

# 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

*1st Special Session*

OF THE

*One Hundred and Sixth  
Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

**Volume II**

MARCH 7, 1974 TO MARCH 29, 1974

**Index**

**Legislative Ethics Committee Report**

The President laid before the Senate the following tabled matter: Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Construction of a District Court Facility in Lewiston." (S. P. 888) (L. D. 2484)

Tabled earlier in today's session by Senator Marcotte of York.

Pending—Passage to be Engrossed.

Mr. Clifford of Androscoggin then presented Senate Amendment "C" and moved its Adoption.

Senate Amendment "C", Filing No. S-446 was Read and Adopted and the Bill, as Amended, Passed to be Engrossed in non-concurrence.

Under suspension of the rules, sent down forthwith for concurrence.

The President laid before the Senate the following tabled matter: Bill, "An Act Relating to Income from the Public Reserved Lands." (H. P. 1739) (L. D. 2185)

Tabled earlier in today's session by Senator Wyman of Washington.

Pending—Acceptance of the Ought to Pass as Amended Committee Report.

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

Mr. WYMAN: Mr. President, I had an amendment prepared for that, and then they made a mistake in preparing it, so they are drawing another amendment. I would appreciate having somebody table it until later because I will have the amendment very shortly.

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

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Berry of Cumberland, tabled pending Acceptance of the Committee Report.

On motion by Mr. Berry of Cumberland, the Senate voted to take from the table the following unassigned matter:

#### **Divided Report**

Four members of the Committee on Transportation on Bill, "An Act to Change Weights and Related Provisions for Commercial Vehicles." (H. P. 1789) (L. D. 2261) Report in Report "A" that the same Ought to Pass in New Draft "A" under Same Title (H. P. 2059) (L. D. 2591)

(Signed)

Senator:

CIANCHETTE of Somerset

Representatives:

DUNN of Poland

BERRY of Madison

KEYTE of Dexter.

Two members of the same Committee on the same subject matter report in Report "B" that the same Ought to Pass in New Draft "B" under Same Title (H. P. 2061) (L. D. 2593)

(Signed)

Senator:

GREELEY of Waldo

Representative:

McCORMICK of Union

Six members of the same Committee on the same subject matter report in Report "C" that the same Ought to Pass in New Draft "C" under Same Title (H. P. 2060) (L. D. 2592)

(Signed)

Senator:

SHUTE of Franklin

Representatives:

WOOD of Brooks

McNALLY of Ellsworth

STROUT of Corinth

FRASER of Mexico

JACQUES of Lewiston

One member of the same Committee on the same subject matter reports in Report "D" that the same be referred to the 107th Legislature.

(Signed)

Representative:

WEBBER of Belfast

Comes from the House, Report "C" Read and Accepted, and the Bill, in New Draft "C" Passed to be Engrossed as amended by House Amendments "B" (H-971) and "D" (H-800).

Tabled earlier in today's session by Mr. Berry of Cumberland.

Pending—Acceptance of Either Committee Report.

Mr. Greeley of Waldo then moved that the Senate Accept Report "D" of the Committee, that the same be referred to the 107th Legislature.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Franklin, Senator Shute.

Mr. SHUTE: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I would oppose the motion to accept Report "D" and ask for a roll call on that motion.

This is a bill with which the Transportation Committee has agonized for the last several weeks, and this is a point for the time of reckoning.

To refresh your memory on the four reports, Report "A" provided for double bottoms in this truck bill; Report "B", which was signed by Senator Greeley and three others, is a Department of Transportation Bill; Report "C", which six members of the Transportation Committee signed, including myself, is one which was prepared by the industry and in which the truckers of the state are interested, and particularly those people who live in District 17 and work in District 17 and find the trucking of pulpwood and logs to be their primary source of income; and Report "C", which Senator Greeley has just moved that you accept, is one which would do nothing about a problem which exists and refer it to the 107th Legislature. This, I believe, is the wrong way to approach this problem. We are here, we are faced with one of three decisions, and I think that today is a decision making day for the people in this industry.

There is no question about the fact that the Maine truck weight laws are almost as confusing as the laws regulating the Maine Milk Commission, not quite but almost. Some of these laws have been on the books for fifty years, and those legislators of 1923 or thereabouts passed some farsighted laws which basically specify that 600 pounds should be the maximum load applied to any square inch of road surface, 600 pounds per square inch of road surface. 50 years ago this law was placed on the books. It is still on our books and is basically a good law. We believe that this law is correct and the weight limits of trucks should be permitted to conform to this.

