

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 II

May 5, 1971 to June 15, 1971

KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

The House met according to adjournment and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Sam Henderson of Norway.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

Papers from the Senate Reports of Committees

Ought to Pass in New Draft

Report of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act to Limit the Tax Exemption for Certain Corporations Which Conduct Their Operations Primarily for the Benefit of Nonresidents of the State" (S. P. 395) (L. D. 1173) reported same in a new draft (S. P. 621) (L. D. 1804) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the New Draft passed to be engrossed.

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence, the New Draft read twice and tomorrow assigned.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Transportation reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to the Maine Turnpike Authority" (S. P. 507) (L. D. 1489)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. KELLAM of Cumberland
JOHNSON of Somerset
—of the Senate.
Messrs. BARNES of Alton
HALL of Windham
KEYTE of Dexter
DUDLEY of Enfield
LEBEL of Van Buren

—of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought not to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. GREELEY of Waldo
—of the Senate.
Messrs. CROSBY of Kennebunk
McNALLY of Ellsworth
WOOD of Brooks
LEE of Albion
FRASER of Mexico
—of the House.

Came from the Senate with the Minority Report accepted.

In the House: Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Wood.

Mr. WOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that we accept the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Wood, moves that the House accept the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Lizotte.

Mr. LIZOTTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I hope that we do not go along with the Minority "ought not to pass," but I hope that we will go along with the "ought to pass" report on this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalburt.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think this is more important a bill than might appear on the surface, and I certainly hope that the motion of the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Wood, will not prevail. And in matters concerning themselves with highway problems, it is of a very very rare time that I oppose him in his thinking.

The Majority Report of the Committee, in my opinion, is a very fine report. When we talk about the Maine Turnpike Authority we are talking about an interest that is owned and controlled, in my opinion, by the First National Bank of Boston. We talk about a program that we don't enjoy the 90—10 monies that we could. We talk about a program now that has intentions of going into an expansion program, which would not benefit my area at least, of over \$60 million. The only thing that benefits my area in this thing here is that for fifteen years, and still now, that we have been able to get a third mode of transportation across the Androscoggin River, we have had to pay from five cents to fifteen cents into the till of the Maine Turnpike Authority, high-salaried hierarchy for fifteen cents. And Lord knows that next week, next month, it might be up to twenty cents.

If you would look at the program as it was indicated so as to how much the replacement of the 24-mile area, it jumps from 1969 right on through 1973, inside of just a very short span of time.

I think personally the bill as was reported out by the Majority Report "ought to pass" is a very fine piece of legislation and it should be put on the books of law in the State of Maine. Somewhere along the line we must have an Authority that the people will have something to say about. But in this particular instance I don't think we do.

It is the second highest toll road in the land. And for some of you who travel over it, it is not necessarily at all times the one that gives us the best of service.

I certainly hope that the motion of the good gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Wood, who I very rarely oppose on measures, will not prevail so that the motion can be made that the Majority Report "Ought to pass" can be accepted. I do hope that you vote against the motion to accept the Minority Report. When the vote is taken, I move it be taken by the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi.

Mr. SUSI: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise in support of the motion made by the gentleman, Mr. Wood. To my knowledge, I am of the opinion that this is an efficient and honest administration in the Turnpike Authority. I am of the opinion that there is still outstanding some \$50 million in indebtedness by this Turnpike Authority which would have to be refinanced by the state if we were to dissolve the Authority and take over the road, which I believe is a possibility, but I doubt if it is advisable.

Now if I am suffering from bad information on this I hope someone would straighten me out. But if it is basically true I think we would do well to support the motion before us.

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

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

I would concur with Representative Susi in his statement to the effect that the Turnpike Authority is an efficient business. However, because it is the Turnpike Authority it makes us ineligible for federal funding. What our tolls are used for is presently the same thing which federal funding would accomplish, the improvement of the turnpike. If we eliminated the Turnpike Authority we would be, I think, ahead because of the federal funding which this would make us eligible for. I hope you vote against the pending motion.

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

Mr. McTEAGUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In addition to the question of federal funding which has been discussed by prior speakers, I would like to go back to the question, is the Turnpike Authority actually running the State of Maine or, as has been suggested, and it is my opinion, based on a couple of experiences with it, it is not, it is run by a bank in Boston.

