

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

1978

Second Regular Session

January 4, 1978 — April 6, 1978

INDEX

Senate Confirmation Session

June 14, 1978

INDEX

First Special Session

September 6, 1978 — September 15, 1978

INDEX

Second Special Session

October 18, 1978

INDEX

Third Special Session

December 6, 1978

INDEX

APPENDIX

row Assigned for Second Reading.

The Committee on Health and Institutional Services on.

Bill, An Act Concerning the Catastrophic Illness and Medically Needy Programs. (H. P. 1911) (L. D. 1972)

Reported that the same Ought to Pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-1046).

Comes from the House, the Bill Passed to be Engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "A" (H-1063) thereto.

Which Report was Read and Accepted, in concurrence, and the Bill Read Once. Committee Amendment "A" was Read. House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" was Read and Adopted in concurrence. Committee Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto was Adopted in concurrence, and the Bill, as amended, Tomorrow Assigned for Second Reading.

Ought to Pass in New Draft

The Committee on Judiciary on,

Bill, "An Act to Prohibit Child Pornography." (H. P. 1937) (L. D. 2017)

Reported that the same Ought to Pass in New Draft under same title. (H. P. 2106) (L. D. 2141)

Comes from the House, the Bill in New Draft, Passed to be Engrossed as amended by House Amendments "D" (H-1064) and "E" (H-1076).

Which Report was Read and Accepted in concurrence, and the Bill, in New Draft, Read Once. House Amendment "D" was Read and Adopted in concurrence, and the Bill, as amended, Tomorrow Assigned for Second Reading.

Divided Report

The Majority of the Committee on Education on, Bill, An Act Relating to the Funding of Education. (Emergency) (H. P. 1943) (L.D. 2022) Reported that the same Ought to Pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-1055).

Signed:

Senators:

KATZ of Kennebec
PIERCE of Kennebec
USHER of Cumberland

Representatives:

CONNOLLY of Portland
WYMAN of Pittsfield
BEAULIEU of Portland
LEWIS of Auburn
FENLASON of Danforth
BAGLEY of Winthrop
BIRT of East Millinocket
MITCHELL of Vassalboro
PLOURDE of Fort Kent

The Minority of the same committee on the same subject matter Reported that the same Ought to Pass.

Signed:

Representative:

LYNCH of Livermore Falls

Comes from the House, the Bill Passed to be Engrossed as Amended by Committee Amendment "A".

Which Reports Were Read.

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

Mr. KATZ: Mr. President, we have before us two Committee Reports. The report signed by Mr. Lynch was signed because he is the sponsor of the Governor's Bill, in its Pristine, original condition and he felt an obligation as sponsor to report it out Ought to Pass as it came into Committee.

The Committee has made changes which more strengthen the Bill than anything else. And it is essentially the Governor's bill with some dollars added into it, particularly in local leeway. Our procedure this morning if it is

agreeable to the Senate, will be to accept a Committee Report. Hopefully the Majority Report of Committee, give the Bill its first reading and read the Committee Amendment. The Committee Amendment is the only Amendment on it, and in that respect it should be a very clean cut job for the Senate because normally we have to deal with House Amendments. A through Double L — and now we only have one. It is my understanding that there will be at least one amendment offered to the Committee Amendment and if it is agreeable to the Senate we will table the Bill after the offering of the first Amendment for further discussion, on Monday.

A few words might be in order so you will have a grasp of what we have done, and I will hold myself available after the Session if you have any specific questions that perplex you and will be available for caucus or anything else on Monday if you wish to try to deal with any concerns of your constituents.

The important factor in this Bill and the most important change that we have made is in the area of dollars. The Governor's Bill would fund out, provided that we pursue the 10 mill figure that we are talking about, at about \$168,000,000. The Committee Bill is going to cost a \$173,000,000, and the major difference is in the area of \$4.1 million for local leeway. Local Leeway, as you know are funds that may be optionally used by people exercising their local control if they wish to spend more money with State participation, and by and large, that money is used by the communities with the lowest property taxes and/or unusually large enrollment of pupils. This is local Control at its finest and many communities that have the opportunity to have access to these State dollars do not choose to use them, and that is local control. To the very, very greatest extent, the Committee has labored hard and conscientiously to reflect the will of the people in the December 5th Referendum. The Uniform Property Tax is gone and we attempted in good faith, with a clear conscience, with a assiduous attention to duty to reflect honestly and openly without any punitive implications whatsoever the will of the people, as we understood the will of the people, on the December 5th Referendum.

