

# 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

1974

Kennebec Journal  
Augusta, Maine

lowly Senator is representing only 30,000 people. So I hope you will feel the importance of your position representing this many people. So certainly on the strength of that, you would have no objections to your getting more signatures to run for this extremely important position.

If we are going to accept this amendment that this gentleman has proposed, I think perhaps that we should, in the light of the many candidates that we have for the gubernatorial position, perhaps we should put a further amendment in and say that any candidate for governor should have to have only a minimum of 25 or a maximum of 50 signatures to get his name on the ballot. I think that that is just as consistent as the amendment which the good gentleman from Bangor has offered at this time.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Mulkern.

Mr. MULKERN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Since the City of Portland was mentioned in connection with this amendment, I would like to say that I may surprise a few people, I am going to vote against this amendment today.

I don't really feel as though I personally am going to be greatly inconvenienced by having to get these extra signatures. Already we have to get a minimum of 206 signatures and a maximum of some 450. I don't think a few added signatures is going to hurt me. So as a member of the City of Portland, I am going to vote against this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Dam.

Mr. DAM: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think the most simple solution to the problem of those representatives from multi-member districts that feel that they have to get too many signatures would be to vote for single-member districts, and then they would be equal with everybody.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oakland, Mr. Brawn.

Mr. BRAUN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies

and Gentlemen of the House: I have here before me the vote of the last election. Let me quote to you what happened in Bangor; "John R. McKernan, Jr., received 5,600 votes." Let me quote down to you the next one below, Stewart Smith, who is now running for another office only received 1,158 votes and I will go down through these there in the single districts, and I will show you that they had almost five to one, these people, had so why shouldn't they have more signatures.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt, that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed. All in favor of indefinite postponement will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

83 having voted in the affirmative and 28 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

Thereupon the Bill was passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

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

Resolution, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Provide for Single Member Districts in the House of Representatives; to Provide for Reduction of the Number of Representatives to One Hundred Thirty-two, and Reapportionment of the House of Representatives before the General Election of 1976; to Provide for Further Reduction of the Number of Representatives to Ninety-nine, and Reapportionment of the House of Representatives and the Senate before the General Election of 1984; to Provide for Annual Sessions of the Legislature and to Limit the Matters which may be Considered in the Second Regular Session; to Establish an Apportionment Commission to Plan for all Reapportionments of the House of Representatives and Senate; to Abolish the Executive Council and Reassign Certain Constitutional Powers to a Legislative Council; and to Provide that Oaths and Subscriptions of Office of the Governor, Representatives and Senators shall be Taken before the Chief Justice of

the Supreme Judicial Court. (H. P. 1972) (L. D. 2513)

Pending — Further Consideration

(Failed engrossment in the House on February 19. In Senate, passed to be engrossed)

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am going to make the motion to insist, and I would like to speak briefly to that motion, please.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, moves the House insist.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I hope we do not have a lengthy debate again because we have now defeated this gem seven times, and each time the opposition gains support. The last vote was 52 for and 90 against. The proponents need the two-thirds vote, but the opposition was only five votes short of the two thirds themselves.

Now, the proponents were almost prepared this morning to offer two amendments. One would leave the size of the House the same until 1984, at which time it would be cut to 132. And the second one, they were going to have the Senate, rather than leadership, confirm all appointments.

Now, I was willing, in the spirit of fair play, to let them offer these amendments, but I warned them at the time that we would then defeat them in turn. However, I do admire determination and stick-to-itiveness, but there is a limit to all things. Their arguments, in my opinion, are very hollow, to say the least. It rather reminds me of what President Abraham Lincoln once said. Their argument is as thin as homeopathic soup made by boiling the shadow of a pigeon that had been half starved to death.

Now certain persons made the statement in this session that really most of the proponents wanted these changes for change sake alone. Relative to this I have three stanzas of a poem by my favorite poet, Robert Service, and I haven't recited these since 1969 in the House.

