

# 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 Seventh Legislature**

(First Special Session)

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

**1976**

KENNEBEC JOURNAL  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

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

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker, do I understand him to say that if he owns 20 percent he doesn't have to pay? He sure does have to pay if he owns 20 percent. He has to pay if he owns 50 percent, because I am tangled up in it right now and I finally got out from under it by a little smooth work, but I had quite a lot of trouble with Miss Allen over here in the department saying that we couldn't operate a corporation without it. Well, they wanted \$1,740 for my son alone, to get a policy that would cover just him alone. We have no employees, and I finally wound up by leasing him all the equipment and was starting him as an independent in the trucking business. We had to carry two businesses in order to stay out from under a \$1700 charge.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Durham, Mr. Tierney.

Mr. TIERNEY: Mr. Speaker, the good gentleman's difficulties obviously occurred prior to October 1, 1975, when the law change to which I refer took effect. If he finds that he does own 20 percent of the voting stock, he is exempt. This is a bill which I dealt with at great length with the good gentleman from Nobleboro, Mr. Palmer, and as I said, if anyone here would take the time to read this bill, they would see that that exemption has been expanded so that the family of the employer can also be exempt, all they have to do is sign a waiver. So I would suggest that you read the bill, because I think what the good gentleman from Farmington and the gentleman from Bridgewater want is expanded in this particular bill.

Thereupon, House Amendment "B" was adopted.

The Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and House Amendments "A" and "B" in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

On motion of Mr. Cooney of Sabattus, the House voted to take from the table the following matter:

"An Act to Reorganize or Repeal Certain Activities and Agencies in Maine State Government (Emergency) (H. P. 2143) (L. D. 2286) (C "A" H-1079) — In House, Passed to be Enacted March 29 — In Senate, Passed to be Enacted in concurrence March 30. (Recalled by Joint Order H. P. 2282)

On motion of Mr. Cooney of Sabattus, under suspension of the rules, the House reconsidered its action whereby the Bill was passed to be enacted.

On further motion of the same gentleman, under suspension of the rules, the House reconsidered its action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed.

On further motion of the same gentleman, under suspension of the rules, the House reconsidered its action whereby Committee Amendment "A" was adopted.

The same gentleman offered House Amendment "B" to Committee Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "B" to Committee Amendment "A" (H-1212) was read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sabattus, Mr. Cooney.

Mr. COONEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This amendment clears up some objections of the Governor. Specifically, it changes the provisions having to do with the Department of Mental Health and Corrections and puts it in concert with the provision we made for the Department of Human Services whereby the commissioners may appoint deputy commissioners. It also gives the Governor a check over salary levels

for people in the Department of Mental Health and Corrections who would be appointed by the commissioner and it further removes some transitional language that froze positions in the bill until 1980.

Thereupon, House Amendment "B" to Committee Amendment "A" was adopted.

Committee Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "B" thereto was adopted.

The Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "B" thereto in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

On motion of Mr. Rolde of York, the House voted to take from the table the following tabled and unassigned matter:

Bill "An Act to Promote the Development of Small Group Homes for Mentally Retarded Individuals" (H. P. 2058) (L. D. 2228) which was tabled pending acceptance of the Leave to Withdraw Report.

Thereupon, the House accepted the Leave to Withdraw Report and sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the following matter:

Bill "An Act Redistributing the Powers of the Executive Council" (H. P. 1997) (L. D. 2197) In House — passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-1115) and House Amendments "A" (H-1166) "B" (H-1177), "C" (H-1183), "E" (H-1191), "F" (H-1196) on April 2. In Senate — passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" as amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-519) thereto and House Amendments "A", "C", and "E" and Senate Amendments "B" (S-524), "D" (S-529) and "C" (S-526) as amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-532) thereto in non-concurrence.

Which was tabled earlier in the day and later today assigned pending further consideration.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sabattus, Mr. Cooney.

Mr. COONEY: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede and concur.

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

Mr. LAPOINTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Again, I ask you to bear with me as I suffer through a cold, and ask you not to go along with receding and concurring as it relates to redistribution of the powers of the Executive Council.