The Bill that you have before you is deficit proof. There is no change that there will be any State Fund deficits in this Bill. You will recall during the early days of L. D. 1994 because we were dealing with estimated figures that we turned up deficits because our estimated figures were not good. It was a new experience for us and we learned a lot and we learned it rather quickly. Now in order to protect the State against any possible deficits, we are in a position of recurring surpluses. And the recurring surpluses are a problem but fortunately a much happier problem.

As you deal with this question of a \$173,000,000, which is the Committee's posture and \$168,000,000; which is our posture and the Governor's posture and as you listen to the rhetoric floating around, as to over spending on Education, and make up your own minds as to where you are at. I want you clearly to understand that I would anticipate that there will be a surplus or unused funds in this \$173,000,000. Which could amount to as much as \$5,000,000. In which case the Committee's position by the end of the fiscal year may very well turn out to be close to the \$168,000,000 figure. I want you to understand that and those of you who support the Committee's position should know that there is unquestionably not going to be \$173,000,000 spent, of State money for the support of education.

What happened to the \$5.1 million pay in? I think that it is important that everybody knows that because I was one of the rascals who said during the campaign that the repeal of the Uniform Property Tax was going to result for most people in some increase in taxes. Well, now we get a closer notion as to where the \$5.1 million

is. It is \$5.1 million that would have gone into surplus so as the Appropriations Committee and the Taxation Committee wrestle with the question of State surplus, the repeal of the Uniform Property Tax means that they will not have that \$5.1 million to deal with and if they go into some program of tax refunds or abatement or anything else that is going to be \$5.1 million that is simply not going back to the people.

I have been asked whatever happened to the one-half of the cost of local education? Which Committee Report reflects the State picking up one-half of the local cost of education? My answer is, neither reports. Both reports, both Mr. Lynch's and the majority of the Committee, pick up 50 percent of the allocation, which is quite a different figure and we want you to know that in this one respect we did not reflect the specifics of the people's position in the referendum on December 5th. You will recall that the wording in that referendum Bill that initiated Bill sought to create the intent of the Legislature to pick up 50 percent of the cost of local education. It is hard to say what the difference in money is but it would probably cost from \$15,000,000. to \$20,000,000. to reflect that which the people said.

Our job has been made easier because all those who supported repeal say that they really did not mean that and although I feel very, very uneasy it is a very, very, — from a fiscal point of view — it puts us in a little better position. I want you to know too, that as you deal with the cost of education you might be interested to know that we have been lapsing about \$5.3 million of unspent state share of the cost of education in a year. \$5.3 million. This is after the fact. It is \$5.3 million that we appropriated. The \$5.3 million that did not get spent. And where is the money? It is part of surplus. The thing that disturbs me in the handling of this \$5.3 million is the fact that as we established last year the level of State's participation, we included that \$5.3 million as a cost and forced local communities to raise Uniform Property Tax to meet half of that cost. So what you might say is that local communities were forced to raise half of that \$5.3 million but the other half lapsed into the General Fund and the State, more or less, took care of its problems and we, in a very real respect, over-collected money based upon the actions of the local communities, and further eroded the opportunity of the State to share in a bonafide extent of 50/50. I think as preliminary remarks, this covers exactly what I wanted to say to you this morning. And let me make a couple of personal comments.

I have a feeling of personal satisfaction that a Legislature filled with nothing but politicians, and some pretty good ones, can be responsive to the people. Most Members of the Senate did not agree with the repeal of the Uniform Property Tax, but we are giving the people a Bill which accurately reflects what they wanted. There was a lot of talk at the beginning of the Session of passing the Governor's Bill out in a bare-bones way, and let the blood flow where it might. We have not done that. We have conscientiously and maybe I ought to go into that just briefly here.

