

# 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 First Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

VOLUME II

MAY 10 - JUNE 22, 1963

and

SPECIAL SESSION

JAN. 6 - JAN. 17, 1964

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

**SENATE**

Friday, June 7, 1963

Senate called to order by the President.

Prayer by the Rev. Edward F. Allen of Augusta.

On motion by Mr. Campbell of Kennebec, the Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

The PRESIDENT: Will young David Jacques please stand?

The Senate is happy indeed to welcome young David Jacques to the Senate Chamber. Of course he is the son of the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Jacques. We are pleased to appoint him an honorary page for the day. (Applause)

The PRESIDENT: Would the Sergeant-at-Arms please escort the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Edmunds to the well of the Senate Chamber?

Mr. Edmunds was escorted to the well of the Senate Chamber by the Sergeant-at-Arms.

The PRESIDENT: We have been informed that even senators from Aroostook have birthdays and that this is yours. We won't even inquire as to how many years old you are. You have heard many adjectives used in connection with your name, most of which are complimentary. You have been called the workhorse of the session, you certainly have been the wheelhorse, and some day you may be a dark horse. But, regardless of all of these things, you have gained the respect of everybody for your ability.

Enough of this serious conversation. We are aware of your illness and how it has caused you discomfort. We hope there will not be a recurrence, but to assist you in finishing the days of this session with the residual effect of your illness we have a gift for you. Will the pages please present the gift. We all say, "Happy Birthday", Perrin. (A pause)

Mr. EDMUNDS: Thank you very kindly.

Mr. Edmunds of Aroostook was granted unanimous consent to address the Senate.

Mr. EDMUNDS: First, Mr. President, I thought I had kept my birthday a secret and I am surprised

that somebody found out that I am 98 years old today, but I certainly do appreciate the consideration of my colleagues in recognizing the fact this morning, and I want you to know that I thank each and every one of you very, very much.

I did have some other remarks to make, which is the reason why I asked unanimous consent to briefly address the Senate.

When the announcement was made yesterday that we would not have a Monday afternoon session it was the thinking of the leadership that the House would be out in sufficient time yesterday afternoon so that the Appropriations Committee could meet and finalize the supplemental budget and the supplemental budget could be ready to be in the House this morning. It was a physical impossibility for the budget office to do the necessary work in making the necessary revisions and getting it printed, so it became apparent that it could not be in the House until this coming Monday. For that reason, and also because of the fact that we have many conference committees who have indicated that they want to work Monday afternoon to resolve disagreeing actions, it has become necessary to change the schedule so that we will have a session at four o'clock on Monday afternoon.

Mr. President, under suspension of the rules I present an order and move its passage.

On motion by Mr. Edmunds of Aroostook, out of order and under suspension of the rules,

ORDERED, the House concurring, that when the Senate and House adjourn, they adjourn to meet on Monday, June 10 at four o'clock in the afternoon. (S. P. 619)

Which was read and passed.

Sent forthwith to the House for concurrence.

**House Papers****Non-concurrent matter**

Bill, "An Act Relating to Matching State Funds with Local Chambers of Commerce to Obtain New and Aid Expansion of Present Industries." (S. P. 47) (L. D. 97)

In Senate, June 4, Bill Substituted for the Report, June 5, passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-265)

Comes from the House, Reports and Bill indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Lovell of York, the Senate voted to insist on its former action and ask for a Committee of Conference.

Bill, "An Act Relating to Establishment of a Personnel Law for Certain Employees of the City of Lewiston." (H. P. 544) (L. D. 801)

In House, June 3, passed to be engrossed.

In Senate, June 4, indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

Comes from the House, that body having insisted and asked for a Committee of Conference.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Couture of Androscoggin, the Senate voted to adhere.

Bill, "An Act Relating to Deficiency Appropriation for Division of Veterans Affairs." (H. P. 407) (L. D. 560)

In House, June 3, passed to be engrossed.

In Senate, June 4, Ought not to pass report accepted in non-concurrence.

Comes from the House that body having insisted and asked for a Committee of Conference.

In the Senate, that body voted to insist and join in the Committee of Conference. The President appointed as Senate conferees: Senators Campbell of Kennebec, Brown of Hancock and Edmunds of Aroostook.

Bill, "An Act to Reorganize the Department of Economic Development." (H. P. 1089) (L. D. 1561)

In House, June 3, passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A.

In Senate, June 5, passed to be engrossed without Amendment, in Non-concurrence.

Comes from the House, that body having insisted and asked for a Committee of Conference.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Lovell of York, the Senate voted to insist on its former action and join in the Committee of Conference. The President appointed as Senate conferees: Senators; Kimball of Hancock, Noyes of Franklin and Lovell of York.

Mr. Edmunds of Aroostook presented the following Joint Resolution:

#### STATE OF MAINE

In the Year of our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred and Sixty-three.

