

# 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 Thirteenth Legislature**  
OF THE  
**State Of Maine**

**VOLUME III**

**FIRST CONFIRMATION SESSION**

August 21, 1987  
Index

**FIRST SPECIAL SESSION**

October 9, 1987 to October 10, 1987  
Index

**SECOND SPECIAL SESSION**

October 21, 1987 to November 20, 1987  
Index

**SECOND REGULAR SESSION**

January 6, 1988 to March 24, 1988

Representative Richard of Madison was granted unanimous consent to address the House:

Representative RICHARD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to have each of my colleagues here in the House give recognition at this time to one of our own, Nat Crowley, who yesterday was elected to the Maine Sports Hall of Fame. Please join me in wishing him our congratulations.

Representative Crowley of Stockton Springs was granted unanimous consent to address the House:

Representative CROWLEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Thank you very much. This is quite an honor to me -- I can't even walk now and I am going to be honored for being an athlete. It is a great honor for me and I appreciate your recognizing it. Thank you.

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 7 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

ORDERS

On motion of Representative MCHENRY of Madawaska, the following Joint Order: (H.P. 1421)

Ordered, the Senate concurring, that the Joint Standing Committee on Labor report out Bill, "AN ACT to Encourage Prompt and Peaceful Settlements of Labor Disputes," H.P. 1415, L.D. 1919, to the House.

Was read and passed and sent up for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

(Off Record Remarks)

(At Ease)

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 6 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Labor reporting "Ought to Pass" on Bill "An Act to Encourage Prompt and Peaceful Settlements of Labor Disputes" (Emergency) (H.P. 1415) (L.D. 1919)

Signed:

Senators: DUTREMBLE of York  
ANDREWS of Cumberland  
Representatives: JOSEPH of Waterville  
MCHENRY of Madawaska  
RUHLIN of Brewer  
RAND of Portland  
TAMMARO of Baileyville  
HALE of Sanford

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting "Ought Not to Pass" on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator: COLLINS of Aroostook  
Representatives: WILLEY of Hampden  
HEPBURN of Skowhegan  
BEGLEY of Waldoboro

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Madawaska, Representative McHenry.

Representative MCHENRY: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I move that the House accept the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report.

L.D. 1919 is a bill that we put in to address the problems that the Governor had in his veto message of June 30th, I think it was. This bill is trying and I believe it does address the problems that the Governor had with the previous bill that we had before the First Regular Session of the Legislature.

It is my understanding that our Senators in Washington would love to see something happen in this field where we have professional strikebreakers coming into the State of Maine taking away jobs from the people in the State of Maine. This is why this bill is before us. We all know what is happening in this state. I, for one, really know what is happening and I can tell you that my people accepted a contract while I was home under real tremendous pressure because of the way the corporations are acting in this state. I believe that totally unfair and unrealistic pressures are being put upon the working people of this state.

I was down here working on the Workers' Compensation Bill, I intended to vote on the contract but I was not given that opportunity because the company had put it out, I believe it was, on Wednesday and they told the employees that if they did not accept the contract by the 29th, that certain issues like double time on Sunday, time and a half, and a lot of language would be removed from the contract. Essentially they were saying, if you go out on strike, you lose your job. My fellow employees had seen in the previous few days where the company had fenced the whole area and it looked like a jail. It made people feel really fearful.

The day that they were asked to vote, the professional strikebreakers were in town, we had a whole lot of new faces in town and I assure you, ladies and gentlemen, that people were extremely fearful that what happened in Jay might happen in Madawaska. Like I said before, I pray to God (and apparently my prayers have been answered) because the people have accepted a contract, a five year contract.

I have talked with other paper industries and they couldn't believe that we accepted a five year contract but, when you have people hanging by a thread, not knowing what might happen -- I have been at Fraser for 27 years and I have seen how we negotiate a contract and "every time" the company would ask for extreme concessions, knowing full-well that we would reject the contract offer. This time, I am sure they were almost in shock that the people accepted it. They did it because of the tremendous fear. I did not vote because I was not there and I really don't know how I would have voted. I wasn't there to see all that was happening and I wasn't there to hear what the people talking in behalf of the company said. I am a working person and I have seen contracts before but I cannot say that I would have voted for or against because I was not there. I might have voted for it; I might have voted against it. I can't honestly tell you. This is the livelihood of people and when you see people losing their jobs to professional strikebreakers, it is a heartbreaker for me to see that happen to our fellow working people of this state. It is not right, it is not justifiable by any stretch of the imagination. It is absolutely unfair.

