

# 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 Fifth  
Legislature***

**OF THE**

**STATE OF MAINE**

**Volume III**

**June 16, 1971 to June 24, 1971**

**Index**

**1st Special Session**

**January 24, 1972 to March 10, 1972**

**Index**

**KENNEBEC JOURNAL  
AUGUSTA, MAINE**

distinctive changes taking place in our population growth, I am sure.

As a member of the Reapportionment Committee, it was I who made the motion to discard 1862 from further consideration. I did so because as a member of this committee I had an opportunity to study it thoroughly. As all of you are aware, the Republicans in caucus and the Democrats in caucus received their own versions of a reapportionment plan literally flung at us in the closing moments and, in our desire to adjourn, not really enough study was given by either party to the proposals presented to it. There were some definite flaws in 1862 and after having studied it, and being made aware of it, I offered the motion that it no longer be considered for further judgment by the committee.

Subsequently many other plans were proposed, some of them which would have given cause for Governor Gerry to become reincarnated almost overnight, but the final plan is not the plan that was sent to us by the court, the final plan which received almost unanimous action by the commission. The plan that received almost unanimous endorsement by the commission was one which would have separated two good Senators, Senators Greeley and Hoffses. The one, as I understand it, which will be before us will place them in the same district, so when this session adjourns one or the other will not be back with us for another time around, and I think this is a pity.

There were some mathematical changes in the commission plan which could have been improved upon, and I felt that at one point the two parties were that close together in reaching an agreement, and had not certain members of the other party made dogmatic declarations in caucus which were reported in the press, I felt that the Republican Senators here could have gotten together with the Democrat Minority and approved a reapportionment plan without it having gone to the Court. This I regret very much because I think it would have been in the interest of good government.

On another matter, Mr. Presi-

dent and Members of the Senate, I felt very deeply this morning about some of the things said concerning the matter of an initiative referendum which came before my Committee on Election Laws. I.B. 2 received two public hearings, one before Judiciary, where over 47,000 names were presented before it. This same bill later on in the session came before the Election Laws Committee and politicians from both sides paraded before our committee giving us the pros and cons. I subscribe to the deep and sincere feeling evidenced before this group earlier today by Senator Katz when he expressed the opinion that a great deal was lost by the people in this state through the discussions that we have had, mainly in the press.

I would like to call attention to the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Harding, that even though he has impugned the good name of Massachusetts here today, the worst thing I find about Massachusetts is its automobile drivers. The ballot which is being considered, the so-called Massachusetts type ballot, is offered in many states, not just Massachusetts, and it is called an office type because each one of the candidates is separated by office. I think this contributes to good government. Furthermore, I would remind the Senator that I wasn't in politics in 1960. I think I was serving on a school board somewhere, a very minor capacity in politics, and I have taken an interest in the elimination of the big box and the executive council for a number of years. Be that as it may, the point remains that 47,000 people have been kept waiting, and now at the Governor's bidding, for over a year and a half following the point of submission of their names to this body, and I think this is a pity.

---

Mr. Kellam of Cumberland was granted unanimous consent to address the Senate:

Mr. KELLAM: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I have something of a cold so I am sure I will be very brief. I just wanted to make a comment in relation to the Reapportionment Commission