JOINT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO EXEMPT CERTAIN CARRIERS FROM MINIMUM RATE REGULATION IN THE TRANSPORTATION OF BULK COMMODITIES, AGRICULTURAL AND FISH PRODUCTS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

We, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the One Hundred First Legislative Session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your Honorable Body as follows:

WHEREAS, it has been recognized that the agricultural economy of the country requires the transportation of bulk agricultural commodities at the lowest possible rates consistent with the financial status of the carriers; and

WHEREAS, the nation's railroad carriers have heretofore been hampered in the setting of minimum rates for the transportation of bulk agricultural commodities by reason of time consuming and arbitrary standards imposed by the Interstate Commerce Commission; and

WHEREAS, it is absolutely essential for the continued development of agricultural production in the State of Maine that the producers of agricultural products be able to reduce transportation costs on feed and other ingredients; and

WHEREAS, other agricultural areas of the country are now the recipients of greatly reduced transportation costs of such ingredients to the detriment of and discrimination against Maine agricultural producers; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That we, the Memorialists, recommend and urge to the Congress of the United States that the document entitled Eighty-Eighth Congress First Session H.R. 4700, a bill to obtain the aforesaid objectives, be passed by the Congress in order to accomplish the aforesaid objectives; and be it further

RESOLVED; That a copy of this Memorial, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be immediately submitted by the Secretary of State to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress and to the members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State. (S. P. 618)

Which was read and adopted.  
Sent down for concurrence.

**Committee Reports — House**

**Conference Committee Report**

The Conference Committee on the disagreeing action of the two branches of Legislature on Bill, "An Act to Create a Mount Desert Island Regional School District." (H. P. 475) (L. D. 678) reported that the House reconsider its action whereby it passed the bill to be engrossed; Adopt Conference Committee Amendment "A" and pass the bill to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" and Conference Committee Amendment "A", and that the Senate recede from its action whereby it passed the Bill to be engrossed; Indefinitely postpone Committee Amendment "A"; adopt House Amendment "A"; adopt Conference Committee Amendment "A", and pass the bill to be engrossed, as amended by House Amendment "A" and Conference Committee Amendment "A" in concurrence.

In the Senate, the report was accepted and the Senate voted to recede from its former action, to indefinitely postpone Committee Amendment A, to adopt House Amendment A and Conference Committee Amendment A, and to pass the bill to be engrossed in concurrence.

**Leave to Withdraw**

The Committee on Constitutional Amendments and Legislative Reapportionment on Resolve, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Relating to Power of Governor to Nominate and Appoint Civil and Judicial Officers. (H. P. 989) (L. D. 1432) reported that the same should be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The same Committee on Resolve, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Clarifying the Manner of Authorizing the Issuance of Bonds on Behalf of the State. (H. P. 994)

(L. D. 1441) reported that the same should be granted Leave to Withdraw.

The same Committee on Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Relating to the Apportionment, Election and Powers of the House of Representatives. (H. P. 1029) (L. D. 1494) reported that the same should be granted Leave to Withdraw.

Which reports were read and accepted in concurrence.

Mr. PORTEOUS of Cumberland: Mr. President, this item 6-4 is a bill that was presented by a member of the other body in relation to apportionment in the House of Representatives. Now just because leave has been given to withdraw I would not want you to believe that our committee is not going to do something about this problem, and I would assure you that very soon in the next couple of legislative days you will have before you for your consideration an alternate plan to this particular L.D. for reapportionment in the House of Representatives.

**Majority — Ought to Pass  
Minority — Ought Not to Pass**

The Majority of the Committee on Taxation on Bill, "An Act Increasing Sales Tax. (H. P. 313) (L. D. 406) reported that the same Ought to pass.

(Signed)

Senators:

WYMAN of Washington  
BROWN of Hancock

Representatives:

WATERMAN of Auburn  
WOOD of Brooks  
ALBAIR of Caribou  
BROWN of Fairfield  
JONES of Farmington

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported that the same Ought not to pass.

(Signed)

Senator:

LETOURNEAU of York

Representatives:

COTTRELL of Portland  
AYOUB of Fort Fairfield.

Comes from the House — Passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate:

Mr. WYMAN of Washington: Mr. President, I move that we accept the Majority "Ought to pass" report of the committee and I would like to speak briefly.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator may proceed.

Mr. WYMAN: Mr. President and members of the Senate: This legislature has adopted a current services budget which will require an additional tax. With this I think we are all agreed. Now in theory there are several ways in which we can accomplish this. We can accomplish a part of it at least with an income tax or with the elimination of the automobile trade-in exemption or the elimination of the exemption on food, and possibly by eliminating some other exemptions. However, while the honorable House of Representatives has not embraced the sales tax bill with open arms it has shown a very definite dislike for these other measures. As I recall, they defeated a motion to recall the income tax from the files by something like a two to one vote, and yesterday it showed a very definite dislike for these other suggestions such as the elimination of the exemption on food or the elimination of the exemption on automobile trade-ins. Therefore, it seems to me that if we are going to face our responsibilities the alternative which we have had and the only practical one is to pass this four per cent sales tax, and I certainly hope that we will accept the committee report and pass the bill, as one member of the body said yesterday: "Pass the bill and get the thunder home."

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Washington, Senator Wyman, that we accept the majority "Ought to pass" report of the committee.

Mr. LOVELL of York: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I would like to move at this time indefinite postponement of this bill and speak to the motion.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator may proceed.