That is why this bill is in. It addresses the qualms that the Governor had with the first bill that we put in.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Hampden, Representative Willey.

Representative WILLEY: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I was quite surprised to see this bill before us today because this bill was never

referred to committee and there were never any hearings on it whatsoever. It was never discussed. As a matter of fact, it was my understanding that it would come up in January and not in this session. I was surprised to see it rear its ugly head today.

As was mentioned, the Governor did veto a similar bill in June and this one doesn't change the situation a lot, I don't think. In the original bill that we had before, it said in several instances that if you do something once, it is customary and repeated. In this one, it leaves out the two times. Now it says, "customary and repeatedly in the normal course of business offers himself or others for employment" — that would mean himself. For instance, an individual might apply for a job as a champion and was on strike at the time and then go to IP and offer himself at a different time for employment — the union or the employer could get an injunction against the company and button it up. I do not believe that that is what is meant by formal strikebreakers, by people who make themselves available only in the instance of breaking a strike. I don't believe that that was the intent of it at all. It does cover virtually everybody except security guards and maintenance people who may be maintaining the machinery which they sold.

In the bill that the Governor vetoed previously, we had excluded security guards and we had excluded maintenance people who did this sort of work on equipment that was there that they sold (maintaining warranty work and this sort of thing). I don't see any difference in this bill at all and I personally doubt and I have no idea in the legal sense whether it violates federal law or not — it seems to me to be contrary to federal law and I sincerely hope that we will be able to defeat this bill today and vote against the motion.

I do ask for a roll call.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Waterville, Representative Joseph.

Representative JOSEPH: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: This bill was designed to meet the Governor's objections. This is a sincere attempt to deal with a very serious situation in our state.

I would like to read to you from Governor McKernan's veto message on June 30th. "If legislation was presented, which regulated firms whose sole business was to provide replacement employees, striking workers, the Supreme Judicial Court rules or advised that such legislation did not violate federal law. I would accept legitimate so-called anti-strikebreaker legislation."

This bill was drafted to meet those concerns. Representative Willey says, "any person who customarily, repeatedly, in the normal course of business, offers himself or others for employment to perform the duties that are normally assigned to employees in a labor dispute, strike, or walk-out" — therefore, this bill simply allows the labor union to deal with this situation in the courts. This is not a new issue to this body. This bill was introduced into Legislative Council October 11th and this bill was on your desks when you arrived here on October 21st, L.D. 1919.

Again, I will repeat that there are many people who feel that this bill is very necessary. The people that this bill will help need help now, not in January, not in February, they need help now. Their lives are on the line.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Hampden, Representative Willey.

Representative WILLEY: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: There is one other item that I would like to call to your attention and I don't mean

to prolong this because I would like to get home too. Apparently, we have to wait a little while.

I call your attention to the top of Page 3. "Employment or retention — to employ or retain any person or organization which customarily and repeatedly" — it says retain and I gather from this that if this bill went into effect, those people who were hired in the recent strike, which is still going on, wouldn't be able to retain those people, you'd have to get rid of them and hire back the original people, the ones out on strike. That seems to me to be crossing a bridge before you get to it because it seems to make it retroactive.

I call your attention again to the fact that it does deal with individuals because it refers repeatedly through the bill to an individual, not just a company, somebody who might do this as a business, an individual, a person and, therefore, I think it is far out of line so far as the professional strikebreaker affair is concerned.

I urge you again to defeat this bill. It is something that we can do without in our economy today.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Rockland, Representative Melendy.