They range the field and rove the flood,

And they climb the mountain's crest.  
Their's is the curse of the gypsy bold,  
And they don't know when to rest.

If they went straight they might go far,  
They are strong and brave and true.  
But they're always tired of things that are,  
And they want the strange and the new.

They say, "Could I find my proper groove,  
What a deep mark I would make!"

So they chop and change, and each fresh move,

Is only a fresh mistake.

Now, without much more to-do, I think that we should very soon take the vote and it will be the final vote, I am assured and I am going to request, and I will do it right now, the yeas and nays when the motion is put.

The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, had an operation last Friday. Mr. Jalbert is coming along fine. But he called me last night, and he said that he hoped to be here today. But unfortunately, right after he called me, he slipped and fell down. Unfortunately, he can't make it. Now you noticed that we just passed an order this morning excusing him for the duration of his illness. But he especially wanted to be here today. To quote what he said to me, he wanted to be "in on the final kill of this bill."

So I now hope that you vote for my motion, and it would be truly fitting and really a climactic end if we now, when we finally lay this to rest, if we would do it in a grand manner with a two-thirds roll call vote.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt.

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I guess probably if this had died a peaceful death in its sleep, possibly I wouldn't have felt too disappointed. But being as its toes have been twisted a little bit and revived, I guess probably now we will have to go through the whole process. Maybe by the time we get this all completed, maybe the gentleman from Lewiston can be here for the final kill. So as a result, I move we recede.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt, moves that the House recede.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I was willing to cooperate, and I was told that I didn't need to, so I could make my motion. So in the interest of expediency, I hope you vote against the motion to recede, and then vote for my motion and give a two-thirds vote to that motion.

Mr. Finemore of Bridgewater requested a roll call vote.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Morton.

Mr. MORTON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We have had some fine entertainment this morning from the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross. He is an excellent reader; he likes poetry, and I enjoy listening to him talk. But it seems to me that this matter of some seriousness to the people of the State of Maine should deserve a little better treatment from this House than the cavalier approach that he has taken.

This reform package is a complete package. It streamlines the legislative process; it strengthens the House, vis-a-vis the executive; it is a move in the right direction. Where is the fear of turning this out to the people? Are we so elite in this place that we don't dare turn a matter of this importance to the people of the State of Maine? I say, let's give it a lot better consideration than the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, was willing to give it this morning.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Carey.

Mr. CAREY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would ask the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Morton, if he wants serious attention given to this thing, would he object if these items went out singly to the people so that they could not vote on an entire package but on each individual item?

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Kelleher.

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House:

Very seldom have I ever taken issue with my good friend from Farmington, Mr. Morton, but to say that Representative Ross is taking a light attitude towards this bill is a very alarming thing for me to hear. Certainly no one has put more time in on an issue such as this as the Representative, and I certainly disagree with the remarks that he took a very light-handed attitude towards this document. I think the House should feel the same way in those regards.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt.

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: To first answer the question of the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Carey, being the sponsor of this and having put a good deal of time in it and convinced myself thoroughly that this is a good change, I would have no personal objection if these single items were put out to the people individually, provided that there was some agreement that every one of them would be put out, that they wouldn't decide by action of either this body or the other body at the other end of the corridor to only put out part of it.

Now, as far as to why I made the motion to recede, I do have an amendment that I would place on this. It would attempt to correct some of the questions that have come up relative to that. One of them is the reduction of the House to 99 members. I guess probably that would be one item in the original bill that I have the most objection to or was least partial to. 132 seemed to have a better consensus, and this would lead future legislatures to make the decision on how they wanted to divide themselves or reduce the size or develop the number of membership.