For 20 years now Maine law has permitted 22,000 pounds per axle. Other legislatures saw fit to give a 10 percent overage or a tolerance, as they refer to it, to permit any leeway in the weight of products which would absorb water, ice or snow, and which subsequent legislatures provided for a further 15 percent increase for forest products during the three winter months of December, January and February. We have a tolerance of 10 percent, which

gives you 24,200 pounds, plus a 15 percent booster in those three months, for which truckers have to pay \$75 extra, or a total of 27,500 pounds per axle.

Report "C" with its House Amendment, and which are a compromise from our original suggestion, have been acceptable to the Department of Transportation. They say that they can live with the reduced weights that are specified in the amendment from Report "C". What the amendment adopted in the other body will do to Report "C" is to provide for a modest increase for three, four, five axle vehicles. Now, there is no current law on the books for six axle trucks, no law at all. The Department of Transportation has proposed that 100,000 pounds is fair, and this is included in Report "A" and Report "B" as well as in Report "C". The only area where we differ in the 100,000 pounds on the six axle vehicles is in the area of tolerance, the 10 percent for overweight and the 15 percent for the frozen road months.

I believe it is time, and I hope you will join me in my belief, that this legislature should adopt new weight limits, giving those small businessmen a break. Now, if you don't think that they are small businessmen, you should have heard the complaint I heard on the telephone last Saturday from the wife of a trucker whose family lives in Temple. I think there is a great deal of similarity to the plight of this family as there is with a small businessman who is in the restaurant business or who is in the retail business of some kind, who over the years finds that he has to improve his storefront, he has to modernize the inside, he has to add new pieces of equipment to his capital investment in order to keep up with the times. The small independent trucker is in the same boat. A few years ago he may have started with a two axle or a three axle truck, and as technology has improved and as perhaps his competitor, his neighbor, purchased a larger vehicle and competed with him successfully, then he too found that he had to improve his operation and purchase a larger truck. The larger trucks that are now on the road today are newer, they are bigger, and far safer than they were five or even ten years ago. And yet they are

carrying less weight per square inch now than with the older rigs that had the narrower tires.

What about this independent businessman in Temple and his family? She related to me that they made a total investment of \$32,000 in a three axle truck. They had to pay a sales tax of \$875 on the original just bare body truck. They had to pay \$585 excise tax. They had to pay \$415 for a license, plus \$75 for the three months of December, January and February. Incidentally, under Report "C" this licensing fee would be raised to \$600. They had to pay the federal government a \$200 federal use tax. They had to pay the insurance agency \$1,300 to insure it and get it on the road properly. They have to pay 9 cents a gallon tax for diesel fuel for federal tax, and they have to file this quarterly. They have to pay 4 cents a gallon for diesel fuel for state, and they file this quarterly. They had to go down to Thorndike, or some such place, and purchase air bags. Well, air bags are a new safety interlock system that provide for an extra axle so that the operator, while he is driving along the highway unloaded, can press a button and lift the two rear axles so that they won't come in contact with the road. And when he is loaded, these rear axles react against the air bags and become another axle. These cost \$2,500. The total investment for this family, \$32,000, and they have a difficult time making it go.

And do you know what they get per cord of wood? Well, it used to be \$3 and \$4 for hauling to wherever they haul, maybe the International Paper Company or maybe Oxford Paper. Maybe another week they will haul long logs into a neighborhood saw mill. But they used to get \$2, \$3, or \$4 a cord, and now it is around \$9. And they are asking for more money from the paper companies, the big companies that are a terrible maw for our forest products because of the great demand for paper and paper products.

Many of these truckers, not only this one in Temple but all over the state, have been caught by the state police for carrying overweight loads. The schedule calls for varying lengths. According to the length of the truck, they can carry so much weight. The maximum right now

is 73,280 pounds. These truckers don't want to be criminals but they are treated as criminals, and when they pay a fine they pay the maximum fine of \$210. Now, some future legislature may very well have some system that is different and more equitable. These people don't want to live outside the law. It is an unpopular law and one which restricts their business and prevents them from earning a living.

