

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 Seventeenth Legislature

OF THE

State Of Maine

VOLUME VII

SECOND REGULAR SESSION

Senate

March 14, 1996 to April 3, 1996

SECOND CONFIRMATION SESSION

August 1, 1996

SECOND SPECIAL SESSION

House of Representatives

September 5, 1996 to September 7, 1996

Senate

September 5, 1996 to September 7, 1996

Index to 117th Legislative Record

HOUSE AND SENATE LEGISLATIVE SENTIMENTS

Senate at Ease
Senate called to order by the President.

Senator **LAWRENCE** of York was granted unanimous consent to address the Senate off the Record.

Senator **SMALL** of Sagadahoc was granted unanimous consent to address the Senate off the Record.

Senator **AMERO** of Cumberland was granted unanimous consent to address the Senate off the Record.

On motion by Senator **RUHLIN** of Penobscot, **RECESSED** until 2:00 o'clock this afternoon.

After Recess
Senate called to order by the President.

Out of order and under suspension of the Rules, the Senate considered the following:

COMMITTEE REPORTS
House

Divided Report

The Majority of the Committee on **AGRICULTURE, CONSERVATION AND FORESTRY** on Bill "An Act to Implement the Compact for Maine's Forests"

H.P. 1390 L.D. 1892

Reported that the same **Ought to Pass as Amended** by Committee Amendment "A" (H-924).

Signed:

Senator:

PARADIS of Aroostook

Representatives:

SPEAR of Nobleboro

AHEARNE of Madawaska

PENDLETON, JR. of Scarborough

HICHBORN of Lagrange

TYLER of Windham

KILKELLY of Wiscasset

CROSS of Dover-Foxcroft

STROUT of Corinth

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject reported that the same **Ought to Pass as Amended** by Committee Amendment "B" (H-925).

Signed:

Senators:

CASSIDY of Washington

LORD of York

Representatives:

DEXTER of Kingfield

KNEELAND of Easton

Comes from the House with the Majority **UGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-924) AS AMENDED BY HOUSE AMENDMENTS "B" (H-931), "D" (H-933) AND "G" (H-937), thereto.**

Which Reports were **READ**.

THE PRESIDENT Is it the pleasure of the Senate to **ACCEPT** the Majority **UGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-924)** Report, in concurrence?

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington, Senator Cassidy.

Senator **CASSIDY**: Mr. President, Men and Women of the Senate. Before we vote on this issue, I would like to discuss several concerns that I have had and expressed through the public hearings and our Committee work sessions and to all of you here for the last few days here. First of all, as you know, I am really opposed to the idea of us having a competing measure on the ballot to come up in November. I think it would be fair to give you some of the reasons why I am concerned about this and some of the risks that we will be taking by doing this.

As you know, in March this proposal that was initiated by a citizen's group, called the clearcutting ban initiative, came before our Committee. At that time we had 900 folks show up over at the Elks Lodge. The hearing went on for hours and hours and there was a great deal of opposition to that proposal. I think, hopefully, all of you are opposed to that proposal, as well. At that time, obviously, I needed to decide what was the best thing for our Committee to do. The options that we had at that time was either to implement that clearcutting ban, or to refuse it and put it out to vote. The other option that we had, after discussion with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State and the Commissioner of Conservation, the option of putting up an alternative proposal. After consulting with the Commissioner, and I'm sure he spoke with the Governor and all the folks involved, the decision was made at that time that it would be better to leave this as a straight up or down vote and put it out for the folks. As you know, the first reaction from the citizens of Maine on some of the early polling, without people understanding exactly what this proposal would do, was possibly 70% of the folks who may have, at that time, supported this clearcutting ban. However, folks didn't realize the other forest practice issues in that proposal that would really devastate our economy. Number one, not being able to harvest more than one-third of your wood over a fifteen-year period, and half acre openings in the canopies and so on and so forth. Once folks started to realize what this would do to our economy, how restrictive it was and so on, and the companies formed a pact and started to do a little advertising. The numbers immediately dropped to down to 49% that were opposed to this. I think it was only about 20% that would favor the clearcutting ban. It was clear to everyone, including, I think, the Governor, his administration, all of you, and probably everyone in this building, that this clearcut proposal would probably go nowhere this fall. In the meanwhile there was some discussion, and a group got together to decide if we should offer some alternative. I think the initial thought, from what I have heard from some of the paper companies and their representatives, was the possibility of putting on a fade-away measure, where we could put something on the ballot so if the clearcut failed, that would go into law; if not, it would fade away. The courts ruled that that was not possible to do. The only option would be this competing measure.