When we sat down in Committee and it was a great Committee I said before I never had two Senators on any committee like Senator Usher and Senator Pierce who apparently did not realize that Senators are not supposed to be so conscientious reporting to their second Committees. And they were with us and participated all the way. We approached this thing with an awful lot of emotional readjustment necessary. But rather than deal with a specifics of the Bill. One, two, three, or four, we just sat around for days, and identified issues. Policy questions, What kind of policy decisions would we have to make? We identified sixteen of them, and then a couple of more came along afterwards. And we did not deal with the bill at all. We dealt with issues. We did not deal with

printouts at all. We dealt with issues. We dealt with issues such as when do you reimburse categorical programs? What do you do about private school transportation?

Incidentally, when it came to private school transportation, which was an issue down at the other end of the corridor, we combined the issue with the issue raised by the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Pierce's bill for Parochial textbooks and the Gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert's Bill on the same subject. And our responses to private school kids is very much intertwined. It is our presumption that the textbook Bill will be enacted, and signed into law. Our support of this segment of school finance was based upon our concern that the other Bill be enacted and signed into Law. We dealt with the policy of the State's role or the State Boards role and the Commissioners recommendations. We dealt with local leeway as a policy question, we dealt with adjustments and per pupil rates above or below state average. And we went through about 18 individual issues. It was an exciting experience because the door was open and all kinds of people dropped in. And we gave access to every single person who came into the room with an issue that he wanted to raise. And we consciously dealt with every issue that everyone who came in the room raised. We found it extremely helpful. We saw a lot of superintendents and you can call them special interested groups all you want. You can call them the educational establishment all you want, and you can talk about the State Department of Education as a vested interest if you want, but these are the people who have to administer a law. And insofar as the mechanics of the law was concerned it was invaluable to us to have perceptions and more than one time a little old superintendent would come in and raise a point and we would sit and look at one another dumbfounded, we had not even considered it. But in the length of time that we had I think that we have a Bill which is honest, which is above board and which reflects the will of the people on December the 5th.

Now there is in this Legislature some deep concern, that it is about time for us to take a hard look not at the establishment of state evaluation and the fairness of state evaluation, but lets take a look at the application of state evaluation. And everything we hear from Washington indicates that we are going to have continued inflation, I must confess a deep disappointment in the Democratic Administration that they have not cured this problem over night. And if we are going to have continued inflation and continued inflation of the value of property we had better find out through a certain inquiry using whatever national resources we can find whether there is another foundation on which to build school funding in the State of Maine. I do not know the answer but I do know that we will be asking you to support yet another finance commission, that will have a very specific assignment. And will involve a lot of people from around the State who have specialized knowledge. We are concerned, too, about the problems of the S.A.D.'s. The S.A.D.'s are under attack, the repeal of the Uniform Property Taxes has created some dislocation and some tensions within communities, the questions of S.A.D.'s is going to have to be looked at very, very carefully. The Attorney General has raised a Constitutional question as to whether S.A.D.'s which have established a cost sharing based upon anything other than State Evaluation whether or not these are Constitutional agreements. We will be looking at that or the Commissioner will be looking at that.

I would urge all of you to rise to great height, of statesmanship next week. Again and again I have voted against my constituents best interested on isolated items in this Bill, and there are some handy, dandy amendments that I can think of which if enacted, would help my con-

stituents significantly from a dollar and cents point of view, but I have resisted that impulse and I ask all of you to.

There is no question that if you look at specifics of the Bill, you could change to benefit your communities but it is the bottom line that counts. And I guess that I am going to have to ask you to face up to the bottom line when you vote on this next week.

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

Mr. MERRILL: Mr. President, I would just like to pose two questions to the Chairman of the Education Committee or anybody else just because I think they ought to be addressed maybe at this point.

First of all, it has been the passing mention made of the issue, but I would like the Chairman of the Education Committee, if he could, to respond to the issue of what either of these Bills does or does not do to the power of the State Board of Education and the role that they play. I think it would be helpful to us to have that on the record.