The reason 132 was picked is because it is the only well, it is the closest and highest number that can be found which 33 would go into, and the concept of developing Senate districts and House districts together does seem to make a good deal of sense to most people. This would allow 132 single-member districts. And there also seems to be some objection in some quarters to the use of the Legislative Council doing confirmation. Personally, I think having

sat on one of the lower rings of the totem pole and taking a look at the work of the Legislative Council, I feel in years to come it will become a very effective instrument and tool of this legislature, and I think that eventually they will look to it as having been a worthwhile accomplishment. I do think the Legislative Council has done a good job. I have no quarrel with trying to have this handled by the State Senate, which would make our Constitution consistent with the federal Constitution.

Now, whether this is or is not sent out to the people or not and what the reaction would be, I have here a group of editorials. As far as I can determine every editorial, every paper, a daily paper in the State of Maine has editorialized in favor of this particular package. There is a long one here in which they take individually each one of the different items that are in the package and separately express them. This was out of the Portland Evening Express, February 20. Here is one from the Maine Sunday Telegram of February 24 in which they endorsed it, and they come out and they said at the every end of it "it deserves to pass." Here is one that comes, I believe this one comes from the Portland Press Herald, and this one here strongly supports it. Here is one that comes from the Bangor Daily News. It was out very early in the session, January 14, 1974; "It deserves special consideration."

I believe that these things have been kicked around for a long while. They have been discussed by political scientists, legislatures. These bills have been before the legislature for a good many years, practically every one of them. I think it is time that we give serious consideration to sending this out to the people. Now if we do recede, I then will offer this amendment which will allow the size of the House to be set at 132 and the confirmation to be done by the Senate. I hope you will vote to recede.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Poland, Mr. Dunn.

Mr. DUNN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It seems to me we are going the wrong way. We want to reduce the size of the legislature to streamline it, where at the same time we are expanding state government in

general. If an amendment were to be proposed here that would reduce all bureaus, boards, commissions and departments the same percentage and to the same length of time, I almost think I might go along with this this morning.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. LaCharite.

Mr. LaCHARITE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to pose a question through the Chair to anyone who may answer.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may pose his question.

Mr. LaCHARITE: Mr. Speaker, In which way would it be possible to take this package and divide it up into individual referendum questions to bring it out to the people? Would an amendment to this bill do this?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. LaCharite, poses a question through the Chair to any member who may answer if he or she wishes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Camden, Mr. Hoffses.

Mr. HOFFSES: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do not rise to answer the question of the gentleman from Brunswick, I rise to discuss this particular matter.

I have consistently allowed that I would vote for the entire package, but that I would not for a moment tolerate splitting it up, changing it around, or anything of that nature. And we have before us the promise or the threat, whichever light you wish to analyze it in, of an amendment here which is going to tinker around with it and is going to change it. Now, that in itself is enough for me to reverse my position to say that I would vote for this thing—vote against it, rather. So, that is what I am going to do, but I am going to emphasize it a little stronger by making reference to a remark relative to a hitchhiking bill yesterday when the respected, distinguished gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, arose and he said "Ladies and gentlemen, hold on to your hats, I am going to shift my position and I am going to vote against the whole package.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Town, Mr. Binnette.

Mr. BINNETTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to pose a question through the Chair to our assistant, Mr. Birt. Now, he held up a lot of editorials and read out several of them. Now, what I would like to know is this, isn't an editorial one man's opinion, and does that man vote up here?

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Carey.

Mr. CAREY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Following on the comment by the gentleman from Old Town, Mr. Binnette, and again on the editorials as put forth by the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt, I would certainly hope that he doesn't believe everything that is in an editorial. Only yesterday in the morning Sentinel I was brought forth as "God of Gods," and even I don't believe that.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Dam.

Mr. DAM: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Going again a little further with the editorials that were read by the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt, I believe the first three editorials come from the same chain of ownership of the newspaper and then the last one, so I am sure the first three would reflect the same view since the chain is owned by the same people. The last one, he said that the Bangor News said that we should give special consideration to this, but he didn't say whether we should give special consideration to supporting it or maybe we should kill it right here. Mybe that should be the consideration.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon.