The Governor, and his folks who met, and I'm not really sure of all of the players that met during the summer, I guess there were people from the Natural Resources Council, some of the environmental groups, the paper companies and industry sort of met behind closed doors to put this proposal together that we have before us today. During that process, it was evident, when we got near the end, that some of the

negative feelings about the whole proposal, when they started to bring in some of the players who didn't have a chance to participate, like the small woodlot owners and a few other people. The problem with that whole process was this, it didn't bring all of the players into effect that should have participated in this thing. I would liked to have seen some legislators, people from our Committee or the Natural Resources Committee. I would liked to have seen some people that belong to the ban clearcutting group have a seat there. Obviously, the loggers, the small woodlot owners and all of those that were left out.

The big objection I had to this whole proposal was, number one, why are we spending the money to be here today, and to go through what we have gone through, and the public hearings we had last week, and the work sessions we have had this week, when we know we are going to beat the issue? The other thing is, we could deal with this thing in the next session, in the 118th, when we have time to work on a bill that has the magnitude of this. I said, during the hearing this week, I really feel if this bill had come to us in the first session of the 117th, probably we would have worked on it that winter, held it over, worked on it the second session and had twenty months or so to put this bill together, to cover all of the bases, to have all the people in place, to make sure that this was right. It's obvious that this has been a very rushed ordeal for everyone. I do commend the Committee for the work that they did in such a short period of time. But, the problem I have with offering this thing, and not having a clear up or down vote, was the fact that the citizens' group that did initiate that referendum, although I don't agree with the referendum, went through the process to collect 57,000 signatures. I feel, even though they are wrong, they should have their day on the ballot. We should be able to go and vote on that, and deal with this thing at the proper time. Those are my first two arguments. Why send this thing out when we know we can beat it? Let's keep it up or down, a simple yes or no. Often, my constituents will say, "Is this one of those referendums that I have to vote 'yes' when I mean 'no' and 'no' when I mean 'yes'?" I had people come up to me a few days after the last referendum a couple of years ago and say they didn't know if they voted the way they wanted to or not. This one was very simple. It was yes or no. So, that was the problem I had when I first said I was opposed to this thing, because everybody, including the paper industry and our Committee, met with the Governor. Everyone, except a small group of people, were saying do not go into a special session, we don't need to do this. I was really quite surprised with the advice of most of the people that he was soliciting were not in favor of this. I think there were only eight on our Committee that said not to do this and four or five others said do it. Those were some of the concerns I had. Then once I did see the bill, I see what's behind all of this in a lot of areas. One, and it was said at the public hearings, the problems we have with this is it's a situation where even some of the opponents, who got up and testified at the hearing, would say to us they were going to support the Governor but this reserve thing is totally ridiculous. We had one person who is a nationally recognized company in this State for their forest practices and what they have done and accomplished say that with this reserve the wood is going to die.

It's going to be insect infested. It is going to rot and blow down. We are going to have a fire and it will be a nature's clearcut. Here is a guy who was sponsoring the bill. The other thing that you have here is just another layer of bureaucracy. I did not run for the State Senate from Washington County saying I wanted to add another half million dollar fiscal note to the State budget. I did not run saying I need another layer of bureaucracy. I ran saying we need to streamline State government. I heard the Governor, at his inauguration, say we are going to have a leaner, meaner, State government. This is not leaner and meaner. It also infringes on the rights of property owners. We have enough rules and regulations in this State without adding this. The thing with the clearcut ban, as you know, it was only in the unorganized territories. This particular bill takes in the entire State.