I have talked to a lot of troopers in our area too who have to enforce the laws that are on the books, and they agree that the current law discriminates against truckers who make investments in bigger, better and safer highway trucking equipment, and they are sympathetic to their problem. During the week of March 10th there were 21 truckers in Rumford District Court who paid \$210 each in overweight fines.

If we don't do something, if we don't do something today in this body, I suggest that there is an ugly mood among the truckers and that they very well could start demanding jury trials. What would that do to the court system? Why is it that the state is more anxious to collect fines than it is in enforcing the law? I am talking about Section 1653 of the law, which says that the state police shall enforce the law by requiring them to unload their load wherever they are caught and place it at a convenient place along the roadside. This would be the quickest way to make the truckers obey the law, and yet the state police have been compassionate about this. They set up their weight scales at the entrance to the big log compounds at Oxford Paper, International Paper, Scott Paper, or wherever, and weigh them outside. If they are overweight, they say "Well, you unload in there", which is their destination anyway. So they have been fair about this, but they could have taken them to court and forced them to unload their lumber right on the road.

But compassionate or not, we agree that the weight limits are unjust, and it would appear that the state is more interested in collecting fines than in enforcing the law that Section 1653 dictates.

Conservationists have demanded that logs be removed from the rivers, and

they are being removed. The Kennebec River in a couple of years will see no more log drives. The Penobscot will be devoid of any further log drives. We are talking about Maine's second industry. Paper manufacturers yes, but also manufacturers of finished lumber. The lumber industry is our second largest industry in the state, and if it is to be fed its raw product, we are going to have to move pulp, logs and chips by truck. Railroad cars are scarce right now.

Last week while I was out and was ill, my roommate in the hospital was a fellow who supervised a log loading area in East Newport for one of the prominent landowners based in Bangor. I asked him about the railroad car situation, and he said "We never can get enough." He said, "We use a lot of them on the Belfast and Moosehead Lake Railroad, and they just aren't available down on that road either." Railroad cars are scarce not only here but in other parts of the country, so we have got to depend on trucks.

The new mill that Scott Paper Company is building at Hinckley will require even more trucks, and if we think we have seen a lot of trucks on the highway — and Farmington is sort of a focal point and so is Skowhegan for all of these trucks coming out of the northern Maine wilderness territories where the raw product comes from — then you wait for a couple of years and you will really see a lot of trucks.

Yes, we do need better roads. The roads are far better today than they were 20 years ago when the last change was made in the weight laws. But International Paper, Scott Paper, Oxford, St. Regis, Frazier, Georgia Pacific, and Great Northern depend on trucks, and they depend on full trucks, not half-full trucks. And the six axle vehicles, which are new and which have the wide tires and provide less than 600 pounds per square inch on the road surface, are modern by all technological standards, and do not provide any loopholes in the law as far as they are concerned, yet their basic weight when they are purchased is almost half of the legal weight they are permitted when they get on the road.

So my plea with you today is to give the truckers the break that they have

deserved for so long and give them a rejection of Report "D", and then I will move to accept Report "C" with your help.

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

Mr. BERRY: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I want to congratulate the Senator from Waldo, Senator Greeley, for proposing a very statesmanlike solution to the dilemma which has been facing everybody on the third floor today.

If there is a hodgepodge of laws, it certainly is well demonstrated in the motor vehicle tonnage and length laws, and the proposal to seriously study with full committee action, which is now for the first time possible by the Transportation committee, and report back next January to the 107th, is a most happy and practical solution to the problem.

I also want to congratulate Senator Shute of Franklin for his very moving and responsible explanation of the problem, particularly from the viewpoint of the people in Senator Shute's area. As I mentioned outside of the door just now to someone, there probably is no member of the Senate more intimately and solely involved with lumber trucks than Senator Shute. Also there is no better example of an area of the state where overloading damage to roads is more in evidence.

Last Sunday I took one of my favorite drives, which is Route 27, the Arnold Trail, from Kingfield to Coburn Gore, real God's country, and every bit of the road is wracked and torn, with holes and frayed pavement, and if you have time to dodge the lumber trucks going back and forth from Canada to the United States, you can see some of the most lovely scenery in the world.

So I think we have right here the nub of the problem, and let's hope that Senator Greeley's committee, if we can pass this motion of Senator Greeley's, will solve the problem. We have got to cope intelligently with overweight and length.