Mr. LOVELL: Mr. President and members of the Senate: On this morning here I certainly would like

to do the good Senator from Aroostook, Senator Edmunds, a favor on his birthday and see this bill indefinitely postponed, so he can go back to Aroostook County with some safety. I know in my own particular case I would hardly dare to go back to York County without some discussion on this bill. I have three alternative proposals that I would like to make, and, as the good Senator from Washington, Senator Wyman, has stated, we have passed the current services budget and without question more funds are needed. I do not feel that the front office or any member of this Senate or the other body is so narrow-minded that they cannot work out different propositions that will bring the needed and desired money in to the State of Maine coffers.

We have to make different decisions on matters of taxation but I will speak for York and Cumberland County, the southern part of the State. It is their feeling — and I have had hundreds of letters and contacts — that due to our location this is going to hurt appreciably our three hundred million dollar tourist business. In addition to that, it can well hurt our industrial development program in the State of Maine with this open, evident tax.

I am a merchant and I have listened to the merchants kick ever since this tax went in. I am getting so that when I go back to Sanford all I do is spent my time in my pharmacy listening to people kick about the sales tax.

Now we agree that certain taxes are needed to balance this budget, but my preference would be a tax that was a hidden tax where you would not have to defend it every time somebody comes in to make a purchase. I have heard all kinds of sarcastic remarks, and I won't repeat some of them, about this legislature and past legislatures and persons in the front office, because if I should repeat some of those remarks it would be asked that they be stricken from the record.

Eighty per cent of our tourist business comes from Massachusetts where they have no sales tax. We have a good many people from New Hampshire come into Maine. New Hampshire has no sales tax. If the transient rental tax along with this

goes to four per cent it is certainly going to hurt our over-all business and this tax could be very, very detrimental to the entire State.

Now I do not need to tell you the condition of Maine. I have already told you that several times and you folks already know it. I simply mention that Maine had the highest percentage rise in bankruptcies last year.

Now the people that have been for this tax, and I have talked with many, are in the great minority, and they seem to be people who without question are going to benefit from higher wages or from their efforts or that of some member of their family, such as a teacher in an institution, consequently they want better services.

Now just briefly to go to the current services budget: here again I do not need to tell you that this budget has doubled since 1951, and yet while we have increased our education costs some twenty per cent we are still way down the line on education. Our teachers colleges are full, the University of Maine is full. They have no problem on getting jobs when they get through college. 77 per cent of the University of Maine students graduating last year left the state. There is no problem on their getting jobs. But with a high sales tax this could hurt our over-all work in Maine for tourism and industrial development, the methods and means that will bring money into the State of Maine.

We have had, without question, a vicious cycle of inflation. We have had constant rises for state employees, teachers, all down the line, so that personal services in our over-all budget have been greatly increased every biennium. We are now at the point where nationwide one out of every seven workers are working for the local, state or federal government. We do not question that the property tax is too high in communities and they are faced with a tremendous problem there.

It is the feeling of many that now the State should become business-like and spend what they estimate they are going to earn in the next biennium and not for every department to come in with all the possible services and raises they can

think of to add to their budget so they can increase and call it their current services budget every other biennium. We have got to a point where people, if we increase taxes, will not be able to have the necessities of life. It is the feeling of many that the department heads should come in and sit down with the Governor and say, "Here is the amount of money we estimate we will be able to spend in the next two years without raising taxes."

We have had a one per cent increase in population a year. With a tax increase it can be a good deal worse than that, particularly with this sales tax. The extra money that we have voted for industrial and recreational development in this body to bring in more industries, more payrolls, more tourists, more jobs, from which more taxes could be collected — in most cases these have been defeated. We certainly need more money for vocational education.

I propose some tax alternatives this morning, because I feel that at coming sessions of the legislature we just cannot continue to increase taxes. Whether I am here or whoever is here, it is up to us to see that we go along on a businesslike basis and spend what we earn, the way most of you ladies and gentlemen have to do in your own business. We have had constant increases in salaries in colleges, in the University of Maine, right down the line. Maybe these increases are worth while, maybe they are deserved, but the time has come when we should definitely make up our minds to live within our income.

Now we have passed the current services budget and there are some very worthy L.D.'s on the table, so I propose through these alternative tax proposals — as I say, it might cause a little extra work for the Committee on Taxation to analyze them carefully, but I don't think an extra day or two in this session if we could prevent going from a three to a four per cent sales tax, would be very detrimental, because the people of the State would be very happy.

Now I will suggest that if the Senate, or the leadership, feels that

these proposals are worthy of talking about then I would hope that we would resolve ourselves into a committee of the whole to talk over these proposals in private.

The first tax that I would suggest is to entirely eliminate the sales tax. This fuss and kick on the sales tax is not conducive — not only to our merchants collecting this tax but to our tourists and our manufacturers — so instead of this I would suggest that we have a two per cent gross receipts tax. Now there are seven states at the present time that have a gross receipts tax. And this could include professional men as well as regular businesses because professional men are not hit by the personal property tax as much as many of us who are in business. And we could allow the businesses to up their prices on fair-traded articles two per cent. Now this tax would be hidden, so that an article you ordinarily sold for 95 cents if you marked it 97 cents you wouldn't have that fuss and kick, and have to listen to all that argument not only from the tourists but the local people. You wouldn't have the problem that we have in Maine of people traveling over to New Hampshire to eliminate paying the sales tax; it would be included in the price of the item. I have talked with many people on it. Last week, for instance, I sold a bottle of mouth wash for 97 cents and there was a 3 cents sales tax to add onto it, and the gentleman kicked a little bit and he said, his words were, "Well, you still insist on feeding the Governor's horses." I said, "No, this is for education, this is for our whole program." But you get that type of remark. I said, "You wouldn't have noticed this if I sold it to you for a dollar?" and he says, "No, I would have had no thought about it at all."