The other problem I had with this bill, it was evident during the public hearings, the paper companies would stand up before us, and after about the fifth one, it was real evident that what they were saying to us is we have been in business for 100 years, it was almost the same tune, we have been doing it right. We have had the spruce budworm. We have had to salvage some wood. We are doing it right again. We are going to do it right even if this doesn't pass. We are going to implement this in October. As you can see, the audit report on this bill is totally voluntary. I don't see why we put into law a bill that folks are going to do only if they want to. It's not like this is Simon says. The other thing that I see in this audit, and I asked some of the folks as they were testifying, there is no question the paper companies seem to think that they have a bad public image. There is no question in my mind that folks in Maine are concerned about clearcuts.

As you know, the Maine Legislature introduced, in 1989, our present Forest Practices Act. Unfortunately, at that time, we had twenty some odd foresters working with the forest people in this State. Today we have eight foresters left. We have a bill that we haven't worked the way we were supposed to from day one. If we enforce the law that we have today, we wouldn't need to be doing this. Although the Forest Department, as by statute, did report back to our Committee in April of 1995, the results of what has happened since we implemented our present act, and there is no question that clearcutting has dropped off over the last five years. There is no question, even, with some of the numbers we have seen in this bill that the average clearcut is 33 acres. I think clearcuts are ugly, too. I also know that I have worked in the woods part time on my own lot, with lumber and firewood for my own use. Over the years I have raised Christmas trees. I have been out there and I know the evolution of what happens when we work our forests. There are times when we need to clearcut an area for some reason or another. As a matter of fact, last year, you may have read in the paper, we had a weird storm go through our area; and I had a lot tamarack, or hackmatack, whichever you prefer, that was all of the same age, in a shallow soil. We had 25 or 30 acres blow over during this freak storm. These trees were 75 to 80 years old. I had a forester come in and he said I had to cut all of them because the ones that didn't blow over would blow over once we clean it up. So, we have a three or four acre clearcut in

my 150 acres that doesn't look that ugly, but I know it doesn't meet the basal foot that is required under the present act. I did get the Commissioner to come and check me out to see what I was doing. Those things happen and we know there has to be exceptions to every law that we make, because there are some reasons why we could create hardships on people. So, those are some of the concerns that I see with the bill.

The biggest concern I see with the bill is this, we had three days of public hearings for two sessions. We had a half hour rotation of folks in favor of this bill and folks who opposed the bill and folks who were neither for nor against it, although we had a few people just jump up in that last area with a "Yes" button on who said they were neither for nor against. I did ask them to remove their button before they continued their discussion. But, what came out of those hearings was this, we had the professional lobbyists, who you have seen here in the corridors for the last two days, speak. We saw paper employees and forest products people who are in the industry but not necessarily professional lobbyists but who have an interest. Then we also had the people speak. We had the Governor's people there lobbying their proposals. We had the environmentalists speaking, as well. If you could, in your mind, picture taking the paid lobbyists and the paper industry and the environmentalists away from that, the rest of the people that I heard for those other half hours were very concerned about their rights to own land in this country. They were concerned about the continued spending of state funds. They were concerned about government in their life, and all those issues. That is what set in my mind. I am representing the people in Washington County, and the people of the State of Maine. Paid lobbyists, to be quite honest with you, have never had a real impact with me. Although I was accused several times during the session that I was paid off by the paper companies, I think they have learned this week that they didn't give me enough money or something, because I'm not paid off by anybody and I never will be. I fought this issue from the beginning based on the value of what I think is right and that's what we are here for, to do what we think is right for our people. My constituents are with me on this. I have been all over my district, talking with them, and they agree 100%.

The other thing that was so striking to me, and I'm just about finished, so just be patient, I was so amazed at the calls I was getting from the industry people. The people who are in the forest products industry, not the lobbyists, and also the testimony I heard when I met with them in the various communities where we were hearing. They would all say to me that I had to support the Governor. Of course, the professional lobbyists know you don't say that. It's like them asking me today, "How many votes do you think you have in the Senate?" I said I have one, that's all I know. I don't know how many votes we have in the Senate. What I am saying is I thought to myself, "Why are these people saying to me, Vinton, I wish you would support this but you are right. You are really right." I have had calls to my home and we had a citizen give testimony up in Presque Isle. He came up to me and said, "Senator Cassidy, the funniest thing happened to me today. A lot of the people who heard what I said told me it was tremendous testimony and they agree with me 100% but