Now, there has been a lot of lobbying here. I think that we probably are faced with an economic question. The question might be phrased this way: The money

that ends up in the pocket of the truckdriver at the end of the week, is the decrease in this due to the energy problem and the increased fuel costs, and apparently fines, is this going to be made up in part by the lumber and the pulp companies paying a little bit more money to these people or are we going to sacrifice more the roads of the State of Maine to let them increase their pay? I think the answer is obvious, but I think it should be worked out in a careful deliberate mood by a committee armed with facts and intelligent staff people to work with them — this is available to them and will be — and then we are going to come up with something that all of us can understand.

I wouldn't offend Senator Shute or anybody on the committee by asking them to explain the laws that we are supposed to be discussing this afternoon. It is totally impossible to do it. Their own men can't do it. So I think that we do have something, and I would assure everybody that this is no compromise. And if it is a compromise to any extent, it is a compromise only for the welfare of the people of the state involved, and neither the truckers or the pulp people. There are trucks involved other than the pulp trucks too. I don't think we need to go through the old arguments we have here every two years on the trucks going back and forth and the little Volkswagen getting bumped around and all that stuff when the big trucks go by.

I think the issue is very simple. I think that Senator Greeley's committee is in a unique position for the first time in many, many years, as Senator Shute has pointed out, to straighten out this morass of laws, and it will be for everybody's benefit. So I would hope very strongly that we will support Senator Greeley.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Somerset, Senator Cianchette.

Mr. CIANCHETTE: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: This is a first for me, to stand up and oppose a motion by the Chairman of the Transportation Committee on a committee problem. And I would like to say that Senator Greeley from Waldo has been my closest friend here in the Senate, one of my closest advisors, and I

have a great deal of respect for him. I feel that Senator Greeley has been under very serious pressures on this truck weight problem, and I can appreciate his problem and I can appreciate why he would like to have it over and done with and a complete study so that he could stand up here and explain the truck weight laws of the State of Maine.

If we pass any of the reports, we will be doing that, because Report "C", Report "B" or Report "A" all have provisions for a study to be reported back to the 107th Legislature for a revision of the truck weight laws. We all know that that needs to be done and it should be done. In the meantime, there is a problem. I believe that they are very close now to agreements on what could be done in this legislature to help out a little bit, to keep things moving, and to keep a good spirit of cooperation going.

I would like to see this bill kept alive and to see if here today or, if not, tomorrow morning we could arrive at that compromise and give some relief right now, and continue a good spirit of compromise and attempt to do a good job on studying this legislation for the 107th. So I would oppose the motion before the Senate now.

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

Mr. SPEERS: Mr. President, in speaking on this particular bill, I think it is incumbent upon every one of us to, in the very first place, ask the purpose of truck weight laws, what the whole purpose of having truck weight laws has been in the past. Obviously, the purpose of having truck weight laws is not to impose a burden upon truckers, not particularly to help them out. In fact, probably the whole purpose of it had nothing to do with truckers themselves at all. Quite obviously the purpose of these laws is to make sure that the condition of the roads of the State of Maine is such that they are not torn apart for all the populace of the State of Maine; not just those who are driving trucks over them, but for all of the people of the state.

Now, we have not heard one single argument in favor of this particular bill which has mentioned in any way, shape

or form what the effect of increasing the weight of these trucks is going to be upon the condition of the roads of this state. I think it obvious that the condition of the roads in the State of Maine at the present time is not one of great admiration. It is also obvious that the State Transportation Department does not now have the funds to maintain the roads in the condition that they should be maintained for all of the people of the state. In fact, they have indicated that they need a two cent increase in the gasoline tax just to maintain the roads in the present condition, which is obvious is not even now satisfactory. They are not going to have that two cent increase in the gasoline tax, we don't know what the revenues are going to be from gasoline sales over the summer, and we don't know what state the highway maintenance program is going to be in the future. Yet all of these questions are ignored when we are asked to increase the weight limits for trucks rolling over these highways. There hasn't been a single mention of what it is going to do to the condition of the roads. It certainly is not going to help them.

I support the motion of the good Senator from Waldo, Senator Greeley, to refer this to the 107th so that the Transportation Committee can look into the problems of truck weights and the effects that they are going to have on the various roads in the state, and to come back to the 107th Legislature with a valid and intelligent report as to the effects that the various weights would have.