And Secondly, I wonder if the Chairman of the Committee, or some other spokesman, could just tell us in very brief terms on the record, what the effect will be if a community does not appropriate the 10 mills one subsidy index in terms of the future help or financial help that they will receive for the State, under the Bill that the Committee has reported out with almost a unanimous report?

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Cumberland, Senator Merrill, has posed a question through the Chair.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Katz.

Mr. KATZ: Mr. President, the Senate might have noticed I was so busy getting thoughts over to you that I neglected to move acceptance of the Majority Report and I do so now.

The role of the State Board in policy has not been changed. In the Governor's Bill there was a change, which diminished the State Board's role. The Committee has reestablished the State Board's role. I would urge those who are concerned about the State Board, and our subsequent Legislature to see what they can do to further strengthen the Board. The Board needs staff, the board needs more independence than it has now.

The second question, as I understand it, what happens to the State's allocation to a community next year which does not raise its 10 mills this year? The allocation depends upon the actual per pupil expenditures of the community. So if a community chooses, because of local control, to raise less dollars this year it can influence the allocation of State dollars next year. And I think that is probably the direction you wanted me to respond.

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

Mr. MERRILL: I thank the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Katz, for his response, and I certainly intend to support the Committee Report but it seems to me that maybe we ought to be cognizant of the fact, if I understand what I have read and if I understand the response to the second question correctly, that we are going to be in a situation where if a community goes through the local control on its School Board's wishes, a period of cutting cost in the area of education and then through the process of local control the School Board is changed and a different philosophy is pursued that it would seem to me if I am not mistaken with the remarks of the Senator from Kennebec, that it would take sometime for the community or some hardship over a period of one year for that community to get themselves back into a situation where they would be more equal. In other words, looking down the road the effect of this four or five years from now might be to encourage some inequities that the community might change their mind about. Now I recognize that maybe there is not anything that we

can do in the present context to address that but it just seems to me and maybe my fears can be allayed that at some future date, we are going to have to look at this whole thing again because it will be enforcing some of the inequities that some of us were so concerned about and tried to remove in the first instance.

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

Mr. KATZ: As I understood it, this was the issue raised by Mary Adams at the public hearing. And this was one of the policy questions we dealt with again and again and again. We gave it every bit of attention we gave anything else. And, we rejected it. Presently if your community spends below state average for education, when it comes time for your allocation you get reimbursed for what you spent two years ago adjusted for what you are spending probably would be in the prior year and then the state will give you one-third of the difference, between that figure and state average. So there is an upward movement and the State tries to pull you up, without expansion of program activities or inflation in a textbook sense, we are going to equalize. But in the real world we do not equalize. If your community spends above average we take that figure we arrive at and pay you one-half of the difference between what your figure is and above state average, unless you happen to be a community that was frozen at the 73-74 level which means almost everybody. So we have addressed the question.

It should be no secret that I feel that the system we had was more equitable than this system that we are offering today. The system today backs away from equity, and steps forward to local control.

I am going to take the Senate's time just briefly to tell you about a public hearing that we had this year, which pretty much exemplifies the kind of frustrations I feel.

A small community came in. It wanted a change in its local government structure. Two people spoke, one was a Selectman and he came in and I could have almost written chapter and verse all the frustrations and venom he felt against the state, and the Legislature, and Augusta — telling him what to do, ordering him to do this, and do that, and he sat down.

And then another gentleman stood up, and all of a sudden my day became bright. He said that his community was in a wooded area down by the coast with a lake not far from the high school but not far from the school. And how the community was planning to gear its instruction in the physical sciences to the fact that there was a lake right there. And there is a wooded area right there, and by the time he got done talking he had shown me a picture of the separations of one little community which through exercising the controls they have, the controls they have always had, to build an exciting educational experience for the kids.

That is where the action is. I tuned out the first guy, because he was just plain "bitching" about things that he could have controlled. And the second citizen was leaning more in the direction of responsibility and every community in the State with the vision to control its own destiny and the motivation to change education into an exciting experience has it. Irrespective of how you vote on 2022. The local control and the local decision making has always been there but it is unused. And I guess until we can convince people to walk away from the television sets and stop talking about responsibility and a little less about rights the children of this State will never get the quality education that they really deserve.

The Majority Ought to Pass, as amended Report Accepted.

