

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the
LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

LEGISLATIVE RECORD

OF THE

***One Hundred and Eighth
Legislature***

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

Volume I

January 5, 1977 to May 25, 1977

KJ PRINTING
AUGUSTA, MAINE

ment officials from coming back as lobbyists. That Bill went under the hammer in here so thus a unanimous vote.

I would like to respond basically to the public image, because no matter what we say, the image is there. The people of this state are tainted with an opinion of lobbyists which I disagree with but the fact is that it is there. So the question is, how are we going to respond to those people that we represent with legislation that they desire? And if you do not think they desire this, I will bet if this was on a referendum ballot that the general public, ignorant of the fact of what really happens in the halls down here, and many of them trust those that they elect to do the job, but there are times that we sit here and we can be swayed by a lobbyist, by an individual that we go to some times for facts. Both sides come forward a lot of the times and give us the facts and we make the final decision. What do you do when you come down to a case where the facts seem to even off? We come into a position of not really knowing which way to go. Subconsciously we may be making that decision based upon prior knowledge of an individual, saying that individual has a philosophy very similar to mine. I particularly consider myself as Democrat, a kind of a conservative one, and I find myself listening more to people who reflect those viewpoints than I do those of the liberal side, and there is a number of lobbyists down here on liberal sides which I tend not to listen to because of those viewpoints. The same situation could exist within the lobby.

I do not think that the Senator from Somerset, Senator Levine, is asking for too much with the Amendment which I have proposed, that I will offer in a little bit. I will just explain that now to bring it to the Senate's attention in reference to individuals that are serving in the Legislature. The intent of my Amendment, which has been put on the desk this morning, is individuals which are presently employed prior to their election to this Chamber could lobby for that particular business or associations of those businesses. A quick reference would be for an example; everybody knows that I run motels and sporting camps and we belong to the Maine Innkeepers Association. When legislation comes up in this Chamber in reference to that, I feel as if I have quite a working knowledge of that field, and I tend to take my knowledge of that field to my colleagues in reference to how that legislation will affect the business world. Well, I do a lot of lobbying on my own legislation, and legislation which affects my business, as everyone in here does, because we have that working knowledge of it.

Since Maine is a citizen legislature, I feel as if the Bill is a little restrictive to go into those individuals whose main source of income is a particular business, to say that he could be excluded from working with the same business to return as a lobbyist. But I look at a number of individuals that are down here, past Legislators that are now lobbyists, and come down here on some of the Bills, they have a working knowledge of the legislative process which a lot of freshman Legislators do not have. In those early days or those early months of the legislative session, they very easily could have some influence. I have the highest integrity for all of the Members of the Legislature, of this Body and the other, but in those flirting months when we first come down here and we are getting our feet on the ground politically, we look somewhere for decisions. It is at the point in time that individuals could easily be influenced by somebody who has served here previously, somebody who is high in the party organization of one party or the other and maybe even assisted that individual in getting elected because of his work in the party system.

I think that if we defeat the Motion that is now prevailing that we will be taking a step forward

in the State of Maine for the interest of the people of this State.

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

Mr. LEVINE: I will be very brief this time on my feet, in answer to a couple of comments that were made. First of all, the comments that were made by the good Senator from York, Senator Hichens, I also have a good deal of respect for that gentleman, and I think that he should know if he reads this legislation carefully that this is not an anti-lobbyist Bill. It in no way can be construed as an anti-lobbyist Bill. It is not a Bill that will besmirch the Legislature here.

I was at a meeting last night and I took it upon myself to stand up and tell those people at that meeting how proud I am of this Legislature because of the problem that arose last week and the way in which we solved the problem ourselves. We cleaned our own house. I am just asking that we keep our house clean.

In response to the good Senator from Cumberland, Senator Hewes. I think he made an excellent comment on how germane my Bill really is here when he started speaking of Members of this Body who would wish to become lobbyists. Now, my bill precludes Members of the Legislature from becoming a lobbyist for two years after leaving office. I do not believe that we should punish people for experience. I am a firm believer in experiential learning. By a two year lay-off, these people in no way lose the experience. They in no way lose the knowledge of how things work in the Maine Legislature. The only thing they can possibly lose in two years is some amount of influence. That is all they can lose.