This House, last Friday, accepted two amendments, one by the gentleman from Windham, Mr. Peterson, and one offered by myself, and these amendments essentially allowed for legislative confirmation for two agencies and the boards of directors and membership of two agencies in state government. The one that was offered by the gentleman from Windham related, as I recall, to the Criminal Justice Planning Administration, or what was formerly referred to as the Maine Law Enforcement Planning Assistance Agency, and the other related to the Board of Trustees of the Criminal Justice Academy, and these appointments would be subject to the confirmation of the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary. The other amendment, which was offered by myself, would have allowed for the Health and Institutional Services Committee to confirm the appointments of the Maine Committee on Aging into the Maine Human Services Council.

I offered my amendment primarily because I felt that these two organizations, the Maine Human Services Council and the Maine Committee on Aging had tremendous input, influence and impact on the distribution of some Human Services' dollars that the State of Maine is entitled to through the federal government.

Specifically, I was concerned about the distribution and allocation of what we call Title 20 money, of which the State of Maine is eligible for approximately \$12 million, tied in with \$4 million of state seed money, that goes to the distribution and setting up and operation of any number of human services programs. Of course, the Maine Human Services Council has a tremendous impact over the priority social services program which was passed in the 106th and continued in the 107th, which primarily allows for human service programs in the rural areas.

I think the issue that is essentially involved in these two groups is that they affect the quality of life as it relates to the distribution of human services for a great deal of people both in the urban and rural areas of the state. I feel very strongly that these appointments should be ratified by the legislature and, furthermore, I would point out that those amendments, both Mr. Peterson's and my own, went under the hammer last Friday. So I would hope that the House would not go along with the motion to recede and concur. I would hope that the House would then go along with the motion to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference to resolve these two minor difficulties.

I realize that some members of the State Government Committee, most notably the ones in the other body, feel that these are superfluous appointments, unnecessary appointments, for ratification by the legislature; I happen to feel very strongly that they are important appointments, and I would hope that the House would stand firm and the House would not acquiesce to the Senate, or cave in to the Senate.

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, if I understand my parliamentary procedure correctly, what we should do is recede and then we can take our action on the amendment after we recede?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would answer in the affirmative.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Kelleher of Bangor, the House voted to recede from its action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended.

On further motion of the same gentleman, the House voted to recede from the adoption of Committee Amendment "A".

Senate Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" (S-519) was read by the Clerk and adopted in concurrence.

Committee Amendment "A" as amended by Senate Amendment "A" thereto was adopted in concurrence.

Senate Amendment "B" (S-524) was read by the Clerk and adopted in concurrence.

Senate Amendment "C" (S-526) was read by the Clerk.

Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "C" (S-532) was read by the Clerk and adopted in concurrence.

Senate Amendment "C" as amended by Senate Amendment "A" thereto was adopted in concurrence.

Senate Amendment "D" (S-529) was read by the Clerk.

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, I move that Senate Amendment "D" be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Kelleher, moves that Senate Amendment "D" be indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sabattus, Mr. Cooney.

Mr. COONEY: Mr. Spekaer, what we are try-

ing to do with Senate Amendment "D" is replace something that was taken out when Mr. LaPointe's amendment was defeated by the other body.

I don't have a strong feeling about either of these two amendments and the House can, of course, make up its own mind on them. I think the feeling about Representative LaPointe's amendment is that you are dealing with, I believe, 32 people on the two committees that he wanted to confirm. He can correct me if I am wrong, but I believe these are staggered terms, they are not coterminous with the Governor, so there is some continuity from one governor to the next, and the confirmation of 32 people by a particular committee, even though they are staggered and only perhaps only a third or fourth of them would come up in one year, is a tremendous number of confirmations. So it is for this reason that the Committee on State Government did not deal with these and the amendment you have before you now that Mr. Kelleher has moved to indefinitely postpone, if you are in favor of Mr. LaPointe's position, you should vote to indefinitely postpone it. If you are in favor of receding and concurring and going with the Senate in killing Mr. LaPointe's Amendment, then you should keep this amendment on and then recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Mrs. Goodwin.

Mrs. GOODWIN: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I would support the motion to indefinitely postpone Senate Amendment "D". I am very concerned about the future of the Maine Committee on Aging and the Maine Human Services Council. As Representative LaPointe has already explained to you, these two committees are not the ordinary advisory committees on state government; these two committees have very, very serious responsibilities resulting in the distribution of millions and millions of state contracts.