Now this would bring in over forty million dollars a year, I am told, and this would prevent all of this fuss, so I think this tax could well be an excellent tax.

Now the sales tax, in communities like Portland and Sanford, where education and other expenses have gotten to an all-time high, could be put on for Portland, if they so

wished, a 2 per cent sales tax to raise extra money, and that would open the door for them. It might not be a good tax but it would open the door for them.

Now my next alternative proposal would be somewhat similar. That is the elimination of automobile trade-ins. We don't allow a reduction on trade-ins on any other appliances such as refrigerators and washing machines, and naturally it is a discriminative tax. This would amount to some three million dollars in the biennium. And then a tax which York County people seem to feel would be an excellent tax, and that is a head tax. Now New Hampshire has a head tax and it brings in 1.3 million to them a year, perhaps not as much as they would like to hope for, but a ten-dollar head tax in Maine with all the exemptions would bring us in five million dollars a year. The people in my county seem to feel, being near New Hampshire, that this is a good tax, this head tax.

Also New Hampshire has a tax which brings them in 1.6 million a year, and according to statistics which have been presented to me this would bring in two million in Maine, and this is a tax on the person who has dividends, bonds, savings accounts and interest, with the exemptions suggested.

It is interesting to note at the last session — you have voted against annual sessions, and that is all right — but the fact sheet stated that two years ago the departments turned back an average of a million and a half dollars a year and we underestimated surplus by two and a half million a year. Now by upping our projection, with the previous taxes I have mentioned, and, if so desired, adding on a one per cent real estate tax so that on a ten thousand dollar home the tax would be a hundred dollars, fifty dollars being paid by the purchaser and fifty dollars by the seller — or take the over-all taxes that Maine has at the present time — and that would include marking up liquor two per cent more, which would be a very small amount, add half a cent on a package of cigarettes — in most cases you would not even



up the price of the cigarettes — we added eight cents a gallon on beer two years ago, from sixteen to twenty-four cents, and you could add another cent on that, add one per cent on the pari-mutuel take, the over-all take, not to burden them because they are ready to fold anyway in most cases — we just don't have the money around in Maine except in the summer time — up the inheritance tax one per cent, up the insurance tax a quarter to a half per cent — wild lands went up two per cent last year, put on another cent — this plus the transfer of real estate tax would bring you sufficient money to take care of the expenses of the state. Also the Park Department is 60 per cent self-supporting, in other words they return sixty per cent of their money invested back each year, and they could up their prices a little bit so that they could well be self-supporting. And possibly you could do the same thing on Sea and Shore Fisheries. Inland Fisheries and Game is at the present time financing their own program, and with a little additional or licenses or extra licenses, Sea and Shore Fisheries might well become self-supporting. And, as the front office has said, possibly here is a time to raise the gas tax half a cent. He doesn't like bonding on the highways and this might be the opportune time to do that.

I will say in closing, no doubt this will be extra work for the taxation committee but I think the over-all effect on the people of Maine by having the sales tax eliminated, having a two per cent gross receipts tax, where the merchants once a month would sit down and make out their checks and not go through the complicated form that they have to now in collecting the tax and so on down the line, I think that this would prevent that tremendous amount of fuss, kick and worry when people make their purchases, I think we would keep our business in the State and I think it would be conducive to the summer business if we could come out with the fact in the headline that Maine has eliminated their sales tax and gone onto a gross receipts tax.

Thank you for your courtesy in listening, and I hope that you will

go along with my motion to indefinitely postpone this bill.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from York, Senator Lovell, that the report and bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. EDMUNDS of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I think that the remarks of the Senator from Washington, Senator Wyman, when he moved to accept the majority "Ought to pass" report of the Taxation Committee clearly indicate the intent of this legislature. We have had a number of tax measures before us, alternative tax measures to the one per cent increase in the sales tax, and I think it is fair to say that they have all had a fair trial, a fair hearing before the committee and thoroughly debated on the floor of both branches and they have been defeated, so I think this is perhaps the only realistic tax measure that we have left that will adequately fund the current services and supplemental budgets as they are reported from the Appropriations Committee and the many worthy L.D.'s which now lie upon the special appropriations table.

As to the package which has just been proposed by the Senator from York, Senator Lovell, which I will review very briefly, I think I would say that it is somewhat irresponsible. 1. To eliminate the sales tax altogether, which provides so many millions of revenue so far as the State is concerned, and then go to a two per cent gross receipts tax, eliminate automobile trade-ins, a two per cent tax on liquor, put a half a cent tax on cigarettes, put an eight cent tax on beer, to further dip into the pari-mutuel betting when, as he indicated, many of our tracks are at the point where they are ready to fold, up the inheritance tax by one per cent when this is the only tax that is currently keeping the State of Maine in the black, to add to the insurance tax by a quarter to a half of one per cent, to increase the tax on wild lands, and we did that at the last session, to increase prices at the State Parks when we are advertising and he is supporting bills to advertise to get people to come to those parks to help reinforce the economy here in

the State, and to increase license fees, etc. as far as Sea and Shore Fisheries are concerned when every day when we look in the newspaper there is further indication of the financial problems in that industry, to me it is completely ridiculous.