I think in addition to making ourselves ineligible for federal funds, it is being paid for unfairly. People that live on one side of Augusta pay one thing, people who live elsewhere don't pay for it and they still get the benefit. The basic problem is that part of the Authority and the sovereignty of our state has been sent to Boston with those bonds, and bankers and lawyers in Boston are telling us what we can and cannot do. Maine has been an independent state from Massachusetts since 1820. I think it is time not only to be independent of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts but to be independent of their banks.

We have had one incident this session. Someone claimed that only the banks in Boston can determine what type safety measures we should have on a road in the State of Maine. I say it is time to stop that type thinking because it is wrong, because the people of Maine are sovereign here, not the banks of Boston.

We have had other times when the Turnpike Authority has gone so far as to tell us that their em-

ployees could not be eligible, and it was beyond the competency of this legislature to make them eligible to participate in the State Employees' Appeals Board. Why? Because of what some bank or bond counsel in Boston said. Again, I think that is wrong, and I think it is time for us to run our own affairs here. We have the federal funds. I think the funding could well be worked out, and I think in the long run it would be worked out as a savings to the general taxpayer in Maine and for the user of the Turnpike. But I think also it is time to bring the authority over this probably our most important road home to Maine and to tell the Boston bankers to mind the banking in Boston and leave our roads to us here.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There might be those who might wonder why I am so interested in the Turnpike Authority. It so happens that I presented a bill many years ago—as a matter of fact in 1947—that would stop the Maine Turnpike Authority. What has happened? What I predicted then would happen has happened. Lawyers and bankers from Massachusetts don't work any different pricewise than lawyers from Maine do, and it is to be expected that they be paid.

And also, a great deal of control has been exercised by the very deep southern end of the county in this area. And the report of the committee in itself would indicate, in my humble opinion, that the State Turnpike Authority, the Maine State Highway Department, with whom I am particularly friendly, have not necessarily faced the realities on this thing.

The report of the majority is strictly a report that is geographically written out, in my opinion, probably. I would take very mild issue with the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi. I mean, I am very happy that he has a beautiful 95, toll free, to travel on. I know that once in a while he gets on toll free one, but generally he is free riding and I am happy for him for that.

We have been paying and we would like to have some sort of change in the programming. Because I well remember at the hearing many many moons ago that it was said that within 30 years the State will have taken over this program and the State will have it and it will be under their jurisdiction. Certainly that has not happened. We are now being hit with the possibility of an additional \$60 million, and that means about \$60 million more in interest.

And I repeat myself, I certainly hope the motion of the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Wood, does not prevail, so that the Majority "Ought to pass" Report will be accepted.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is, to say the least, refreshing sometimes to be on the opposite side of the question with the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, because his arguments are always certainly very convincing.

I am very concerned, and in my concern I think I share the concern of all the citizens of the State of Maine. I think Mr. Jalbert more or less is reacting upon it as a local problem. I do not believe at this time that we are in a position financially to take over this much highway that is very well being maintained by the Turnpike Authority, in my opinion. I travel over it and I don't object to paying the toll, at the different times that I travel over it.

I would point out also that the great part of the tolls on this Turnpike are paid by our out-of-state revenues, and in paying that they are doing no different than I do when I go down and go over the New York Thruway or the New Jersey Turnpike. And I certainly do not feel that the State of Maine should lead the parade in eliminating tolls from our highways which are helping tremendously to support our highway program.

I realize—I looked at this bill and I realized that the gentleman from Lewiston is going to say that there is nothing in this that says

anything about the fact that the State has got to remove the tolls. But you and I know that the State Highway Commission is not going to operate a toll road very long. Once the State Highway Commission takes this over the next move is definitely going to be the removal of the tolls. And I am sure I am getting into the area that the Highway Committee can handle very well and probably they should tell me I should keep out of it, but I do feel strongly about and against this move. I just don't think that the State of Maine, the finances of the State of Maine can afford it at this time.

The Turnpike Authority is doing a good job. They emphasize the fact that they can get federal funds. Well, I am sure that the Highway Committee will—if my reasoning is wrong on this they will correct me, but I don't believe that they are talking about anything except the road below Portland. So there are 60 miles of this turnpike that will never be brought into the interstate system, as long as we have an interstate system that comes up through the state in another manner.

So actually we are only talking about the lower 40 miles of the Maine Turnpike when we talk about federal funds if this is taken over by the State.