Representative MELENDY: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I urge you to please vote favorably on this legislation. Too many of our Maine people are being hurt because without this law, out-of-stater's are allowed to come in and take over the jobs of our people. Large corporations are allowed to continue to operate with these scabs, while our Maine workers, upon whose backs and work ethics this state was built, are left without income. While our workers are waiting and waiting for the so-called bargaining process to help them, the company is operating and making profits with the help of these out-of-state people. What incentive does company management have to bargain in good faith when they can continue to operate? Let me tell you, they have absolutely none.

Take a look at what is happening in Jay. Go over there, look into the eyes of the workers who have no leverage in the bargaining process. Quite simply, all they can do is sit back and wait until the company feels like bargaining and, as they sit and wait for the company, their savings dwindle, the pressure mounts to pay for the necessities of life like housing, food, heat and the despair of possible poverty and long-termed unemployment grows. In many cases, families are torn apart. I don't know about you, ladies and gentlemen, but if I were in their shoes as Thanksgiving and Christmas approaches, I would be able to find very little to be truly thankful for.

The playing turf is absolutely unfair and I ask you all to help right this wrong. You sent a message down once to the second floor this year on this issue and I urge you to do so once again.

The Governor talks about economic development and jobs for Maine people — yet he allows Maine jobs to be taken over by out-of-stater's — isn't that talking out of both sides of his mouth? Let's give him a second chance to make the right choice. After all, even we get a second chance to vote on issues.

Representative Joseph has written this bill in a manner that will help Maine workers, while meeting the Governor's concerns, which he stated in his veto message during the First Session. So, let's give him another chance and let's give the workers of Maine a fighting chance. We all know, ladies and gentlemen, that a vote we took today may hurt many workers — let's vote this time to give Maine workers a greater opportunity to keep their jobs through good faith bargaining with Maine employers.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Sanford, Representative Hale.

Representative HALE: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: The purpose of this bill is not to prohibit a company from hiring. The purpose of this bill is to prohibit a company from replacing workers during a strike with professional strikebreakers such as BE&K. It is to prohibit them from utilizing an individual professional strikebreaker, it is not to discourage or prohibit them from hiring replacement workers.

The purpose of introducing this has been explained by Representative Joseph, that the part that was objectionable to the Governor has been removed. We need to do something to stop the continuing practice of bringing into the State of Maine professional strikebreakers.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Skowhegan, Representative Hepburn.

Representative HEPBURN: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I am very impressed on how everyone is able to speak so eloquently on this issue today. I don't know where they had their public hearing but I wish they had invited me when they did.

We are dealing with something that has been very controversial between this body and the Executive Branch. We are dealing with language that really hasn't been looked over much more than a few minutes today. We don't know what the ramifications are. I didn't realize that we were even going to talk about it until an hour ago when I signed the jacket on it.

It is just voting in the dark, it is not what the process is about, it is very hasty -- let's talk about it in January when we talk about all of the bills and put it through the same normal legislative process.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Waldoboro, Representative Begley.

Representative BEGLEY: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: As a member of the Labor Committee, I was dismayed and disappointed when I was called out into the hall just a few minutes before our lunch break and asked to sign the jacket for the bill that you have before you now.

I would reiterate what Representative Willey and Representative Hepburn has said -- we have had no public hearing on this, we have had absolutely no committee action, no chance to talk it over and it is my understanding that it does not address all of the Governor's concerns. I do believe that we should be addressing it in January and I am under the impression that, even if this were passed, it would not help the situation in Jay. I would be happy to have someone address that if I am wrong so I would encourage you to vote against this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Madawaska, Representative McHenry.

Representative MCHENRY: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I don't know why people are dismayed and surprised and what have you, we all realize that I put in an Order awhile ago, we were all here in the chamber. We all know full-well that the Labor Committee held an extremely long hearing on this issue. We have had hearings on strikebreakers -- you can shake your heads but we did. If my memory serves me right, we had very long hearings in Room 113 on strikebreakers. We all know what the strikebreaker bill is about, we debated it June 30th. If we had not had a bill before us, how could the Governor have vetoed a strikebreaker bill? He did veto it June 30th so we must have had a hearing sometime. Unless my mind is failing me, I would like someone to tell me differently but we already had a hearing on strikebreakers -- not the exact same bill

that you have before you because the bill we have before us is here to address the problems that the Governor had with the first one.