The colleague of mine who has just spoken for these various tax measures has at this session of the legislature and at the last session of the legislature introduced literally millions of dollars worth of special L.D.'s, millions of dollars worth of bond issues, and he stands here now and proposes that we start practicing economy here within the State of Maine and live within our means. At the risk of being out of order, I will just make the comment that the good Senator is being entirely inconsistent.

Mr. President, I would certainly hope that the motion that the sales tax increase be indefinitely postponed would not prevail and when the vote is taken I would request a division.

Mrs. CHRISTIE of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I recall very clearly attending a meeting of the Taxation Committee a few months ago and I heard the Chairman of that committee say, "I notice that nobody has made any complaint about the appropriations that have been made and now you come in here and find your way to criticize the taxes that are proposed." I feel that we need fiscal responsibility. As I remember it, there was not a voice raised against the current services budget when it came into the Senate. If we are going to finance that budget we have to have money and that money must come from taxation. Nobody likes taxes. I have talked with people at home and they say, "Oh, I hope you do not put that one per cent increase on the sales tax." I say, "Well, you want the vocational school, don't you?" "Well, yes." And so they say no more. I feel that we have to accept our responsibility: if we are going to have these services we must have the taxes to carry out these services. I feel that this is a fair tax, it is a tax which is assessed against everyone who buys the things that are under this sales tax. I think that is fair. The people who perhaps spend the most

on the sales tax are the people with large families, and you might say it is not fair that they be taxed, but are not those the people who are getting the services. My family, consisting of myself alone, is not benefitting very much from the services that are offered by the State. I feel that everyone should bear his part of the responsibility, and I feel that this is as fair a tax as we can have and I am in favor of it.

Mr. PIKE of Oxford: Mr. President and fellow Senators: We heard yesterday that the good Senator from York was twenty years ahead of his time. Perhaps he is thirty years ahead of some of us. We can understand how he feels, being down next to the New Hampshire line, but I am sure that some of the things which you buy in New Hampshire are not tax-free. I had occasion within six months of buying an automobile at the Mountain Motors in Conway, because I thought I could do a little better there. I knew that I had got to pay a tax on it. They did license it here before I did pay the tax but they sent me a bill and I paid the tax on it just the same as if I bought it in Maine.

Back a few weeks ago when they were having quite a controversy over at the other end of the corridor on the current services budget one of the prominent businessmen back home told me to come down and pass that budget and increase the sales tax, that the folks wanted the services and they were willing to pay for them. I know our good Senator from York is a druggist, and when I came down Monday I stopped at one of the principle druggists in Norway and asked him how he felt about this sales tax. He told me he didn't believe it would make a mite of difference in his business, he was willing to accept it and have the services.

Our good Senator from York has spoken about it hurting the summer business. I have been in the tourist business, this is going to be 37 years, and it is very seldom that anyone has said a word about the tax. And when this rental tax came on, I have never heard one word said against it by any of my guests,

and I do not believe the State over this sales tax increase would hurt a particle.

Mr. COUTURE of Androscoggin: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I rise here this morning to support the indefinite postponement, and I rise in opposition to increasing the sales tax to four per cent. I am going to vote against increasing the sales tax as I have been in opposition to the sales tax since it was first proposed here in the State if Maine years back when I was a member of the House. Again I would like to say to this Senate that even when my own party was in the corner office and they wanted to increase it from two to three per cent I stood up on my feet in opposition to it. Certainly I can not vote for a four per cent sales tax at this time, and I am not going to stand here and vote any four per cent sales tax on the people of the State of Maine with my vote.

They have mentioned the current services budget that we have passed. The debate in this Senate wasn't too great as far as the current services budget, I believe, for the reason it would just have taken more time to debate that matter, which I could. Yes, I can see what we are facing here. Now in the current services budget in the other body when it was fought there they proposed to cut what would really hurt the needy people of this State right in the heart. They started hitting the Welfare Department. To put on a four per cent sales tax onto people who are not able to even pay a three per cent sales tax to be able to pass this current services budget, is hitting these people right in the heart. Here on the floor of the Senate when this session started, with the increase for State employees and the department increases, and going along with longer sessions I could see that more money would be needed, and time and time again I felt that if it was agreeable to the legislature here to increase our department heads and our state employees, by checking down the line I found that our needy people in the State do not have enough to live on. Fortunately they are either on one pension or another, either

they are on the Old Age Assistance or they are on ADC or the totally disabled or the blind in this State. At that time I introduced a piece of legislation to increase ten per cent across the board, so in case this four per cent sales tax goes through they would at least have this ten per cent increase in their pension instead of trying to take another cent away from them which they cannot afford to pay, but the bill came out unanimously ought not to pass and was thrown in the wastebasket.