There are two technical review committees. The technical review committee of the Maine Committee on Aging which deals with all contracts of money under the Older Americans Act and under the Elderly Priority Social Services Act, and there is also the technical review committee for the Maine Human Services Council.

We have another joint technical review committee which deals with all programs that have services which are for the elderly and non-elderly combined.

I am very concerned, because not only do we pass on all these programs, the Maine Committee on Aging itself conducts a program, which is called the Nursing Home Advisory Program. I am also concerned about what happened last fall. We talk about continuity, perhaps these aren't very important appointments.

Last fall, five members of my committee came up for reappointment. Two did not wish to be reappointed; three did. These three women who wished to be reappointed were three of the outstanding senior citizen leaders in this state, and yet despite my pleading, the Governor would not reappoint them. I tried again and again, but I was not successful. There was very little I could do about it, except when he put up appointments of other people, I at least had someone to go to.

The law says very clearly that anyone appointed to the Maine Committee on Aging must be a current leader of Maine's elderly; yet, he appointed somebody who had never even been to a senior citizens meeting in his life. It happened that he was related to a campaign worker of the Governor. Now, it happened, because there was an Executive, I was able to block that appointment. In fact, the gentleman was so embarrassed when he found out, that he withdrew from the nomination.

I would hope that there would be some check

and balance about who we are going to put on the Maine Committee on Aging. The Maine Committee on Aging is not just a committee that sits around and does nothing. The Maine Committee on Aging has done a lot for Maine senior citizens over the past five years, and I hope we can over the next five years.

I would ask for a roll call, please.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Winthrop, Mr. Bagley.

Mr. BAGLEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I want to go along with the last speaker. As President of the Central Senior Citizens Association, I have had a lot of dealings with this committee and I agree with the statements she made about those people who were not reappointed last time. I think we should go along with her.

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Just to echo the thoughts of the good lady from Bath, I presently serve on the Human Service Council as a representative from the body. Her remarks indicating that we do deal with many millions of dollars is quite true. The Committee on Human Services has a great say in what happens down in the Department of Human Services as far as their review of technical programs and the funding of federal dollars.

I would urge the House to support the indefinite postponement motion, simply because of the fact of the input of these various people. It is a 17-member advisory group and they do have a great amount of say on the implementation and the programs that are in the field of human service. I hope you would support the motion to indefinitely postpone.

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 Bangor, Mr. Kelleher, that Senate Amendment "D" be indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence. All those in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Albert, Ault, Bachrach, Bagley, Bennett, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Berube, Blodgett, Boudreau, Burns, Bustin, Byers, Call, Carey, Carroll, Carter, Chonko, Churchill, Clark, Connolly, Cooney, Cote, Cox, Curran, P.; Curran, R.; Curtis, Dam, Davies, DeVane, Dow, Drigotas, Durgin, Dyer, Farley, Faucher, Fenlason, Finemore, Flanagan, Fraser, Gauthier, Goodwin, H.; Goodwin, K.; Gould, Gray, Greenlaw, Hall, Henderson, Hennessey, Hewes, Higgins, Hinds, Hughes, Hunter, Hutchings, Immonen, Ingegneri, Jackson, Jensen, Joyce, Kauffman, Kelleher, Kelley, Kennedy, Laffin, LaPointe, Laverty, LeBlanc, Lewin, Lewis, Littlefield, Lizotte, Lovell, Lunt, Lynch, MacEachern, Mahany, Martin, A.; Martin, R.; Maxwell, McBrearty, McMahon, Mills, Miskavage, Mitchell, Morin, Morton, Mulkern, Nadeau, Najarian, Norris, Peakes, Pearson, Pelosi, Perkins, T.; Peterson, P.; Pierce, Post, Powell, Raymond, Rideout, Rolde, Rollins, Saunders, Shute, Silverman, Smith, Snow, Spencer, Sprowl, Strout, Susi, Talbot, Tarr, Teague, Theriault, Tierney, Torrey, Tozier, Truman, Twitchell, Tyndale, Usher, Wagner, Walker, Wilfong, Winship, The Speaker.

NAY — Birt, Carpenter, Conners, Farnham,

Garsoe, Kany, Mackel, McKernan, Palmer, Perkins, S.; Quinn, Snowe, Stubbs.

ABSENT — Bowie, Doak, Hobbins, Jacques, Jalbert, Leonard, MacLeod, Peterson, T.; Webber.