I guess perhaps I have expressed my position on this as well as I can, but I feel sincerely that it is not in the best interests of the State to make this move at this time.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I just have two very short questions that I would like to ask of anyone that would answer them. The first one is, the amount of bonds that are outstanding at the present time. We know that they are selling at well below par, and if we take them over will these bonds be redeemed at par?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, poses a question through the Chair to anyone who would care to answer it.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Crosby.

Mr. CROSBY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In answer to the first part of Representative Ross's question, at the present time there are \$52 million worth of outstanding bonds. Now how they are going to be redeemed was never brought up.

To go along with Mr. Bragdon, I think you will find that if the State should take the turnpike over—we are talking about 90-10 money, we are talking about the big bankers in Boston, I think that that is irrelevant. If the State takes over the highway and continues the toll they will not be eligible for any 90-10 federal funds. In order to get the money they would have to take the tolls off.

I am not against the Boston bankers; I don't think that they are running our state. I reported this out as "ought not to pass" for one simple reason. At the present time we have a—well, we will call it a business in the state, that is paying its way, and now we are asking the State to take it over. I think this is poor business. And as Mr. Bragdon said, it is being paid for by those that use it. It is not compulsory that anybody ride on the turnpike.

If the State does take it over, we are going to take it out of the hands of a going business that is paying its way, making improvements. Now it has been forced to pay \$3 million for a center rail guard the full length of it. We are taking it over and instead of those who use it paying for it every one of us in the state is going to pick up our share of the \$52 million—not only paying off the bonds, we are also going to pick up the future maintenance, the future expansion.

At the present time it is planned to widen the road from York—incidentally it is already widened from Kittery to York; from York to Portland will be widened into six lanes. The Turnpike is planning on this. Perhaps they are not going to pay off their bonds as quickly as they thought, but you must consider, too, that in the years that it has been in existence the number of cars on the road has increased tremendously.

So we have got to take that into consideration.

So my feeling is that instead of the whole state paying for this, let those that use it pay for it. I don't think that anybody is getting particularly rich off of it. I don't own any Turnpike bonds; I have no connection with the bonds. I do come from the southern part of the state. No pressure has been put on me to fight for this; I want it made perfectly clear.

So therefore I think that instead of putting this albatross around the neck of the Maine Highway Department we better leave it where it is.

Mr. JALBERT of Lewiston was granted permission to speak a third time.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have no thought in my mind that I would want to see the tolls removed until the payment of the bonds is finished, and no such thought has been entertained in my argument. Also if I want to use the turnpike I pay for it; if I don't want to use it I don't pay for it, because I just don't use it.

Also I would like to make this statement here, that we would like to take some sort of—along the line, some sort of advantage of more federal monies or federal monies. I will have to conclude my remarks by saying that as far as I am concerned I am not just going to get up and say that the Maine State Authority is run efficiently, because it wasn't when it started and it isn't run efficiently now. And the proof of my argument is the fantastic amount of accidents, the failure of them to properly maintain the road, particularly in the winter months.

I don't think there is a road in the country that has been handled as poorly as the Maine Turnpike Authority. I don't think there is a road in the country that has more complaints than that road has had. I don't think there is a road in the country that has had more accidents than that highway has had. So anybody that turns around here and says that that highway is conducted efficiently is seeing the world through dark colored glasses.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Sheltra.

Mr. SHELTRA: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: There is no question in my mind that this is an efficient organization, private enterprise, and believe me they are milking the public for every dime they can. And I will tell you exactly how.

I happen to come from Biddeford and if you take the toll from Biddeford to the Kittery exit it will cost you 50c for 36 miles. If you take the toll from Biddeford to Westbrook, which is half the distance, it will cost you 50c to take the toll. Generally speaking the tolls between one gate and another, generally speaking it is supposed to be a 15c discrepancy. As it exists presently, for instance, if you are living in South Portland and if you happen to be working in the S. D. Warren mill in Westbrook, which is only about a three-mile stretch, and this should be a safety factor, you will be charged 25c to go from one tollgate to another.

This is outrageous. This means that the workingman that goes to work in that area is paying \$3.00 a week to go to and from work; and in many instances he is forced to do this because the city congested traffic in the South Portland area going into Portland is very bad, especially during the inclement weather.