they were there on company time so they had to say what they did, but I was right." I wondered why they were saying this. The reason they are saying it is because they don't understand the process. They just should have said to vote with the Governor and that's it, maybe that would have gotten to me. But those people don't understand the process. They were telling me what their heart was saying. I had another group come in here last week who was going to testify. I explained some things in the bill to them and said I couldn't understand why the group was testifying. They said the paper companies called them and told them to. I showed them this, this, this, this, and they said they still had to testify because their people told them they had to but they looked at it. I saw him leave the hearing later that afternoon and I haven't seen him since. When people realize what is in this bill, when they stand up and say that the small woodlot owners endorsed this, what you find out is that the Director of Forestry went and spoke to the Director of the Small Woodlot Owners. They took a vote and voted to support this compact. There are 1500 members they didn't poll, including me. If I had gone and spoke to the Board of Directors, you probably would have seen a different vote. So, I wasn't really impressed. We have a wide range of coverage. You may hear this afternoon that this group, this group, this group, and this group support this. The fact is there is a wide range of very shallow support for this.

Finally, what I will say is this, a few years ago, more than thirty, when I was in high school, I had an opportunity one time to participate in a sports camp put on by the University of Maine. At that time there was a wonderful guy named Brian McCloud, who was the head basketball coach. I can always remember what he told us kids one day. He said, "In basketball, normally a bad pass is followed by another bad pass." I hope here, today, that a bad decision for us to be here is not followed by another bad decision to pass this bill. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Paradis.

Senator **PARADIS:** Thank you, Mr. President, Men and Women of the Senate. The pile of paper you see here is part of the work that has been done since January on this very issue. Many of us felt very guilty that so many trees literally bit the dust during these negotiations and talks. Whenever 55,000 people speak by putting their John Hancock to a document, it says something. It says that we have a problem. We had a problem, we were told, by the way we were managing our forests. That was a very clear message. The referendum did immediately cast a pall on the industry. Much of the investment, land acquisition, buying chain saws or equipment, came to a halt. Living in the northern reaches of this gorgeous state, we felt it immediately. There is a face to the impact of this proposed referendum. All the individuals involved in the forest products industry, to the environmentalists sitting around the table, for as many months as they have done it, is unprecedented. We always do it this way, legislatively. We always bring the people who are interested in an issue around the table, but I have never seen the extent of the work that was done here. The executive and legislative branches were involved to the extent they chose to be, as 75% are employed in other jobs it made it very difficult. I felt very confident that there was some excellent

work going. We were very impressed this week as we dealt with a room full of people while we were reviewing the compact in Room 113. I was always impressed with, no matter what the questions were, all there were were the two committees sitting and reviewing this compact; and there was question after question after question. I don't think there was one time when there was not an answer that was forthcoming or would be here in an hour. We were able to get the information. Maine is now an excellent place to do business. We have done a great job, as policymakers, to change some things that were impeding the business climate in this State. We have a pall that is continuing to hang over us. The perception remains, even after so many months, that the referendum was accepted. That has not lifted. We, as policymakers, are here today and we need to do something about it. I think we have a document here that will do just that. We have to put a stake in the monster that is lunging for the heart of the Maine citizens involved in the forest industry and all the ancillary industries that are related to the beautiful State of Maine. We have 90% of our area forested, 17 million acres are wooded. That's why this is here today. It's not a small or specious piece. We don't have the luxury of time and we deserve to put this gutwrenching issue behind us. We are remaining under this economic cloud. We know, living in Maine, we chose to live here even if it is very difficult, we have to be poor, but we know that we do what we have to do with what we have. This is what we have. I think it is a wonderful plan. I laud the people who put the amount of energy into this compact that made the document what it is today. I urge your support. Merci beaucoup.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from York, Senator Lord.