Along the line with this increase in Welfare, it was proven that the matter would cost \$450,000 to the State to do so. Also I tried to prove to them that the federal aid on this matter would mean \$550,000 toward that \$450,000, but still that wasn't enough and they threw it out. I have proposed a bill on the tax at the mutual windows at the races, to increase it so we would have the revenue to take care of this \$450,000. There was enough pressure in the committee so the bill came out unanimously "Ought not to pass, although most of them were aware of the reason the bill was introduced because I made it known. So when the debate really got hot at the other end of the hall that is just what they did. Now our debate is on the floor of the Senate. I know what they are going after now. In the other branch it was education, welfare, everything that could possibly hit everybody hard. Now the only salvation out of this is food, again hitting the people with families who cannot afford to pay even the three per cent sales tax. But I haven't seen anybody, either in this branch take any stand on doing away with some exemptions in that sales tax for the needy people in this state. Anybody in this House would know that a man and his wife, and we will say another one in the family besides, or even two, a total of four in the family, will never get an where near what a family of eight or nine or ten would with only one person earning a living for that family. In no way can we take this under consideration. I remember back some years I tried to have an amendment to exempt clothing from

the sales tax, clothing of children going to school. That was a step to relieve the burden at least on clothing and shoes for children under thirteen years of age. That was not accepted and went in the wastebasket. My eyes were peeking down through at the people who cannot afford to pay. I said it before and I am going to say it again.

I cannot face people on state welfare today, the ones on aid to the blind, the totally disabled or whatever pension they have had and say, "With no increase on what you get, we want one more percent out of you. Then we will give you your check on one hand and take it back with the other hand."

What are we trying to do here? Do you think it is fair to give it to them with one hand and take it away from them with the other? You want to think about that. I am sure that there isn't a member in this Senate here in whatever County they represent, that they don't know of some cases where the people have pensions and what they do receive to live in this world is not even enough to spend half as happy a life as they should. Still you are going to tax them another penny on the sales tax. You know they can't afford to pay the three percent. They seem to be forgotten. I am not going to vote for indefinite postponement at this time but I am going to vote against on a future motion the increase in the sales tax in the condition that it is now. All of you here, I don't care which one of you it is, in one way or another is looking toward his own business as far as taxes and being exempt.

Again I say we spend thousands and thousands of dollars for education. This is a matter I have preached in my own town. But there is nothing done for the family that can't afford to send their children to school. It is only for people who can send their children to school. Those that have a large family and have a burden of taxes, they can only go as far as high school and then they have to go to work. And speaking through experience, I am one of the children out of 21 in my family and I didn't go to college, no I didn't. And the reason I didn't go to college was because I had to go

out and work and help my parents and help to feed the rest of the family. These things I had to go through are not forgotten and they never will be forgotten as long as I live. I don't want anyone here to feel that as far as I am concerned there is nothing I would rather do in this world than go to college but my heart was doing something else. I was the third from the oldest in the family and I was facing the others behind me and I knew the income of the house and I knew we were in need. So I went to work. That is what makes me say that with all the money we spend here on education, certain ones are taken care of and others are deprived because the income is not there. We don't help the poor family as much as we do the multi-millionaire. Some way or another the poor family has to give up what they possibly would enjoy the rest of their life. And then we are going to hit these people right in the eye with another cent on the sales tax. Why can't we tax the people that can afford to pay? What is wrong with that? We are going to tax those that haven't enough income to eat three meals a day and have a decent place to live in. If we bent down and took care of these unfortunate people in the state it will be called an unfair tax. They are facing the cost of living as much as anyone in this State and what are we doing for them? Where is the increase on their pension?

I brought a young lady here about six weeks ago who was crying with tears in her eyes, she was blind at 32 years of age and her ambition is to go to school and become a teacher for the blind. You saw it in the newspaper here on a drive she did around the city of Lewiston. Her picture was there with two other blind children in our city. She cannot afford to go to school. She only wants to help the ones that she knows are miserable. I had an appeal in front of the Governor for her, and in front of the Health and Welfare. I tried everything under the sun to see that she had her desire. There is no way she can get this. And if you go through with this, she will receive the blind pension and then she will have to pay this

here. This has been the action of the legislature since I have been in the House or the Senate.

I am hoping that some of these days somebody will look after the people in this state, not only those that have it, but those that haven't got enough to live with.

Mr. JACQUES of Androscoggin: We must resist every attempt to increase the rate of our Maine state sales tax. This tax, originally proposed as a cure-all for our taxation ills has become a monster that is on the road to consuming economic expansion and recreational promotion.

Already, in a few short years, we have seen the rate upped every time some one or group sells the legislature on a cockeyed scheme for increasing the costs of government.

Any legislator in his right mind and fully informed on the facts of economic life in Maine should oppose a sales tax increase, for the cold fact is that our state is earning notoriety for being the highest taxed and the lowest income section of the United States.

We will never attract industry and business to locate here, nor will we lure the customers that will properly develop our recreational potential with a constantly increasing sales tax. The sales tax is Maine's worst advertisement. It reflects a state that is contributing to its own destruction by embracing a suicidal policy of taxing the poor and discouraging potential economic development.