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am somewhat confused as to what exactly we are discussing. I guess there is no particular item before us, if I understand the situation correctly. However, I guess that we are talking about two matters, either splitting this bill up, sending it out to the people or sending it out to them whole. Now I think either one, once you give serious thought to it, you are going to decide that neither method is wise.

Certainly it would not go out to the people as it is made up now and they would give intelligent reaction to it. I think they would laugh at us after we had discussed it all this time and then we finally decided to send it out to the people. I honestly feel that we would make ourselves ridiculous.

Mr. Birt has made serious effort, and I thought this morning he had finally given up. But I think that we should not pursue this idea after debating this matter this length of time. We should forget the idea of sending it out to the people in any form.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: To answer the question of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, we most certainly have something specific before us right now. We have the motion to recede. If we vote for that motion to recede, we keep it alive, we open it up for amendments, and the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt, has stated that he has at least one and perhaps two amendments. I hope you vote against the motion to recede.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call, it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All those desiring a roll call vote will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken, and more than one fifth of the members present having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt, that the House recede on House Paper 1972, L. D. 2513. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Ault, Baker, Berube, Birt, Briggs, Carter, Chonko, Clark, Cooney, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Dow, Drigotas, Dunleavy, Emery, D. F.; Farley, Farnham, Gahagan, Garsoe, Goodwin, K.; Greenlaw, Huber, Jackson, Jacques, Knight, Lawry, Lewis, J.; Martin, McKernan, McMahon, McTeague, Merrill, Morton, Murchison, Murray, Najarian, Perkins, Peterson,

Pontbriand, Pratt, Shute, Simpson, L. E.; Smith, D. M.; Smith, S.; Snowe, Trask, White, Whitzell, Wood, M. E.; The Speaker.

**NAY** — Albert, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Binnette, Bither, Boudreau, Bragdon, Brawn, Brown, Bustin, Cameron, Carey, Carrier, Chick, Churchill, Conley, Cote, Cottrell, Cressey, Crommett, Curran, Dam, Davis, Deshaies, Donaghy, Dunn, Dyar, Evans, Farrington, Faucher, Fecteau, Ferris, Finemore, Flynn, Fraser, Genest, Good, Goodwin, H.; Hamblen, Hancock, Herrick, Hobbins, Hoffses, Hunter, Kauffman, Kelleher, Kelley, Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Kilroy, LaCharite, LeBlanc, Lewis, E.; Littlefield, Lynch, MacLeod, Maddox, Mahany, Maxwell, McCormick, McHenry, McNally, Mills, Morin, L.; Mulkern, O'Brien, Palmer, Parks, Ricker, Rolde, Rollins, Ross, Santoro, Shaw, Sproul, Stillings, Strout, Talbot, Tanguay, Theriault, Tierney, Trumbull, Twitchell, Tyndale, Walker, Webber, Wheeler, Willard.

**ABSENT** — Bunker, Connolly, Dudley, Gauthier, Haskell, Immonen, Jalbert, LaPointe, Morin, V.; Norris, Sheltra, Silverman, Soulas, Susi.

Yes, 49; No, 88; Absent, 14.

The **SPEAKER**: Forty-nine having voted in the affirmative and eighty-eight in the negative, with fourteen being absent, the motion did not prevail.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross.

**Mr. ROSS**: Mr. Speaker, I now withdraw my motion to insist. I would like to make the motion now that we adhere and be done with this thing once and for all. I request that you withdraw my motion to insist.

Thereupon, Mr. Ross of Bath withdrew his motion to insist.

**Mr. ROSS**: Mr. Speaker, I now make the motion to adhere, and I request a roll call in the hopes that we can get two-thirds of the vote to adhere.