Senator LORD: Thank you, Mr. President, my Learned Colleagues. In 1989 the same group of people worked for what we called the Forest Practices Act. They worked for six months and sent it over to the Committee on Natural Resources. I think we worked for two or three weeks before we came up with the bill. It was agreed at that time that this was a good document. It was a good way for us to run our forests in the State of Maine. It was agreed at that time that they would let the Forest Practices Act work for five years. At the end of the five years it was looked over to see if there was any recommended changes or some different policies, or rules and regulations. They didn't wait for five years. One of the groups thought that after three years that it wasn't working and they had to make changes. That's what they tried to do and that's what they have been trying to do for the last two years. So, now we come up with this bill. I will predict that it won't be two or three years before you are going to be fiddling with this bill, also. There is no question in my mind. Last Tuesday morning I spent part of the morning down in Biddeford, at a restaurant down there, for a briefing of the bill from some of the people who are supporting it. I think there were nine Representatives and Senators there and a couple of selectmen and town officials. One of the people that was for the bill got up and said, "Now you can't tinker with this bill. This is the document you are going to leave alone. You just can't tinker with it, because if you tinker with it, the support is going to fall apart and nothing is going to be done." Well, folks, you know we worked on this, we heard the

hearings, and we made some major changes. I see the same people out there pushing it just as hard now as they did when they first had the bill.

There are some things that I think are good things in here, and there are some things that I think are bad. I'm going to list one. If you look on page 10, under the decision-making process, it says, "The Board shall, in its decision, by unanimous approval of its members." Now, I don't know about you, but I belong to an awful lot of different organizations and I have never heard of such a thing as unanimous approval. You don't do that in State government. You don't do that in town government. You don't do that in the federal government. To me this is dictatorship. One person on that committee can hold the rest of them hostage. Either you do what I want or I'm not going to vote for what you want. I don't believe that is democracy. I don't believe that that is the way to make decisions. You should either go by the majority or a two-thirds vote. This is one of the things that I think is the worst thing in the bill.

I know there has been a lot of time spent, but I think that I will agree with Senator Cassidy. We have a referendum question and we had the darned thing licked. There is no question in my mind. I think it was licked when the first vote came out and people were very much for the bill. But, I think, after some of these paper companies and some other people got some good advertising in the papers, I think a lot of the people who voted for the ban was hoodwinked; and they realized it; and it started to change. Then they came out with the economic results. We were going to lose 15,000 jobs. It was going to cost the economy of the State \$2.3 million. The people down my way said, "Look, those people up in the northern part of the State are working. If they can't work, they are going to go on welfare. Who's going to have to pay for the welfare? It's going to be the people down in the southern part of the State and it's going to hurt our economy." I think these things are what turned the thing around, and I think that we could be voting on the referendum question alone. Then, by gosh, it would probably go down in flames. I would hope that you would take this into consideration. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Waldo, Senator Longley.

Senator LONGLEY: Thank you, Mr. President. Men and Women of the Senate, I rise in support of the compact, and I would like to explain. This compact is not everything to anybody, it's something for many of us. It's an improvement on forest practices. All summer we have been learning about forestry. We have realized that the referendum poses a billion-dollar threat to our economy. We realize that people are concerned about clearcutting, too much clearcutting. Compliments of the Governor, environmental groups and paper companies and small woodlot owners and the Sportsmans Alliance of Maine, and a variety of people who normally fight, compliments of their willingness to get together, probably in a year when we need more people of diverse interest getting together and finding common ground than ever before, we have had this group get together and find common ground. We have a wonderful compact in front of us which, in addition to offering us chance to both defeat a complete ban on clearcutting, as in question 2A, the complete ban, we have an opportunity to improve forest practices. Out of the crisis around

clearcutting we have crafted an opportunity. If we want to live up to our motto of "Dirigo", "We Lead", I see this as an opportunity. Just as Percival Baxter stood before this body and tried to convince them of the importance of helping our forests, of realizing that our forests are both an economic base and an ecological base, and we merge that union and have sustainable forestry, or else the next generation of Maine children will have less opportunity. This compact, I say, is an opportunity for all of us to prove ourselves as leaders. We see something that we don't want passed. We built the momentum for the defeat of question 2A and, hopefully, today we will present to the people an opportunity for question 2B. I agree with the Governor. I hope that by the end of today, or tonight, or whenever we adjourn, that a lot of us can leave and can educate the people about the basics. I would just like to delve into the basics very quickly, because we are all going to have to educate, presuming that we can get enough votes here in this body today.