Now we come to the bottom line. The bottom line is this. You can vote either for or against the Motion of Senator Collins to accept the Majority Ought Not To Pass Report. I will explain what you are doing. If you vote in favor of accepting the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report, according to the comments of the good Senator from Cumberland, Senator Hewes, what you are doing is you are voting in your own interest or in the interest of friends and peers within this group and who might wish to become lobbyists. And to my mind if you vote against the Majority Ought Not To Pass Report, you are voting in favor of the people of Maine that elected us and sent us here. We are here to represent those people.

This is not a reactive piece of legislation. This is an active piece of legislation. We have not been put in that box yet, and I do not want to see us put in that box. I do not want to see us placed in a situation where we are going to have to pass a Bill of this nature, a Bill that might be unfair.

Therefore, I request the Members of this legislative body to oppose the Motion of the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Collins, to accept the Majority Ought Not To Pass Report.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Hancock, Senator McNally.

Mr. McNALLY: Mr. President, after having served approximately five and one-half terms in this Legislature, I hate to think that because of the grandfather clause that we are supermen in reference to those that will be elected in the years to come. Think that over.

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

Mr. HEWES: Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I would like to rebut a couple of the comments of the good Senator from Kennebec, Senator Levine. He said we are not voting for ourselves here. I state that this does not apply until, as you say, for three years in the future, so really we are not just voting for ourselves or against ourselves. But you say this is not an anti-lobbyist Bill, but I submit this is an anti-legislator Bill. One might infer that Legislators

have some barrier, some dishonesty or some taint or some inability to direct the public. everybody in the state, except 184 ex-legislators are able to serve as lobbyists under this Bill. I think you are taking a basic right away from the Legislators, and I hope that you will vote with the prevailing Motion.

The PRESIDENT: A Roll Call has been requested. In order for the Chair to order a Roll Call, it must be the expressed desire of one-fifth of those Senators present and voting. Will all those Senators in favor of a Roll Call, please rise in their places to be 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 Collins, that the Senate accept the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report of the Committee.

A yes vote will be in favor of accepting the Ought Not to Pass Report. A nay vote will be opposed.

The Secretary will call the Roll.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Carpenter, Chapman, Collins, D.; Collins S.; Cummings, Greeley, Hewes, Hichens, Huber, McNally, Pierce, Redmond, Snowe, Speers, Trotzky, Wyman.

NAY — Conley, Curtis, Danton, Farley, Katz, Levine, Lovell, Martin, Merrill, Minkowsky, Morrell, O'Leary, Pray, Usher.

ABSENT — Jackson, Mangan.

16 Senators having voted in the affirmative, and 14 Senators in the negative, with 2 Senators being absent, the Motion to accept the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report does prevail.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington, Senator Wyman.

Mr. WYMAN: Mr. President, having voted on the prevailing side, I move reconsideration.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Washington, Senator Wyman, now moves the Senate reconsider its action whereby it accepted the Majority Ought not to Pass Report of the Committee.

A viva voce vote being had,

The Motion to reconsider does not prevail.

Sent down for concurrence.

The President laid before the Senate: Bill, "An Act to Establish a Presidential Primary in the State of Maine." (H. P. 187) (L. D. 249)

Tabled — May 19, 1977 by Senator Speers of Kennebec

Pending — Enactment.

On Motion of Mr. Huber of Cumberland. Placed on Special Appropriations Table. Pending enactment.

The President laid before the Senate:

HOUSE REPORTS — from the Committee on LABOR — Bill, "An Act Concerning the Payment of Workmen's Compensation Pending an Appeal to the Supreme Judicial Court." (H. P. 281) (L. D. 375) MAJORITY REPORT — Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-269); MINORITY REPORT — Ought Not to Pass

Tabled — May 19, 1977 by Senator Speers of Kennebec

Pending — Motion of Senator McNally of Hancock to accept the Minority Report

On Motion of Mr. Speers of Kennebec.

Retabled for Two Legislative Days.