With wide-spread unemployment and low wages prevalent in our state along with the insecurity and desperation of many of our fine citizens as a result, we should not talk increase in taxes and the expansion of a sales tax monster which is never satisfied and continually grows to a present point where other states use Maine as an example of why they should not embark on the tragic adventure of adopting a sales tax.

Instead of this backward step, we in the legislature should insist on greater economy, maximum efficiency and fullest utilization of every advantage contained in our governmental system.

There's much to be gained by applying soundest of business principles to our state machinery and reviewing and correcting the faulty procedures that have been created by poor management or political expediency.

An increase in sales tax is a blow to the common people of Maine. Until such a time as our workingman income in Maine has been brought up to the standard of the American way of life in the more prosperous and secure areas of our country, it would be well for us to shy away from any ill-advised attempts to further burden our people with drug-like schemes that only prescribe dangerous habit but do not offer a cure for our maladies.

Thank you very much, Mr. President, and I hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone this bill does prevail.

Mr. LOVELL of York: Mr. President, I would just like briefly to answer a couple of statements made. To the good Senator from Aroostook, Senator Edmunds. My proposals were three different type package deals which, each one, would raise sufficient money to take care of the current services and the supplemental budget, and the L.D.'s on the table. There were three different proposals. Now any one proposal that anybody was interested in, that is all right.

Now as far as tourists are concerned at State Parks or other areas, they do not mind paying a fee to park their cars or to stay overnight. That has been proved in other states, particularly in the state of Oklahoma where I visited last year. They put out revenue bond issues to develop everything from fair grounds to State Parks, and they are self reducing. I haven't asked for the practice of economy. However, I will say that all the bills I have entered have been industrial economic bills which if passed, would have meant more money in taxes to Maine, more tourists, more industry and you wouldn't have needed to raise the taxes. As far as the current services budget is concerned, we didn't debate that in the Senate. I think that most of us felt that we had to accept it. The majority was overwhelmingly against

us, and as far as Senator Pike says that automobiles require that you show that the sales tax has been paid before you can register if you buy it out of state, but that is the only article I know of. In fact, some time ago I understood that Maine was losing some 2½ million a year from people buying out of state where they could not collect the sales tax. I might also say that as far as the Maine Hotel Association is concerned, maybe the people in his area haven't kicked about the transient rental tax, but the great majority are against this increase in tax.

I might say to the good Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Couture, that indefinite postponement of this bill would only mean that then the taxation committee could come out with a concrete proposal for a tax which would not increase the sales tax but would supply the needed funds for the state to meet its obligations.

Mr. WHITTAKER of Penobscot: Mr. President and members of the Senate, it seems to me quite obvious that the increase in the sales tax is the only tax legislation which has a chance of passage in the two bodies of the legislature. However, I want to say publicly that at this time I am not prepared to vote for political expediency. I have said before and I want to say it again that I believe the time has come for the people of this state to seriously consider raising funds through an income tax which will begin to move this state ahead. Even the passage of the one cent increase in the sales tax will only maintain the status quo. It has been said more than once to this state and will be said many more times in the days to come that we do not have enough money to support the many services which have been recommended in L.D.'s. We know we are not going to have enough money to provide an adequate education for our young people. There are many other areas of need among the mentally retarded, vocational rehabilitation which we will not be able to meet, even with the passage of this bill. It has been said here that we should hide our taxes. It has also been said that no one

enjoys paying taxes. Without attempting to maintain a holier than thou attitude, this is one citizen of the state who enjoys paying taxes because I know that when taxes are paid, they go for the education of our young people; they go for the care of our mentally ill; they go for the rehabilitation of people less fortunate than we, and I think the time has come for us who are legislators to begin to educate the people of this state to the significance of tax paying as a moral responsibility.

It is on this basis that I have spoken many times publicly in many places and I speak here on behalf of an income tax which would give the privilege to pay taxes for the support of necessary services in this state to those who are best able to pay; namely, the ten percent of the families in our state who have an average gross income of \$8500 to \$15,000 and the ten percent of the families in this state who have a gross income of over \$15,000. These are the people who should be paying a fairer share of the tax responsibility in this state. And they will do this only through the payment of an income tax. I agree that the sales tax increase will work further hardship upon those least able to pay, and for this reason, among others, at the present time, I am going to vote against the sales tax increase.

Mr. CRAM of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I would like to express a regret to leadership that I do not feel that I should vote for the sales tax increase at this time. I can't agree with the last speaker that an income tax is a good thing for the State of Maine, but neither can I agree with the one cent increase in the sales tax.

I sympathize with the people in the vacation business and the retail business, especially on the borderline counties where the four percent sales tax is going to be felt. Senator Lovell's idea of a gross receipts tax is new to me and is a little interesting. I think in a tax like this that businesses in interstate commerce would be exempt, hospitals would be exempt, but that anyone rendering services to the residents

of the state of Maine and summer visitors would be included, so that many of the things now exempt in our present sales tax would be covered. It would seem to me that this would be a fair distribution of the tax and would still be pretty well distributed according to income and ability to pay. For instance, it would reach professional fees. I have no particular objection to paying a tax on my fees as an attorney if reasonable and of course every tax is passed on to the consumer eventually but a gross receipts tax would not deter the retired individual from coming into the state and buying a retirement home, as an income tax would. It would not affect the older person who has retired. The tax would be paid by people in active business.