For you landowners, if you do not clearcut, this compact does not affect you. If you own land and clearcut less than five acres, this compact still does not affect you. If you clearcut more than fifty acres, we ask you to take a timeout and make sure that it is good, healthy clearcutting in the right places. It is restricting clearcutting to the right places, so we have sustainable forestry, so the next generation of Maine kids can go into those forests like we have been able to and can help develop our Maine identity, which is very much related to our forests. In terms of property rights, it respects property rights. It says, as I just said, if you are not clearcutting, we are not going to bother you. It says if you, in your town, start to develop an ordinance that will be more restrictive than what we possibly pass today, we simply say make sure that the landowners who may not be residents of that town get notice that their land will be discussed at a public hearing and then, possibly, at a town meeting. In terms of education, in my opinion, that is another way that we respect property rights. It is saying to all of us in Maine that forestry is real important. Let's take the time to understand what forestry is all about so that maybe the next time there is a referendum that is too drastic, before people sign, they will have the intelligent questions to ask. Thank you for listening to me. I encourage you to vote for the motion in favor of the compact which, hopefully, will become "2B for ME" and all of us. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Harriman.

Senator HARRIMAN: Thank you, Mr. President. Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I would like to begin my remarks by expressing a sincere, heartfelt thanks to everyone who has been involved in the moment we are facing today, for, indeed, I believe this public discussion and the work that has gone on up to this point proves one thing, and that is that Maine people do not believe that their forests are being used in a way that will assure sustainability for centuries to come. We have the opportunity to change that for the better - better for Maine's environment, better for Maine's economy.

Just as my good friend from Washington, Senator Cassidy, was candid with you, I hope that you, in

turn, will respect my opportunity to do the same, because I respect his position. It has come from within his heart and his deep-held beliefs, as do I. I want to start by saying it was not my choice to be here in special session. That power is granted within the Constitution of the State of Maine that allows one person, in this case our Governor, to call us into special session. That privilege that he or she has to do that has brought us to the opportunity today where we can come in here and say that we want to work together with the very people who are working in our forests, who are concerned about our environment and our future. Or, we have the message we will leave here today that says we don't care what you think. We know best and we are going home. So, if I could, Mr. President, I would just like to help you appreciate the perspective from which I come; and there are three of them.

When the citizens of Senate District 23 gave me the honor of sitting in their seat, and this is, indeed, their seat, not mine, one of the things I was asked to participate in was a project called The Maine Environmental Priority Project. This project started in an environment where there was complete hostility amongst people who use our environment and those who are passionate about preserving it. As a matter of fact, some of my colleagues in that first session asked me if I was crazy. Why would I want to get involved in a process where people barely talk to each other? Indeed, the early part of our work involved discussions of the interpretation of people's body language. They barely could sit across the table from one another and have lunch. Yet I submit to you today, three years later, these people look at each other with mutual respect; and they, together, have come up with a consensus on what Maine's environmental threats are. They have ranked them and they are standing behind them. One of them is called our terrestrial ecosystem, and I won't bother to describe all of the details to you. But, a major component of that, which was rated high in our work, was forest management practices.

The second perspective, Mr. President, that I bring to you is that of Chair of the Business and Economic Development Committee. We undertook a piece of legislation that you may recall was entitled the Jaakko Poyry Report. It was an exhaustive study, probably about six inches in depth, addressing all facets of the Maine paper industry making. The quality of the species of trees, the production of the workforce, the technological standing of the mills; and it became quite apparent that, except for a few isolated instances, we were losing ground in the worldwide competition. One of the specific recommendations was to create a Paper Industry Council, which I have the pleasure of chairing. This Council was put together for the sole purpose of advocating the benefits of, and the value of, the paper industry here in the State of Maine. It contains such diverse voices on there as a member of the Maine Audubon Society, a spokesperson for the railroad industry in Maine, the Commissioner of Economic and Community Development, legislators, and I could go on and on. We took a hard look at this so-called question 1 when it was before the Legislature. We invited numerous so-called experts to come in and help us understand the condition of Maine's forests. After much deliberation we unanimously, I underscore unanimously, agreed that the Paper Industry Council would recommend to the