Bill, "An Act Relating to the Law Governing the Manufacturers, Distributors and Dealers of Beverage Containers." (S. P. 213) (L. D. 662)

Tabled — May 19, 1977 by Senator Hichens of York

Pending — Consideration

On Motion of Mr. Hichens of York, the Senate voted to recede and concur.

The President laid before the Senate:

Bill, "An Act Relating to the Spending Ceiling for Education Purposes." (Emergency) (H. P. 968) (L. D. 1165)

Tabled — May 19, 1977 by Senator Huber of Cumberland

Pending — Motion of Senator Collins of Knox to reconsider action whereby Bill was Passed to be Engrossed.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Knox, Senator Collins.

Mr. COLLINS: Mr. President, when this matter was tabled the other day, I professed my misgivings and, to some degree, my ignorance of what the Bill was really doing. The Chairman of the Education Committee has been very helpful in this interim in providing materials to be considered by all Members of the Senate. There has been some opportunity for many of us to talk with Municipal Officials and School Officials back home.

I am hopeful that this morning we can give this matter more thorough debate than it has received so far, because there are two or three issues here that I know concern us all. They leave many of us on the horns of a dilemma but they certainly should be discussed.

If the Motion to reconsider does prevail, I will then move that the rules be suspended so that we can reconsider the adoption of the Committee Amendment as amended by the House Amendment. I would then ask that the House Amendment be indefinitely postponed, and we would then be in a position to consider purely the Committee Amendment. I believe that some people feel that that should be indefinitely postponed.

If may oversimplify the problem as I see it, the original Bill says to us; let the local unit raise whatever amount of their own money they wish for their own schools. We had a suspension of the ceiling the year that is currently with us. This would do something similar to that for the year ahead at least. The Committee Amendment says to us, "it is rather dangerous to let the local community raise all the money it wants to for its own schools from its own sources, because it will be under tremendous pressure to respond to the union bargaining table emphasis for higher and higher wages." It says other things as well. It is saying that perhaps at the local we just do not understand how to keep the controls on burgeoning budgets. There is, I recognize, a good deal of support for having the Legislature keep the restraining hand over the local budgets.

The final chapter of this three part measure, as I understand it, says to us that we are getting a little out of date in the base that we use in our computations for assistance from the State, and that we ought to move up that base year to a more recent year. This, of course, means that starting from a higher base move forward into a higher budget, so that down the road we have from the House Amendment a rather built-in program of increasing from \$3.5 to \$4.5 million per year a base for calculation. I am sure we all realize that the Legislature has the final hand, the final say in any year. We decide what the State will appropriate. We can change base years or not, but when we encourage both the Commissioner of Education, the Education Department and the local School Administrators to build upon a constantly escalating base, it seems to me that perhaps we provide too much encouragement toward increasing and increasing and increasing our school budgets.

I wish very much that we could get back to some of the local budget meetings where some of these things were thrashed out in more careful detail, and local people made those decisions. Perhaps that day is gone forever. I hope that it is not. As we see smaller and smaller attendance at school budget meetings, I think we realize that more and more people just do not

understand what the school budgeting process is, and what is being done, it has become so complicated that it is very difficult for the ordinary citizen to comprehend it.

So, with these considerations, I urge the Senate at this point to vote in favor of reconsideration, and if this be the will of the Senate, then I would make succeeding Motions that I have outlined so that we might move into debate and further consideration of these issues that I have just very roughly outlined.

Thank You, Mr. President.

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

Mr. KATZ: Mr. President, I support the Motion of the Senator from Knox, Senator Collins, that we should reconsider, and because we are in a kind of a parliamentary bind, I would like to go one step further beyond the Senator to ask that the Senate, in a spirit of equity and fairness, go along also with the Motion to suspend the rules for reconsideration of our action when the Bill first became before us.

This Bill came before us with a House Amendment on it. The House Amendment did not have any recourse at all to the Committee on Education. We did not discuss it. It just emerged into visibility for the first time when we got it down here after the House action. There is a cost factor involved. I was not aware at the time when I let the First Reading go by what I was putting the Senate into a parliamentary bind because the First Reading involved the acceptance of both the Committee Amendment and the House Amendment, and now that these days have gone by in order to really debate both Amendments the Senate is going to have to suspend the rules and get a two-thirds vote.

