. That is all that it does.

Thereupon, House Amendment "D" was adopted.

The Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "B" and House Amendments "C" and "D" in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

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

An Act to Appropriate Moneys for the Expenditures of State Government and Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1972 and June 30, 1973 (S. P. 768) (L. D. 2047)

Pending—Passage to be enacted.

On motion of Mr. Susi of Pittsfield, retabled pending passage to be enacted and tomorrow assigned.

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

Mr. HARDY: Is the House in possession of L. D. 2051?

The SPEAKER: The answer is in the affirmative. Bill "An Act Implementing the Reorganization of the Department of Environmental Protection, Senate Paper 772, L. D. 2051, on which the House voted to recede and concur earlier in the day.

The Chair recognizes the same gentleman.

Mr. HARDY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: Last week, the House passed by a 3 to 1 margin, the amendment to this bill,

which would leave the EIC at its present membership of ten.

Yesterday in the other branch, it was decided that our amendment should be rejected and such happened. This morning, as you all remember, we receded and concurred and this went under the hammer without debate.

I think that we should have asked for a Committee of Conference at the moment. I believe that most of us believe that the present EIC, with its present makup, is doing a pretty good job and I think we shouldn't change its make-up without good reason. Nobody has given us a good reason for adding this new member to the commission.

I now move that we reconsider our action this morning, and if this is granted I should ask to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Hardy of Hope, the House reconsidered its action of earlier in the day whereby it voted to recede and concur.

The motion to recede and concur was lost.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the same gentleman.

Mr. HARDY: Mr. Speaker, I now move that we insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Hope, Mr. Hardy, now moves that the House insist on its former action and ask for a Committee of Conference.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I agree with the gentleman from Hope that we should keep the EIC at its present membership. I am just wondering, however, if perhaps what we ought to do is just to move to insist on our former action rather than asking for a Committee of Conference.

I wonder if you would take that under consideration. I think it would save us some time and prevent another committee having to meet. Mr. Speaker, does the motion to insist have priority over insisting and asking for a Committee of Conference?

The SPEAKER: The answer is in the affirmative.

Thereupon, on motion of the same gentleman, the House voted to insist.

On motion of Mr. Porter of Lincoln,

Adjourned until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.