The Bill Read Once.

Committee Amendment "A" Read.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Knox, Senator Collins.

Mr. COLLINS: Mr. President, I present Senate Amendment "A" to Committee Amend-

ment "A" (S-483).

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Knox, Senator Collins, now offers Senate Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" and moves its adoption.

Senate Amendment "A" (S-483) Read.

On Motion of Mr. Katz of Kennebec, Tabled until Monday, pending Adoption of Senate Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A".

(Off Record Remarks)

Divided Report

The Majority of the Committee on Human Resources on, Bill, "An Act to Revise the Effective Date of the Act which Prohibits the Practice of Mandatory Retirement Age." (Emergency) (H. P. 1985) (L. D. 2068)

Reported that the same Ought to Pass in New draft under new title, "RESOLVE, Authorizing Certain Employees of the State of Maine to Request an Extension of Employment After Their Mandatory Retirement Age, Years of Service Requirement or Age and Years of Service Requirement" (H. P. 2101) (L. D. 2140)

Signed:

Senators:

LOVELL of York

MANGAN of Androscoggin

Representatives:

HUTCHINGS of Lincolnville

MARSHALL of Millinocket

DAVIES of Orono

CUNNINGHAM of New Gloucester

LaPLANTE of Sabattus

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter Reported that the same Ought Not to Pass.

Signed:

Senator:

HICHENS of York

Representatives:

GREEN of Auburn

PETERSON of Caribou

KANY of Waterville

BURNS of Anson

TALBOT of Portland

Comes from the House, the Resolve, Passed to be Engrossed as amended by House Amendment "B" (H-1067) as amended by House Amendment "A" (H-1077) thereto.

Which Reports were Read.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from York, Senator Lovell.

Mr. LOVELL: Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate: I guess as I get older, I get more soft hearted. Which is probably understandable. In fact when this Bill came before the Committee on Human Resources, we did not want to interfere with the Mandatory Retirement Bill, but a Legislative Assistant pops up and says, I can write a Resolve that will cover this and will not effect the mandatory Retirement Bill whatsoever. And now this Bill, this Resolve, was brought in by a friend of mine from the other Body, so consequently, I said well alright, write the Resolve up, I figure it is an emergency and would have no chance of passing by two-thirds in both Bodies, so consequently, the Resolve was written up and this friend of mine came to me. I was against it. This friend of mine came to me and he said would you please sign it out Ought to Pass so I can get one signer so I can debate the Bill in the other Body. So I signed the Bill Ought to Pass. Now I see the Bill come out as a Majority Report. Now I do not know whether the gentleman in the other Body said the same thing to other people, or else I have an awful lot of influence with the Committee on Human Resources. I am not sure which, it was, but I do not think that I have got the influence on the Committee on Human Resources. So consequently, this is only to benefit one person, and this one person is not very popular with the Fish and Game Department as I understand it. So consequently, I am not going to make a

motion, but a good friend of mine is going to stand up and make a motion on this Bill.

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

Mr. HEWES: Mr. President, I move the indefinite postponement of this Bill and all its accompanying papers.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Cumberland, Senator Hewes, now moves that this Bill and all its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. Is it the pleasure of the Senate?

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Mangan.

Mr. MANGAN: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I also signed the Majority Report on this matter, and we are basically discussing the very serious issue as to whether this one specific individual will have the chance to continue working for another year so he can get another thousand dollars a year, another thousand dollars a month in his retirement. The big issue here, the heavy concentrated issue is whether we are going to allow the people who retired between January 1, '78 and July 1, '78 when the mandatory retirement thing takes effect, whether we will allow them to elect to work that additional period of time, and I think if you search your consciences, and decide whether you feel it is going to open up Pandora's Box or whether this one individual who has worked at least 38 years or 39 years and needs a matter of 8 months more should be allowed to continue to work and apparently the resolution is just not going to basically effect the law itself, but it is just basically to permit this specific individual and, probably anybody else who retired between January 1 and July 1, to elect to work a little bit longer providing that everybody in his office agrees to it. I understand that this individual was very unpopular as far as the Department was concerned. I believe that he worked as a game warden, but I understand that he has a great deal of respect and admiration in the area that he did work, which was Aroostook County and apparently he was quite a life saver and a tremendous game warden, probably he was too individual, and individualistic acting for the Department itself.