I rise today not as an advocate or an opponent of any particular position, but I feel that it is important for the Senate to have the opportunity to debate the issues which were so clearly raised by the Senator from Knox. I would, therefore, urge the Senate to reconsider its action of the other day and then subsequent to the Motion to suspend the rules which is not debatable, to suspend the rules to give us the opportunity for the kind of debate I think this important issue needs.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Sagadahoc, Senator Chapman.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I too urge reconsideration as has been proposed by the Senator from Knox, Senator Collins.

I am very distressed to find that we are voting for something now and the Bill in its present which will require future Legislatures to fund money for programs we are now passing. This brings me right back to the whole subject we addressed earlier and repeal of the inventory tax. If we passed the Bill as presently situated, House Amendment C we will be doing just this: We will be passing on to future Legislatures the requirement of finding the funds to fund the present Bill, and I hope we will not do this.

There are problems in the various towns with regard to the present funding restraints. I spent quite a bit of time since this subject has been on our calendar in talking with the citizenry and the school superintendents in my District. Restraint per se is good, and it is needed, and I think most agree to this point. The Bill, as amended by Committee Amendment A, will require many towns to seek State Board approval under the Hardship Provision. I think really too many towns would be required to go this route. But this is preferable to me than the House Amendment C posture which increases future State commitment to education. I would like to make one point however; that I believe that I would favor the removal of spending ceilings entirely for one more year only, on a basis whereby the additional expenditures do not ac-

crue to future State cost of education. At the same time, that a study involving knowledgeable persons be constituted to find an ongoing solution to the ceiling problem; a problem that would be satisfactory not only to the residents and citizens of the City of Portland and large communities, but also to the small towns, the towns like Alna and Arrowsic. They have real problems.

I am a staunch supporter of local control, as I am sure you know, but we have embarked on a road to provide State funding of education in a manner to provide an equal basic educational opportunity to all, no matter where one lives in the State of Maine. I support this broad objective. To remove the ceiling permanently would only return us in time to the former unequal status. Restraint is necessary. Let us do it by thoroughly recognizing the effects of restraint on both large and small communities.

This needs more study than I understand has been put to it at present, and, as the Senators previously stated, I think the whole School Funding Issue needs to be simplified a little bit more so our citizenry in our towns can understand it and act more intelligently on the decisions they are faced with.

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

Mr. CONLEY: Mr. President and Members of the Senate, it is clearly obvious that there are a great many questions relative to this particular piece of legislation, and I also understand the problems that we have parliamentary-wise, and it is not my intent to be an obstructionist in the sense of reconsidering and suspending the rules; however, I do philosophically have some views dealing with the Education Funding Bill. It has always been my particular feeling that once we establish a ceiling on school funding, we should abide by that. Two years ago we under-funded education by \$10 million and, therefore, we did not have a ceiling put on. Local school units throughout the State had to raise that \$10 million to meet the educational costs on the local level.

It is my understanding that the Committee Amendment on this particular Bill now sets a school funding limit for this biennium, and I am not quite clear in my own mind as to exactly what House Amendment A as amended by Committee Amendment A does do. I would honestly, rather than get into any type of turmoil here this morning, like to have someone table this for One Legislative Day so that I can pursue some figures from the Department of Education or sit down with the Chairman of the Education Committee myself and perhaps even some members of my party who may like further clarification of this particular Bill so that we could take some action on it tomorrow.

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

Mr. KATZ: Mr. President, I think it is important that everybody understands all the facets before voting, and I would presume that if tabling is a procedure to be followed, that probably we should table, but let me express a couple of concerns. We have every community in the state in a position of suspense. They really do not know how much they can legally raise. Now if this Bill is passed, with the Committee Amendment on it, we are placing a ceiling on how much every community in the State can raise and in order to go beyond the procedures that are set up in law, a good many communities, and I agree with the good Senator who says that too many communities, would have to go to the State Board for a Hardship Grant. That means we are going to have to develop a budget and put in a request for a Hardship Grant and get it approved, presumably in order to legally raise that amount of money, and I have been pleading with the Senate to do whatever is necessary to have a clear under-

standing of what is involved so we can have a prompt decision.