I would hope that you would vote to pass this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Kennebunk, Representative Murphy.

Representative MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I really don't want to talk to the particulars of the bill but I would like to talk about the process.

Yesterday we passed an Order carrying this bill over to the Second Regular Session. I think we are nearing the end of the Special Session where we have proven, people of both parties, people of both branches, that we can come together to solve a problem. I am not sure if there are those out there who don't want us to work together, I would hope not. I would hope that there is no one out there at this time and this hour who wants to repolarize this chamber. I would hope not.

We have just finished the experience of working together. The Representative from Waterville came to the Council and I told her during that meeting that we very much want to address this problem. We were told that there was going to be a serious effort to talk with the Governor's Office, that did not occur. No final drafted bill, no sincere effort to put this bill back into committee, a committee that has proven to this body that there is a process where they can come together and solve problems. They have that record, a proven track record, that they can solve a crisis.

I am opposed to the bill because of the process and I would hope that we could look at that process but maybe look ahead to the future in terms of momentary short-term gain or looking toward January and February of coming together on this problem and finding a mutual solution. Passage today will recreate that polarization.

Every member of this body on the way home, hopefully this afternoon, can go home with head held high. We have a choice now in terms of how the newspapers will report this special session. There have been members of this body from both parties who have acted with dignity and courage or will the newspapers tomorrow at the moment of one of our greatest accomplishments, mutual accomplishments, report the legislature beginning again fighting among itself and business as usual? I would hope that if we defeat this process, not the bill, but defeat the process, that we can have a motion or an Order to refer this bill back to committee so that the Labor Committee, which has proven to us what they can do, can begin to work and reestablish that process again.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Fairfield, Representative Gwadosky.

Representative GWADOSKY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I respect the comments of the minority leader and share many of his thoughts. I have to be quite honest with you that the issue before us is not the process but the issue before us is a very important measure, a very important bill. I have to be more honest with you when I say that I am not really all that concerned in how the press reports that we are holding hands as we walk out of this chamber today.

Time and time again during the year, the good Representative from Kennebunk has risen to defend the Governor of this state on a variety of issues, labor related issues particularly. On more than one occasion, we have heard the comments of how important it is to develop this philosophical concept of a

level playing field. It is so unique and important for this delicate balance of negotiations between management and labor can take place. We are beginning to hear hints of this again today.

I would suggest that we need to take a look, a real hard look at the real world. There are nearly 1,000 workers in Jay right now who are asking the same question. You have got nearly 1,000 workers in Jay right now who may never go back to work again and they are also looking for that level playing field. The problem is that it doesn't exist. When we, as a policy in this state, say that management simply has the right to blatantly get rid of a work force rather than negotiate, that is not a level playing field. There is no incentive for them to negotiate over wages or benefits or any other issue when one side can simply eliminate the other by bringing in a new work force at a lower wage rate.

Every Wednesday night up in Jay, Maine they have a rally. For those of you who haven't had the opportunity to attend those, I suggest you might want to try it sometime because they also have a philosophical concept about how to achieve that level playing field. It is very simple and its very succinct. It's called "scabs out, union in."

This bill may or may not have direct implications as to what is going on at Jay but it sure as heck has implications of what is going to happen at Keyes-Fibre in Fairfield and Waterville, what is going to happen at Scott Paper Company in Winslow and what is going to happen at S.D. Warren in Somerset later this spring when their contracts come up.

This issue is more than a debate on the process, Representative Murphy, it is a debate on a very important measure. I hope you all consider that.

Representative Willey of Hampden was granted permission to address the House a third time.

Representative WILLEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I don't deny that this is an important issue, it is a very important issue. It being that important, wouldn't you think that since this bill has been around now a month or so or something like that, that it might have been referred to the Labor Committee, that there would have been public hearings, that this whole issue would have been aired out and both sides of the argument presented in a tangible fashion and both sides of the issue talked about to a point where you could understand what was going on rather than the side-tracking affair that happened here where it has not been referred for any discussion whatever until today? That, seems to me, if it is not important enough to go to a hearing, then I don't understand the importance of it. The importance of a hearing is to air these issues out, let people have a say on both sides of the issue. I think it is absolutely wrong for anything of this importance to be sidetracked to a point where the public doesn't get involved at all.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Rumford, Representative Erwin.