Yes, 129; No, 13; Absent, 9.

The SPEAKER: One hundred and twenty-nine having voted in the affirmative and thirteen in the negative, with nine being absent, the motion does prevail.

On motion of Mr. Quinn of Gorham, the House voted to recede from the adoption of House Amendment "F".

Thereupon, the same gentleman moved the indefinite postponement of the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the same gentleman.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Again, as the gentleman from Sabattus, Mr. Cooney, said a minute ago, I don't have very strong feelings about the particular committee itself, and it was obvious from the intent of the mood of the House that the last amendment was to go through with an overwhelming majority.

I would point out, however, that when you saw the red lights up there with one exception, you saw the entire State Government Committee. We did work on this a long time. We reduced 460-odd positions that require confirmation to about 110 or 112 positions that require confirmation. With this motion you just made, you indicated that the House was willing to increase that number by nearly 30 percent with one swift amendment. All right, so be it. However, Mr. Peterson's amendment proposes to add to that anywhere between 12 and 30 more people that will require confirmation, this time having to do with the Criminal Justice Planning and Assistance Agency and the Board of Trustees of the Criminal Justice Academy, which also has 12 members. You are just automatically, if you let this amendment go on, we will have added about 60 percent more in two quick amendments to the entire work of the State Government Committee all summer, and I would point out also that the Criminal Justice Planning and Assistance Agency isn't even in the bill now, because it doesn't even require confirmation now. You are going to add 12 people and to ex officio people to require confirmation by a committee that don't even have to be confirmed by the Executive Council now.

If you wish to do that, and I will not argue against it, you certainly may, but I would like to point out that there is some undesirable aspects to passing legislation on a quick amendment thrown up in the air, batted around with not too much discussion of fact against the committee who has put in months of work on it.

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I don't think that the amendment that was offered by my good friend from Windham, Mr. Peterson, was hastily offered or was it thrown up in the air. I think that the House expressed itself quite well the other day with the dissatisfaction of the fact that this wasn't included in the Executive Council bill to begin with.

I don't want to shock my good friend from Gorham, Mr. Quinn, but I might address myself to the House that the very able gentleman who offered the amendment isn't here. Even though that happens to be a fact, I think the vote that was expressed the other day pertaining to this amendment should clearly put the gentleman at ease to the fact in what direction this House wants to go with this particular amendment. I would ask the House to oppose the gentleman's motion and leave the amendment tacked on the bill, where it is right now.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Berwick, Mr. Goodwin.

Mr. GOODWIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate what my good friend from Bangor just said. If the House wishes to seriously debate this issue, I would hope that we could table it, since the good gentleman from Windham, Mr. Peterson, is unable to be here because his wife is in the hospital having a baby, and I think it is something that he should at least have a say in if we are seriously going to debate this.

I guess what I would like to ask is for a division on this question and if it is going to be close, perhaps we could table this until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Gorham, Mr. Quinn, that House Amendment "F" be indefinitely postponed in concurrence. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

Whereupon, Mr. Goodwin of South Berwick requesting a roll call vote.

The SPEAKER: 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.

Subsequently, Mr. Quinn of Gorham withdrew his motion to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "F".

Thereupon, House Amendment "F" was adopted.

The Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" as amended by Senate Amendment "A" thereto and House Amendments "A", "B", "C", "E", and "F" and Senate Amendment "B" and Senate Amendment "C" as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

On motion of Mr. Perkins of Blue Hill, the House voted to take from the table the following matter which was recalled from the Governor:

An Act Relating to Employment of Drug Inspectors by the State Board of Pharmacy (H. P. 1879) (L. D. 2054) (C "A" H-957) — In House, Passed to be Enacted March 16. — In Senate, Passed to be Enacted in concurrence March 16. (Recalled by Joint Order H. P. 2242)

On motion of Mr. Perkins of Blue Hill, under suspension of the rules, the House reconsidered its action whereby the Bill was passed to be enacted.

On motion of the same gentleman, was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Perkins of Blue Hill was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. PERKINS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Thank you for allowing me this magnificent persuade of parliamentary procedure. This bill was to allow the Commission of Pharmacy to employ drug inspectors, and the gentleman on the second floor had some opposition because it created a precedent in that it removed this position from the personnel group. The Personnel Division, after a conference with myself and some others on the second floor, found it was possible to create a position that was commensurate with the position and thus a salary that was commensurate and could hire inspectors and by calling and checking this afternoon, I find that this has in fact been done and that now this bill is no longer necessary.