I want to re-emphasize to the Senate that there really is no purely right answer, and there is no purely wrong answer. One of the problems in grappling with this is that our personal philosophies are coming into real conflict with the actualities of what this does within our communities, and that is not an easy one to resolve. Let me take a little whack at explaining why the House Amendment was put on. When L.D. 1994 was originally enacted we built into the law a provision that those communities that were spending above average per pupil would be given State Funds equal to one-half of the distance between the state average and what they were spending. This was meant as a depressant, to kind of squash down their spending a little bit. At the same time we addressed ourselves to the question of those communities spending below average. We moved those communities up by one-third of the difference. In the process we would be compressing the difference between the lowest spending communities and the higher spending communities. Well, you can see some philosophical problems right there. As long as the State was "adequately funding" what was really being spent on education around the State, those provisions were, I think, effective, but, unfortunately, coming back to the House Amendment, the state of the higher spending communities was '73-'74 and you understand that the amount of financial support that those towns have gotten from the State has gradually shrunk, and now most all of the difference in spending between our higher spending communities and the State's obligation has gradually compacted and now there is very little money going from the State to support those communities. You can say that is as it should be, because the higher spending communities are not as efficient, they are not as effective and we really want to put the pickle to them a little bit to get them to stop this excess of spending. But then you run into the dilemma that it really is not a case of being efficient or effective. It is not a case of being a big city versus a small town. There are a lot of reasons why a community spends above average, — the number of students that they educate, their ability to organize classes with an adequate number of students in each class, the location of the community. Cumberland County, in general, just simply has to pay a higher wage scale than teachers from Washington County. It is a law of supply and demand.

It is an extremely complicated issue, and I hope that if it is the judgment of the Senate to table this for a day that we really must do all our homework and deal with this, whatever our decision is, in extremely prompt manner.

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

Mr. HUBER: Mr. President and Members of the Senate. As I understand these Amendments, House Amendment A to Committee Amendment A, as the good Senator from Kennebec, Senator Katz mentioned, does carry a cost estimated at between \$3.5 and \$4.5 million in the second year of our biennium. Presumably this cost would compound the parliamentary problems in the passage of this Bill because I think a Bill carrying this type of cost probably should get consideration along with all of our other appropriations measures.

Of course, this cost does assume some assumptions, primarily the assumption the Legislature will accept the Commissioner of Education's certification, including the optional local funds without State legislation.

Committee Amendment A itself, as I understand it, would require approval of the Board of Education in spending beyond the ceiling. This would impose State control of purely local spending of local funds. In L.D. 1994 we assumed there would be local control of State

funds. This did not work and it did not work spectacularly.

The Commissioner's notification in our notification of actual education costs in our existing funding law does require the Commissioner detail the optional local funds without State legislation, that is spending above the ceiling. This then comes related to the legislative decision as to whether this optional local expenditure of local funds is due to under funding by the legislature in funding so-called basic education or whether it essentially amounts to a redefinition of what that basic education is. I do not think we should impose State control of purely local funding, and I do think we should rely on the legislative decision as to the purpose of such funding.

I would support an additional one year moratorium on the spending ceiling, and I hope the Senate will move to reconsider and suspend the rules.

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

Mr. CONLEY: Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I hope you will bear with me. I know the hour is getting late, and I can see that the Presiding Officer is starting to wipe the sweat from his brow.

However, Mr. President, there is a question in my mind, in fact there are a few questions in mind relative to this, and one is whether or not the philosophy of 1452, or 1994 is the original concept, is still being maintained if Committee Amendment A is indefinitely postponed, if that does take off the funding ceiling. Secondly, again I am not quite sure as to how House Amendment A, although my understanding of it deals primarily with hardship cases having to come before the Board of Education. Maybe I am wrong on that but I certainly want the opportunity to review.

But it would seem to me that we should at least be getting in touch with our superintendents within our local districts to see how both of these Amendments are going to affect our school funding and I think perhaps if some Senator would table this until tomorrow, we might be able to review that.