Representative ERWIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I cannot believe that anyone in this body would vote against this bill because of the process. This is a good bill. I believe it is very much needed. We voted for a similar bill before. The passage of this bill is not going to change the final vote on the workers' comp bill. I voted against the Labor bill because I felt it was unfair to the workers in benefit cuts and relocation, but I voted for the final bill because I knew we needed to address a serious situation that this state is in. I did it very, very reluctantly because, as

you know, I come from a union town. I would certainly hope you would vote in favor of this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Waterville, Representative Joseph.

Representative JOSEPH: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: "My personal abhorrence of having Maine jobs potentially being filled, even temporarily by "non-resident contractors" is a sad reminder of what can happen when the collective bargaining process breaks down. We all suffer when there is labor/management strife" — Governor John R. McKernan, June 19, 1987.

"If the widespread use of replacement workers that is now occurring upsets the appropriate balance between management and labor and collective bargaining, it seems that we should take a look at this" — Senator George J. Mitchell.

Senator Cohen says he sees "A clear parallel between the football players strike and the National Football League and the paperworkers strike underway at the International Paper Company plant in Jay." Cohen also said, "The same strategy that has been used by some other companies across this country to break union strikes is a key question unanswered in his mind as to whether companies and team owners have bargained in good faith." Both our U.S. Senators believe that this question is an important question for the State of Maine and needs scrutiny by the U.S. Congress and needs a law in this state.

This bill is the same bill we debated on May 29th, June 1st, June 8th and June 30th. This bill's public hearing was held April 6th. The only difference in this bill is using, in the normal course of business, the omission of the presumption clause which defines a person as a strikebreaker if they did this once or twice. I urge you to vote for this bill and let the courts decide if professional strikebreakers are in this state. There is a need for this legislation.

I feel it essential that I reply to Representative Murphy's accusation that I had not contacted the Governor's Office. I had three distinct conversations with the Governor's special assistant. We also talked about me seeing the Governor. The Governor was unable to see me. The Labor Committee, as you well know, went into deliberations and has not had more than one or two days a weekend days — occasionally we worked on Saturday in order to hear another bill. The sponsors of this bill felt that this bill could stand on its own because it had been thoroughly debated in both chambers of this legislature.

I urge you to deal with this bill fairly and honestly.

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

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

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is the motion of Representative McHenry of Madawaska that the House accept the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report. Those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 183

YEA - Aliberti, Allen, Anthony, Bickford, Bost, Boutilier, Brown, Carroll, Carter, Cashman, Chonko, Clark, H.; Coles, Cote, Crowley, Daggett, Diamond, Dore, Duffy, Dutremble, L.; Erwin, P.; Gould, R. A.; Gurney, Gwadosky, Hale, Handy, Hichborn, Hickey,

Hoglund, Holt, Hussey, Jacques, Jalbert, Joseph, Kilkelly, LaPointe, Lisnik, Macomber, Mahany, Manning, Martin, H.; Mayo, McGowan, McHenry, McSweeney, Melendy, Michaud, Mills, Mitchell, Nadeau, G. G.; Nadeau, G. R.; Nutting, O'Gara, Oliver, Paradis, P.; Paul, Perry, Pouliot, Priest, Rand, Richard, Rotondi, Ruhlin, Rydell, Sheltra, Simpson, Smith, Soucy, Swazey, Tamaro, Thistle, Tracy, Vose, Walker, The Speaker.

NAY - Anderson, Armstrong, Bailey, Begley, Bott, Callahan, Curran, Davis, Dellert, Dexter, Farnum, Farren, Foss, Foster, Garland, Glidden, Greenlaw, Harper, Hepburn, Higgins, Holloway, Jackson, Kimball, Lawrence, Look, Lord, MacBride, Marsano, Matthews, K.; McPherson, Moholland, Murphy, E.; Murphy, T.; Nicholson, Norton, Paradis, E.; Parent, Pines, Reed, Rice, Ridley, Salsbury, Seavey, Sherburne, Small, Stanley, Stevens, A.; Strout, B.; Strout, D.; Taylor, Telow, Tupper, Webster, M.; Wentworth, Weymouth, Whitcomb, Willey.