So I tell you, ladies and gentlemen, the toll structure is very unfair and we are being taken advantage of. I can readily understand that you people in upper state perhaps don't realize this. So much is made about the tourist using the tolls, but believe you me it is these in-between exits with outrageous prices that our own people are paying, to line the pockets of these individuals, that I can't put up with.

I certainly hope that you would go along with the Majority Report and not concur with the Minority Report as suggested by Mr. Wood.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson.

Mr. SIMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I use the toll road between my home and here five days a week. I have every single day all winter long. I have found that, in fact many times I have thought maybe they had too many people

out working on the roads on the Maine Turnpike. But I also have not only travelled the Maine Turnpike this particular year but many other years, night and day, and all hours of the day; and I have never found yet that I couldn't get up and down the Maine Turnpike in pretty good speed and in safety, especially in the winter time if ever there was a time.

I think for the number of miles that they have and the crew that they have, that they do an excellent job. It costs me 95c to come up here in the morning and 95c to go back at night, and I would just as soon double that, maybe even triple it, just for the sake of not having to drive through some of the cities such as Auburn and Lewiston, Biddeford and what have you, in the congestion that you find in the particular cities.

As for the tourists coming into the state, I would say that the tourists coming into the state, from what I deal with them, would far rather pay the toll, and maybe even a higher toll, for the sake of being able to come into the state, to get in here on a good safe highway, to get into the area without having to come along Route 1. And I would ask that we keep the Maine Turnpike just as it is.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Jutras.

Mr. JUTRAS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The first thing I shall do, I shall remove my colored glasses before any statement is made about the Maine Turnpike this morning as suggested by Mr. Jalberty. All the remarks made by the different speakers have some merit, but it seems to me that this is developing into a political issue, because those of the other party from my own party, seem to have the facts and figures pretty well at hand and they are very logical; and their conclusions are sound. The members of my party apparently are trying to make an emotional issue out of this Maine Turnpike Authority, and for that reason I support the Minority Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Union, Mrs. McCormick.

Mrs. McCORMICK: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think it is about time this House used a little common sense. If they looked at this bill maybe it might sink in a little that the date on this is January 1, 1972. You are asking us to take over the Maine Turnpike Authority as of this date and absorb the \$52 million bond that is still owed.

We also just passed a measure in this House to make them put guardrails down this. So if we take over this Authority we are not only taking over the \$52 million, we are also taking over the price of those guardrails. Now you just stop and think about it a little bit and I think it better stay where it is.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Lizotte.

Mr. LIZOTTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In answer to the good gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson, if he has traveled the Maine Turnpike in the wintertime and if we have any amount of snow whatsoever, the Maine Turnpike closes and they don't let anybody on the Maine Turnpike.

Secondly, if we want to be conservative about this, they have outstanding bonds of \$52 million as it was said. But they are in the process of spending another \$60 million for the section between York and Scarborough and the widening of the turnpike. If we don't take the turnpike now, instead of having the \$52 million bonds, we eventually will be taking it over and we will probably wind up with over a hundred million dollars in bonds.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alton, Mr. Barnes.

Mr. BARNES: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Before I take the liberty of pushing my little button to nay, I want to say that this is, as the gentleman from Ellsworth once remarked, this is one leopard who has changed his spots this morning. I signed the Majority "Ought to pass" Report, but since doing that I have had a change of heart — and it hasn't been because of any pressure that has been brought upon me, it is

just simply that I have seen the light and I am going to go along with the motion to accept the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report.

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: If I was a member of the Transportation Committee I would have signed the "Ought to pass" Report. For the simple reason, if you are ever going to get the bills paid on this turnpike you are not going to have it paid through the Authority. They are just going to continue spending and spending down there on different sections of the road and keep that little corporation, that little organization going, and it is never going to be taken off.

I feel for better roads in the State of Maine that we would be better off with the Highway Commission managing it. This is one way we can — they are never going to stop it down there because they have got a little gravy train, they are going to keep it going, and if it was in the Highway Department at least after some time they would reduce these bonds; and like Mr. Lizotte said, they have got \$52 million worth of bonds now, they are anticipating spending 61 or 62 million, I have heard the talk that they are going to build six-lane roads down there and eight lanes.

I don't know, this is just talk I have heard around the House here this morning. But I would like to know, if someone would care to answer, on the 52 million when do they anticipate that these bonds would be paid for without any more construction? When would the 52 million be retired?