On Motion of Mr. Speers of Kennebec, Retabled for One Legislative Day.

The President laid before the Senate:

HOUSE REPORT — from the Committee on Fisheries and Wildlife — Bill, "An Act Concerning the Taking of Black Bass. (H. P. 265) (L. D. 333) Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-353)

Tabled — May 20, 1977 by Senator Martin of Aroostook

Pending — Motion of Senator Conley of Cumberland to Indefinitely Postpone Bill and Papers

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

Mr. CONLEY: Mr. President, I request Leave to Withdraw the Motion.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Cumberland, Senator Conley, now requests leave of the Senate to withdraw his Motion to indefinitely postpone this Bill. Is this the pleasure of the Senate? It is a vote.

Ought to Pass as amended Report accepted in concurrence.

The Bill Read Once. Committee Amendment "A" Read and adopted, and the Bill, as amended, Tomorrow Assigned for Second Reading.

The President laid before the Senate: Bill, "An Act to Strengthen the Counties' Role in Human Services." (H. P. 213) (L. D. 223)

Tabled — May 20, 1977 by Senator Conley of Cumberland

Pending — Adoption of Committee Amendment "A" (H-338)

Committee Amendment "A" Adopted. The

Bill, as amended, Tomorrow Assigned for Second Reading.

HOUSE REPORTS — from the Committee on Election Laws — Bill, "An Act Concerning Expenses of the Commission on Governmental Ethics and Election Practices." (Emergency) (H. P. 816) (L. D. 989) Majority Report — Ought Not to Pass; Minority Report — Ought to Pass

Tabled — May 20, 1977 by Senator Speers of Kennebec

Pending — Motion of Senator Conley of Cumberland to Accept the Minority Ought to Pass Report

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

Mr. KATZ: Mr. President, I would oppose that Motion. This is a Bill which simply would pay members of the Commission on Governmental Ethics a per diem of \$25.00 for the work on behalf of the Committee, and it is a very reasonable Bill until you stop to think that our statutes are filled, simply filled with important citizen oriented organizations who are in a posture of public service, are doing important things for the State. We have some really top-notch people on this Commission. I do not think that there is a demand from the Commission itself, although I am not quite certain someone has not spoken to me about a demand.

I voted against this because I have a feeling if you start paying this Commission, that sooner or later we are going to have to pay them what they are worth, and, believe me, we have got some high priced people on there. I think that we should keep it a voluntary commission, public service, and resist the overwhelming impulse to keep loading work on their shoulders, which will make them a duplicate of the Department of State's Election Laws Division.

I oppose the Motion and request a Division.

The PRESIDENT: A Division has been requested.

Will all those Senators in favor of the Motion to accept the Minority Ought to Pass Report of the Committee, please rise in their places to be counted.

Will all those Senators opposing the Motion to accept the Minority Ought to Pass Report of the Committee, please rise in their places to be counted.

4 Senators having voted in the affirmative, and 26 Senators in the Negative, the Motion to accept the Minority Ought to Pass Report does not prevail.

Majority Ought Not to Pass Report accepted in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

The President laid before the Senate:

SENATE REPORTS — from the Committee on Taxation — Bill, "An Act Relating to State Income Tax Deduction for Student Tuition Payments." (S. P. 402) (L. D. 1385) Majority Report — Ought Not to Pass; Minority Report — Ought to Pass in New Draft Under Same Title (S. P. 505) (L. D. 1790)

Tabled — May 20, 1977 by Senator Jackson of Cumberland

Pending — Acceptance of Majority Ought Not to Pass Report

On Motion of Mr. Speers of Kennebec,

Retabled for One Legislative Day.

The President laid before the Senate: Bill, "An Act to Amend the Charter of the Augusta Sanitary District." (H. P. 718) (L. D. 840) (Emergency)

Tabled — May 20, 1977 by Senator Speers of Kennebec

Pending — Motion by Senator Speers of Kennebec to Reconsider Adoption of Committee Amendment "A" (H-339)

On Motion of Mr. Speers of Kennebec,

Retabled for One Legislative Day.