I would like to make a comment on one of the most incredible arguments I think we have heard in this session of the legislature to date, and this includes the regular session as well as this special session. That is the argument that has been flying around these chambers that these weights are being violated every day anyway, so what we should do here in this body is change the law to conform with what has actually been the fact throughout the state all along. Well, ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, we don't tailor the laws of the State of Maine to conform to what those who are now breaking the law would say that law should be. We should be here tailoring the laws of the State of Maine to conform with what we feel is in the best interests

of all the people of the state. By that, I mean the purpose of these laws, and that is to maintain adequate and safe, good highways. If we were to adopt that kind of an argument, we would take a look at the crime statistics and say well, the crime statistics are on the rise and everyone is committing crimes, therefore, we should tailor the laws of the State of Maine to abolish all crimes so that nobody would be committing crimes. I think that argument is utterly preposterous.

So I would support the motion of the good Senator from Waldo, Senator Greeley, to have this matter go out to a study of the Transportation Committee over this summer, and have them come back to the 107th with a clear report on the effects of the weight on the highways of the state, which is after all what we should be clearly concerned with in this and, hopefully, clearing up what has been referred to as a hodgepodge of weight laws at the same time.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. President, I would like to pose a question through the Chair to the Chairman of the Transportation Committee, and that is: I would like to know whether or not my understanding is correct, and that is on Report "B" which the Senator from Franklin is asking us to ultimately adopt, whether or not Report "B" would allow maximum weight of 128,500 pounds?

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Waldo, Senator Greeley.

Mr. GREELEY: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: In answer to the question, the weight is 100,000 pounds, but with the ten percent tolerance plus the fifteen percent tolerance, it goes up to 128,500 pounds.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Franklin, Senator Shute.

Mr. SHUTE: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: Also in response to Senator Richardson's question, it is Report "C" and not Report "B". Report "B" also calls for 100,000 pounds for six axle units as well as Report "A". This is a Department of Transportation



proposal. Their proposal, however, limits it at 100,000 pounds and provides for no tolerance whatever. Report "C" does provide for a tolerance.

With reference to the fact that the legislature shouldn't be tailoring the laws of the state to those people who are disobeying, Senator Speers will recall, I am sure, from his high school days he surely must have studied the effects of prohibition in this country. The fact it was an unpopular law was no less a reason for people finding that they should observe it, which they didn't, and which later they were responsible for the repeal. Senator Speers and the rest of you will recall in your high school English days that you may have read the speech on conciliation by Edmund Burke before Parliament, in which he deplored what Parliament was doing to the colonies with the stamp tax and all of the other oppressive acts. Now don't you think the people in the State of Maine who are represented here by the truckers feel somewhat in the same position? They feel that they have an oppressive law and they feel that it should be changed. This is why they are here with Report "C".

Senator Berry has alluded to Route 27. I recall when I was a boy I went over that "road", and I will put quotes around "road" because that is all it was, a trail from Eustis to Wilton. In those days when you came to the chain of ponds and you had a Model T Ford, you had to turn the thing around and go in reverse in order to get up those steep pitches. It is little better than that right now. And the Civilian Conservation Corps, under our great Democratic President Roosevelt, was responsible for getting a bunch of unemployed people up in that country and doing that road over or fixing it up so that you can at least get two trucks over it, and just about that, but little has been done since the days of the CCC. There is one short stretch above Eustis that the Department of Transportation reconstructed a few years ago, but essentially we are talking about a road that is 30, 40 or more years old, and it hasn't been changed much since then. We are talking about a law that is as old as that, and nothing has been done about it. I say if we adopt Report "B", this

indeed is a copout that you have been talking about, and probably will be talking about until April Fools Day.

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

Mr. KATZ: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I remember standing in the back of the House of Representatives and hearing Senator Shute's very first major speech to the House of Representatives in his freshman year. And I suspect that because he is not standing for re-election that this may have been his last, and I want the Senator to know that I think that, even with his superb beginning, he improves with age, and I still am influenced by his speeches.