ABSENT - Baker, Bragg, Clark, M.; Conley, Hanley, Hillock, Ketover, Lacroix, Lebowitz, Paradis, J.; Racine, Reeves, Rolde, Scarpino, Stevens, P.; Stevenson, Tardy, Warren, Zirkilton.

Yes, 75; No, 57; Absent, 19; Paired, 0; Excused, 0.

75 having voted in the affirmative and 57 in the negative with 19 being absent, the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report was accepted, the Bill read once.

Under suspension of the rules, the Bill was read a second time.

Representative Priest of Brunswick offered House Amendment "B" (H-436) to L.D. 1919 and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "B" (H-436) was read by the Clerk. The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Brunswick, Representative Priest.

Representative PRIEST: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: Section 856 is a criminal penalty in the current strikebreaker law, which this bill will be part of. The bill itself was enacted in 1965 with that penalty, that penalty has never been used. The bill which you have before you contemplates a civil injunction as a means of enforcing this law rather than criminal penalty. Criminal penalties involve such things as Fifth Amendment rights and makes enforcement much more difficult; therefore, this amendment would remove the criminal penalty and would rely on civil enforcement primarily through injunction which is the intent of the bill.

Thereupon, House Amendment "B" (H-436) was adopted.

Representative Gwadosky of Fairfield offered House Amendment "A" (H-435) and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" (H-435) was read by the Clerk and adopted.

The Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" (H-435) and House Amendment "B" (H-436) thereto and sent up for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, was ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

The following items appearing on Supplement No. 8 were taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

SENATE PAPERS

The following Communication:

Maine State Senate  
Augusta, Maine 04333  
November 20, 1987

The Honorable John L. Martin  
Speaker of the House  
113th Legislature

Augusta, Maine 04333

Dear Speaker Martin:

In accordance with Joint Rule 38, please be advised that the Senate today confirmed, upon the recommendation of the Joint Standing Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, the Governor's nomination of Margaret M. Roy of Cornish for appointment to the Board of Environmental Protection.

Margaret M. Roy is replacing Evelyn Jephson.

Sincerely,  
S/Joy J. O'Brien  
Secretary of the Senate

Was read and ordered placed on file.

The following Communication:

The Senate of Maine  
Augusta

November 20, 1987

Honorable Edwin H. Pert

Clerk of the House  
State House Station 2  
Augusta, Maine 04333

Dear Clerk Pert:

Senate Paper 685, Legislative Document 1914, An Act an to Amend the Insurance Law Relating to the Type of Coverage Provided by Insurance Carriers, having been returned by the Governor together with his objections of the same pursuant to the provisions of the Constitution of the State of Maine, after reconsideration the Senate proceeded to vote on the question: "Shall this Bill become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor?"

Thirteen Senators having voted in the affirmative and Twenty-two Senators having voted in the negative, accordingly, it was the vote of the Senate that the Bill not become law and the veto was sustained.

Respectfully,  
S/Joy J. O'Brien  
Secretary of the Senate

Was read and ordered placed on file.

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 10 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

SENATE PAPER

Bill "An Act to Make Technical Corrections in the Workers' Compensation Act" (Emergency) (S.P. 710) (L.D. 1932)

Came from the Senate under suspension of the rules and without reference to a Committee, the Bill read twice and passed to be engrossed.

(The Committee on Reference of Bills had suggested reference to the Committee on Labor.)

Under suspension of the rules and without reference to a Committee, the bill was read twice and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

By unanimous consent, was ordered sent forthwith to engrossing.

(At Ease to the Gong)

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 9 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

PASSED TO BE ENACTED

An Act to Encourage Prompt and Peaceful Settlements of Labor Disputes (H.P. 1415) (L.D. 1919) (H. "A" H-435; H. "B" H-436)