The **SPEAKER**: A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call, it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All those desiring a roll call vote will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken, and more than one fifth of the members

present having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

The **SPEAKER**: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, that the House adhere on House Paper 1972, L. D. 2513. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

#### **ROLL CALL**

**YEA** — Albert, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Binnette, Bither, Boudreau, Bragdon, Brawn, Bustin, Cameron, Carey, Carrier, Chick, Churchill, Cote, Cressey, Crommett, Curran, Dam, Davis, Deshaies, Donaghy, Dunn, Dyar, Evans, Farrington, Fecteau, Ferris, Finemore, Flynn, Fraser, Gauthier, Genest, Good, Goodwin, H.; Hamblen, Hancock, Herrick, Hobbins, Hoffses, Hunter, Kauffman, Kelleher, Kelley, Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Kilroy, LaCharite, LeBlanc, Lewis, E.; Littlefield, Lynch, MacLeod, Maddox, Mahany, Maxwell, McCormick, McHenry, Mills, Morin, L.; Mulkern, O'Brien, Palmer, Parks, Pratt, Ricker, Rolde, Rollins, Ross, Santoro, Shaw, Sproul, Stillings, Strout, Talbot, Tanguay, Theriault, Tierney, Trumbull, Twitchell, Tyndale, Walker, Webber, Wheeler, Whitzell, Willard, Wood, M. E.

**NAY** — Ault, Baker, Berube, Birt, Brigge, Brown, Carter, Chonko, Clark, Conley, Cooney, Cottrell, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Dow, Drigotas, Dunleavy, Emery, D. F.; Farley, Farnham, Faucher, Gahagan, Garsoe, Goodwin, K.; Greenlaw, Huber, Jackson, Jacques, Knight, LaPointe, Lawry, Lewis, J.; Martin, McKernan, McMahon, McNally, McTeague, Merrill, Morton, Murchison, Murray, Najarian, Norris, Perkins, Peterson, Pontbriand, Shute, Simpson, L. E.; Smith, D. M.; Smith, S.; Snowe, Trask, White, The Speaker.

**ABSENT** — Bunker, Connolly, Dudley, Haskell, Immonen, Jalbert, Morin, V.; Sheltra, Silverman, Soulas, Susi.

Yes, 87; No, 53; Absent, 11.

The **SPEAKER**: Eighty-seven having voted in the affirmative and fifty-three in the negative, with eleven being absent the motion does prevail.

Mr. Birt of East Millinocket was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

**Mr. BIRT**: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and



Gentlemen of the House: I realize, and I have heard a good many comments about the problems that are involved with the recent apportionment and why they have come about. I thought I would like to give you at least some background of the problems that we ran into and what we might be able to do in future apportionments.

Prior to 1960, there were no problems with apportionment. The individual states worked out their own decisions. In 1962, the first of the cases came out from the United States Supreme Court working towards the eventual tightening up of the one man, one vote philosophy. During the 1960's there were quite a few decisions that came out from the United States Supreme Court on this. At that time nobody realized the full impact of it until the 1970 census came around and many of these apportionment plans had to be developed.

The United States Census Bureau, from my understanding, has used a great many different factors in determining the necessary needs of people who want to use census data, but they have never given any serious consideration to the problems that are involved in things such as apportionment.

There has been an Apportionment Commission appointed by the National Legislative Conference, and the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin, is a member of that committee. This committee has met with some of the people in the Census Bureau in attempting to work out guidelines of how the census will be taken so they can be used more fairly in the development of apportionment plans. They haven't had complete success in this.

Recently there has been a bill introduced in Congress of which I have a copy here requiring that the census be taken on plans in the individual states in accordance with a plan approved by the governor thereof, of the tabulation of the total population of the state obtained in each census and required for the apportionment of the legislative bodies. This is what this requires, that the governor will have a plan for taking the census submitted to the Census Bureau sometime around 1978. So the 1980

census will be developed in a way that it can be best used by people within the state who need it. And this primarily refers to people who are involved in taking apportionment.