Mr. Scott of Wilton then moved the previous question.

The SPEAKER: For the Chair to entertain the motion for the previous question it must have the consent of one third of the members present and voting. All members desiring that the Chair entertain the motion for the previous question will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken and more than one third of the members present having expressed a desire for the previous question, the previous question was entertained.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is, shall the main question be put now? This is debatable for five minutes by any member. The pending question is, shall the main question be put now? All in favor will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the main question was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The yeas and nays have 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 members 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 Brooks, Mr. Wood, that the House accept the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report on Bill "An Act relating to the Maine Turnpike Authority," Senate Paper 507, L. D. 1489, in concurrence. If you are in favor of this motion you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Albert, Ault, Bailey, Baker, Barnes, Bartlett, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Birt, Bither, Bragdon, Brown, Bunker, Call, Carrier, Churchill, Clark, Collins, Cottrell, Crosby, Curtis, A. P.; Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Cyr, Dam, Donaghy, Dow, Dyar, Evans, Faucher, Finemore, Fraser, Gagnon, Hardy, Haskell, Hayes, Henley, Hewes, Hodgdon, Immonen, Jutras, Kelley, K. F.; Kelley, R. P.; Lawry, Lee, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Littlefield, MacLeod, Maddox, Marstaller, McCormick, McNally, Millett, Morrell, Mosher, Norris, Page, Parks, Payson, Porter, Pratt, Rand, Rollins, Ross, Scott, Shaw, Shute, Silverman, Simpson, L. E.; Simpson, T. R.; Smith, E. H.; Susi, Theriault, Trask, Webber,

White, Williams, Wood, M. W.; Wood, M. E.; Woodbury.

NAY—Bedard, Bernier, Berube, Binnette, Boudreau, B o u r g o i n , Brawn, Bustin, Carter, Clemente, Conley, Cooney, Cote, Curran, Doyle, Drigotas, Dudley, Emery, D. F.; Emery, E. M.; Farrington, Genest, Gill, Good, Goodwin, Hall, Hancock, Hawken, Herrick, Jalbert, Kelleher, Kelley, P. S.; Keyte, Kilroy, Lebel, Lessard, Lizotte, Lucas, Lynch, Mahany, Manchester, Marsh, Martin, McCloskey, McKinnon, McTeague, Mills, Murray, O'Brien, Pontbriand, Santoro, Sheltra, Slane, Smith, D. M.; Starbird, Stillings, Tyndale, Vincent, Wheeler, Whitson.

ABSENT — Carey, Cummings, Fecteau, Gauthier, Hanson, Lund, Orestis, Rocheleau, T a n g u a y , Wight.

Yes, 81, No, 59; Absent, 10.

The SPEAKER: Eighty-one having voted in the affirmative, fifty-nine in the negative, with ten being absent, the motion does prevail.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Public Intoxication" (S. P. 607) (L. D. 1786) which was passed to be enacted in the House on June 4 and passed to be engrossed on June 2.

Came from the Senate passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.

In the House: the House voted to recede and concur.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Amend the Oil and Gas Conservation and Development Control Act" (H. P. 499) (L. D. 645) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on March 16.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Revising the Air Pollution Laws" (H. P. 1127) (L. D. 1557) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" in the House on June 1.

Came from the Senate passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" as amended by Senate Amendment "B" thereto and Senate Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Majority Report of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to the Housing Needs of People Who Pay Rent" (H. P. 881) (L. D. 1202) reporting same in new draft (H. P. 1386) (L. D. 1809) under same title and that it "Ought to pass" and Minority Report reporting "Ought not to pass" which Reports and Bill were indefinitely postponed in the House on June 4.

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston-Auburn, Mr. Emery.

Mr. EMERY: Mr. Speaker, I move that we adhere.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Emery, moves that the House adhere to its former action.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede and concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, moves that the House recede and concur.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Carrier.

Mr. CARRIER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is the rent escrow bill which was killed in this House last Friday. I naturally oppose the motion to recede and concur. What has happened here, we killed this bill in the House on Friday, it went to the Senate yesterday, and they voted the "Ought to pass" Report with no discussion whatsoever. However, this has not changed my mind about the distasteful thing about this bill.

We are back today facing this bill, L. D. 1809, and I believe it was a wise move on the part of