The Chair laid before the House the following matter:

Bill "An Act to Clarify the Election Laws" (H. P. 2293) (L. D. 2344) which was tabled earlier in the day and later today assigned, pending passage to be engrossed.

On motion of Mrs. Boudreau of Portland, retabled pending passage to be engrossed and later today assigned.

On motion of Mr. Rolde of York,  
Recessed until the sound of the gong.

After Recess  
5:30 p.m.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chair laid before the House the following matter:

Bill "An Act to Clarify the Election Laws" (H. P. 2293) (L. D. 2344) which was tabled earlier in the day and later today assigned, requesting passage to be engrossed.

On motion of Mrs. Boudreau of Portland tabled pending passage to be engrossed and tomorrow assigned.

The following item appearing on Supplement No. 5 was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act to Revise and Reallocate Appropriations from the General Fund for the Expenditures of State Government for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1976 and June 30, 1977 and Changing Certain Provisions of the Law Necessary to the Proper Operations of State Government" (Emergency) (S. P. 790) (L. D. 2341)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Second Reading and read the second time.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We are going to attempt to send Report A to the Senate tonight in non-concurrence in hopes that we can get into a Committee of Conference situation as soon as possible to expedite the remaining business of this legislature.

I would urge you to let this thing go along. We have had some discussions earlier on today with those who have some differences with Report A, but I think now there is a general agreement that Report A should be sent along without amendments to the Senate in order to get the Conference Committee set up.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nobleboro, Mr. Palmer.

Mr. PALMER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Differing from the debate this morning, I would concur wholeheartedly with the remarks of the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft and would hope that we would expedite matters and send Report A long.

Mr. Norris of Brewer presented House Amendment "G" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "G" (H-1228) was read by the Clerk.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Goodwin of South Berwick, House Amendment "G" was indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Before this is passed to be engrossed, I would like to have someone indicate to me why I should not, or maybe others, offer amendment at this time to give guidance to the Conference Committee? There are issues that some people consider objectionable in this particular proposal and I

wonder if anyone such as the House Chairman of the Appropriations Committee could indicate why there would be any confusion in adding amendments at this time to give the Conference Committee guidance as to the intentions of this House?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Henderson, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Smith, who may respond if he so desires.

The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It was a concern among many members of the legislature we are getting bogged down and that the Conference Committee, if it is formed, in fact, is going to be the vehicle by which the policy is going to be set.

There are a great number of amendments that various people have suggested they would like to offer and our only suggestion is that in order to expedite the thing, get into a Committee of Conference we do it without amendments. Obviously, there is one gentleman here who doesn't share my feeling but it is simply a time consideration at this point.

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

Mr. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to pose a further question and that is, if this were to go to a Committee of Conference and the amendments that some of us would prefer did not come out of that conference, I am wondering if it would then be in a position to be amended at all, whether these amendments would be possible and, secondly, whether those members of the Committee of Conference I would hope would consult with those of us who would like to offer amendments so that that Conference Committee can come up with some favorable report. I would like to ask whether there could be amendments offered at a later time?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Henderson, that if the Committee of Conference were not acceptable to the members of the House, they could move to reject the conference report and go back to another conference and that direction would obviously have to be followed by the new Committee of Conference. When the Committee of Conference comes in with the conference report, there are only two motions that can be made, the motion to accept the conference report or the motion to reject the conference report. However, if it is rejected, then, obviously, additional comments would stand to what the next conference committee would want to have transpire.

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

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Isn't it possible that the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Henderson, might meet with the committee and suggest these and they could be put in at the time of the Committee of Conference? I know we have done it in past years gone by, if you will remember. It saves a lot of time that way.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would answer in the affirmative, that that would be possible.

Thereupon, the Bill passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

On motion of Mr. Strout of Corinth the House reconsidered its action whereby Bill "An Act Correcting Errors and Inconsistencies in Motor Vehicle Related Laws" (Emergency) (H. P. 2270) (L. D. 2337) was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "B".

On further motion of the same gentleman, the House reconsidered its action whereby House Amendment "B" was adopted.