What we would hope is that this census would follow ward lines, precinct lines and other political subdivisions so that we won't run into the problems that we are running into now. I know that the problems that we run into are unfortunate, and yet there seems to be no solution.

Interestingly enough, and I also have the hearings of that, and among the people who spoke in favor of this bill was the Governor of the State, Governor Curtis. He went to Washington and submitted a statement and spoke before the Committee on Post Office Civil Service relative to this. I thought I might give you some of this as background. I think the gentleman from Eagle Lake might have a few other comments to make. He has indicated that he would. And it would at least give you something to take back to some of the areas where we have got some really disagreeable apportionment plans, and at least you can explain out what the problem was.

---

Mr. Martin of Eagle Lake was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: After we got through reapportionment, as a matter of fact, as we were going through it, every member of that commission got rather disgusted with some of the things we had to work with, or the lack of things that we had to work with. As it worked out, what we had to rely on were census figures and we were having real problems trying to get those and get the proper figures as well.

One of the real areas where we had serious problems, of course, involved areas involving military personnel and student population. And the Census Bureau had made no effort at all to separate the two, to separate military and students from the local residency whatsoever. Hopefully, the committee that we have created on the national level is going to assist next time in providing that information, and it can't

help but help us as we get ready for the next reapportionment. I can assure you that if this were done and that the Census Bureau were to take these things into consideration, which could be easily done by the enumerators as they go from place to place, the next time we do reapportionment it would be somewhat easier to do. The only alternative that we have to the federal census is for us to take our own. There are some states that do that, but it is extremely expensive and it is one which I do not think that we would be capable to bear the burden of.

You have on your desks today, changing the subject to some degree, the Washington Report for State Legislators done by the National Legislative Conference. This specific proposal is the President's proposal on the 1975 budget, and I thought that it would be of interest to you in light of some of the federal programs that affect each and all of you in your various districts back home, since many people will be asking questions as to what federal funds will become available. And this is made available to leadership and I thought it would be appropriate that each member of the legislature also get a copy of it for your own information.

---

(Off Record Remarks)

---

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore.

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I move now we reconsider our action where we voted to adhere on L. D. 2513.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore, moves that the House reconsider its action of earlier in the day whereby it voted to adhere on House Paper 1972, L. D. 2513. The Chair will order a voice vote. All in favor of reconsideration will say yes; those opposed will say no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion did not prevail.

The following Joint Resolution from

the Senate was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

WHEREAS, a great sadness fills our chambers with the untimely passing of Col. Parker F. Hennessey who devoted his life to serving his State in a most honorable way; and

WHEREAS, Col. Hennessey was Chief of the Maine State Police, Commissioner of Public Safety and above all a proud cop whose 38-year tenure in law enforcement will remain immortal in the minds of vast numbers; and

WHEREAS, he was a towering figure in his profession, widely recognized expert in polygraph and an able administrator who always dispatched his responsibilities with appropriate humor and in the best interests of his command; and

WHEREAS, the noble profession of law enforcement has been greatly enhanced by his distinguished career and the Maine Criminal Justice Academy, now offering state-wide professional police training, is a fitting monument to his character and achievement; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That we, the Members of the One Hundred and Sixth Legislature of the State of Maine, now assembled in special legislative session, join in this hour of grief to record a moment of silent tribute to the life and career of Col. Parker F. Hennessey, and each in his own way to extend our deepest sympathy to his bereaved family and countless others who must share in this great loss; and be it further

RESOLVED: That a suitable copy of this Resolution be prepared and presented to his dear wife and family in token of our lasting esteem and when both Houses of the Legislature adjourn this day that it be done out of respect to his memory. (S. P. 919)

Came from the Senate read and adopted.

In the House, the Joint Resolution was read and adopted in concurrence.

Pursuant to the Joint Resolution,  
Adjourned until nine-thirty tomorrow morning.