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

Mr. HICHENS: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I am sitting here rather enjoying the debate regarding the fact that they are breaking the law so why not make it legal. If I remember correctly, last week or the week before we had three individual liquor bills which we debated, and the gentleman from Androscoggin County who is absent today said that they are doing it anyway, so why not put it under controls and make it legal. I think the same arguments would be effective as has been presented this afternoon. But I also sat in caucus this morning and listened to a debate on these three reports, and I was told that there was going to be some agreement made before we discussed it this afternoon. I have just checked with Senator Shute and he tells me that no agreement has been made, so under those circumstances, I will have to go along with the Senator from Waldo, Senator Greeley's recommendations.

The PRESIDENT: The pending motion before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Waldo, Senator Greeley, that the Senate accept Report "D", Refer to the 107th Legislature, in non-concurrence. A roll call has been requested. In order for the Chair to order a roll call, it requires the affirmative vote of at least one-fifth of those Senators present and voting. Will all those Senators in favor of ordering a roll call

please rise and remain standing until counted.

Obviously more than one-fifth having arisen, a roll call is ordered. The pending motion before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Waldo, Senator Greeley, that the Senate accept Report "D" of the Committee on Transportation on Bill, "An Act to Change Weights and Related Provisions for Commercial Vehicles", to report this to the 107th Legislature, in non-concurrence. A "Yes" vote will be in favor of accepting Report "D"; a "No" vote will be opposed.

The Secretary will call the roll.

**ROLL CALL**

YEAS: Senators Anderson, Berry, Brennan, Conley, Cox, Greeley, Hichens, Marcotte, Richardson, Speers, MacLeod.

NAYS: Senators Cianchette, Clifford, Cummings, Danton, Graffam, Haskell, Henley, Huber, Katz, Kelley, Minkowsky, Roberts, Sewall, Shute, Tanous, Wyman.

ABSENT: Senators Cyr, Fortier, Joly, Morrell, Olfene, Schulten.

A roll call was had. 11 Senators having voted in the affirmative, and 16 Senators having voted in the negative, with six Senators being absent, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Shute of Franklin, the Ought to Pass in New Draft Report "C" of the Committee was Accepted in concurrence and the Bill in New Draft Read Once. House Amendments "B" and "D" were Read and Adopted in concurrence and under suspension of the rules, the Bill as Amended Read a Second Time and Passed to be Engrossed in concurrence.

Under further suspension of the rules, sent forthwith to the Engrossing Department.

**Papers from the House**

Out of order and under suspension of the rules, the Senate voted to take up the following:

**Non-concurrent Matter**

Joint Order (S. P. 961) relative to Maine Port Authority.

In the Senate March 26, 1974. Read and Passed.

Comes from the House, Indefinitely Postponed, in non-concurrence.

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

Mr. KATZ: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: This was the order that we debated briefly yesterday pertaining to a trade-off in the direction of assuring that Maine people get the benefits of the products of any refinery that ever comes to Maine.

In my conversations with the Department of Transportation, I am convinced that they share this feeling, that if we do get a refinery there should be some kind of sharing of the products. I think we have gotten the message across, and I move that the Senate recede and concur.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Kennebec, Senator Katz, now moves that the Senate recede and concur with the House. Is this the pleasure of the Senate?

The motion prevailed.

**Non-concurrent Matter**

Joint Resolution (S. P. 913) Creating a Task Force on Mental Health Study.

In the Senate March 26, 1974, Read and Adopted.

Comes from the House, Indefinitely Postponed, in non-concurrence.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Hichens of York, the Senate voted to Recede and Concur.

**Non-concurrent Matter**

Bill, "An Act to Correct Errors and Inconsistencies in the Public Laws." (S. P. 953) (L. D. 2606)

In the Senate March 26, 1974, Passed to be Engrossed as Amended by Senate Amendments "A" (S-427), "B" (S-428), "C" (S-429), "D" (S-431), "E" (S-432), "F" (S-433), "G" (S-434), "H" (S-436), "I" (S-437), "K" (S-439), "L" (S-440), "N" (S-442) "O" (S-443).

Comes from the House, Passed to be Engrossed as Amended by Senate Amendments "A", "B", "C", "D", "E", "F", "G", "H", "I", "K", "L", "N", "O" and House Amendments "A" (H-810), "B" (H-811) and "D" (H-820), in non-concurrence.

Thereupon, the Senate voted to Recede and Concur.

Under suspension of the rules, sent