So if you wish to search your consciences, if that is the issue, are you going to bring it back to January 1 so that anybody who retires between January 1 and effective date of the act can actually extend their period of time. If you are in favor of it, vote for the Majority Report. If you are opposed to touching the law at all, to grandfather sort of speak those who retire after January 1st, then vote the Ought Not to Pass.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Curtis.

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. President, in addition to this being the wrong way to try to enact a piece of Legislation, I would suggest that we do not know whether or not this Resolve if passed would effect only one State Employee or more than one State Employee, because the amended, corrected copy of the Amendment, (H-1067) described as the purpose of this Amendment is to clarify the intent of the Resolve, states that and State Employee who is retired subsequent to January 1, 1978 and prior to enactment of this Resolve may request an extension of services provided in this Resolve.

I read it through. I am not clear, for example, Mr. President, as to whether or not this would effect the University Employees, whether or not it would effect Maine Maritime Academy Employees and I would suggest finally, that if one person has a problem with the existing statutes, that there is an opportunity under the present State Law for him to appeal on a year to year basis be extended if the authorities so approve continuation of his service that exist in the State Law and always has.

The PRESIDENT: The pending question before the Senate is the Motion by the Senator

from Cumberland, Senator Hewes, that the Senate indefinitely postpone this Bill and all its accompanying papers.

Is it the pleasure of the Senate? It is a vote.

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

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Kennebec, Senator Katz, moves that the Senate reconsider its action whereby it voted to indefinitely postpone this Bill. Is it the pleasure of the Senate?

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Hewes.

Mr. HEWES: Mr. President, I request a Division.

The PRESIDENT: A Division has been requested.

Will all those Senators in favor of reconsideration please rise in their places to be counted.

Will all those Senators opposed please rise in their places to be counted.

4 Senators having voted in the affirmative and 21 Senators in the negative, the Motion to reconsider does not prevail.

Second Readers

The Committee on Bills in the Second Reading reported the following:

House

Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Supreme Judicial Court to Establish by Rule a Committee on Judicial Responsibility and Disability." (H. P. 1900) (L. D. 1957)

Which was Read a Second Time.

On Motion of Mr. Speers of Kennebec. Tabled until Tuesday next, pending Passage to be Engrossed.

RESOLVE, for Laying of the County Taxes and Authorizing Expenditures of Waldo County for the Year 1978. (Emergency) (H. P. 2120) (L. D. 2148)

RESOLVE, for Laying of the County Taxes and Authorizing Expenditures of Knox County for the Year 1978. (Emergency) (H. P. 2121) (L. D. 2149)

Which were Read a Second Time and Passed to be Engrossed, in concurrence.

Bill, "An Act to Amend the Statutes Relating to Airmobiles." (H. P. 2126) (L. D. 2153)

Which was Read a Second Time and Passed to be Engrossed, in non-concurrence, without reference to a Committee.

Sent down for concurrence.

House — As Amended

Bill, "An Act to Provide for Programs to Aid School Administrative Units to Identify and Provide Special Educational Programs for Gifted and Talented Children." (H. P. 1934) (L. D. 2005)

Which was Read a Second Time and Passed to be Engrossed, as amended, in concurrence.

Enactors

The Committee on Engrossed Bills reported as truly and strictly engrossed the following:

Emergency

"An Act Providing Allocations from the Unappropriated Highway Fund Surplus for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1979." (S. P. 694) (L. D. 2135)

On Motion of Mr. Greeley of Waldo, placed on the Special Highway Appropriations Table.

Orders of the Day

The President laid before the Senate:

JOINT RESOLUTION Requesting the Members of the maine Delegation to the Congress of the United States to Urge the President of the United States to Approve the Application of Governor Longley for a Presidential Declaration that a Disaster Exists in Maine Because of Severe Winter Storms Suffered in January and February, 1978. (H. P. 2123)

Tabled — February 22, 1978 by Senator Huber of Cumberland

Pending — Adoption