I wish a little broader consideration could have been given to some of these alternatives in consideration of this tax earlier in the session.

Mr. WYMAN of Washington: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I think that the good Senator from Cumberland, Senator Cram hit the nail right on the head as far as considering these alternate proposals earlier in the session. While I am not in favor of an income tax and I am not in favor of a gross receipts tax, I do say that the time to have taken those up and spent time on them was earlier in the session. We did on the income tax and we turned it down and the House turned it down.

As far as remaking the whole tax structure of the state as Senator Lovell suggested, your Taxation Committee is willing to work but I think if all of us are realistic, we know that we can't do it at this late date. I do wish we could get down to facts and face realities that we will have to pass this four percent sales tax.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from York, Senator Lovell, that reports and bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. COUTURE of Androscoggin: Mr. President, with the number of Senators who are absent in the Senate today, I now move that this bill

be tabled until the next legislative day.

Mr. EDMUNDS of Aroostook: Mr. President, I request a division.

A division has been requested.

Six having voted in the affirmative and twenty-one opposed, the motion to table did not prevail.

The PRESIDENT: The question now before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from York, Senator Lovell that reports and bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. REED of Sagadahoc: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I guess it is a question of live and learn. I don't think there is anyone who wishes to go home and go to work more than I do, yet I rise this morning and ask that I be permitted to pair my vote with the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Brooks. If he were here, he would vote against indefinite postponement, and I would vote for indefinite postponement. He has been contacted this morning and this is his wish.

Mr. JACQUES of Androscoggin: Mr. President, I rise to a point of inquiry. Did the Senator notify? Did he talk with Senator Brooks by phone or in person?

The PRESIDENT: The Senate will be at ease.

Mr. JACQUES of Androscoggin: Mr. President, I withdraw my question.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Sagadahoc, Senator Reed, has requested permission to be excused from voting for the reasons stated.

Mr. COUTURE of Androscoggin: Mr. President, I can't remember in my own mind. I know there was something said but I would like to ask a question about what was mentioned here about pairing votes.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair would reply to the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Couture by saying that the rule book is blank with regard to pairing votes. However, by long tradition and custom, pairing a vote is a courtesy extended to members of both Houses of this legislature. It is urged, however, because people can legitimately change their minds, that before a request for a pairing of votes be made, that

a communication of recent origin be had in some manner between the parties, in order to determine that you are not pairing a vote with someone who voted in a particular way a matter of weeks ago and may have changed his mind since. This is only comment the Chair would have to make in this matter and continues with the suggestion that the same be carried out.

As a matter of fact, in connection with the request of the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Jacques, regarding the request of the Senator from Sagadahoc, Senator Reed, this inquiry can be answered by the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Edmunds if he chooses to answer.

Mr. EDMUNDS of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate, in answer to the parliamentary inquiry of the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Jacques, approximately five minutes before we went into session this morning, I received a phone call from the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Brooks from his office in Portland where he had a very important, previously scheduled business appointment, asking me to arrange a pair for him on the sales tax should it be before this body today, indicating that he would vote Yes on a motion to accept the Majority Ought to Pass report and that he would vote No on a motion to indefinitely postpone should such a motion be presented to this body. I feel reasonably positive that he has not changed his mind in the last hour and thirty minutes.

Mr. PORTEOUS of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I have understood this time honored custom to be a direct contact between the person pairing and the person who is absent and whose vote is being paired. If the absent Senator in question talked to a proponent of this measure, for which I know he would vote, as he has and we have had quite a bit of discussion over the period of a few years—I know how he would vote, but I don't think that it is proper for him to indicate a person who is also a proponent of the measure and have it passed on to an opponent without

direct communication between the two.

As a matter of fact I had always understood that it should be prepared in advance with the Secretary of the Senate to avoid any misunderstanding or any improper vote. We will stay here today and have work to do and we are here to vote and I don't think it is proper for leadership to round up votes like this from absentee senators. There happens to be two Senators absent today. And I would like to ask through the Chair if there is any person who would be voting against indefinite postponement would be willing to pair with these absent Senators. I would be glad to make a telephone call directly to either one of those.

Mr. REED of Sagadahoc: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I suppose maybe I was premature in accepting this. I do feel that everything is above board in this sense, however, there are other Senators who are absent and we have gotten into this wrangle. However, would it be proper at this time, since there is debate and feeling, to ask for an opinion and if a majority of the Senate members feel it should not be done then I would have to vote. I ask for a division.

The PRESIDENT: The request to be excused from voting is subject to a majority vote and a division can be requested and is now requested.

The Chair will now declare a ten minute recess.

Senate called to order by the President.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the request of the Senator from Sagadahoc, Senator Reed, that he be excused from voting in order to pair his vote with the absent Senator from Cumberland, Senator Brooks. This request, if doubted has a majority vote and a division has been requested.

Mr. EDMUNDS of Aroostook: Mr. President, before the Senate votes on this measure, may I say that it has been a long established custom for pairs to be allowed in this body where no personal contact was made



between the party pairing and the other party when he had good faith in the intermediary who arranged the pair.

Secondly it has never been custom or precedent for the pairs to be arranged through the office of the Secretary of the Senate who has informed me that in his many years of experience here, he has only once acted in that capacity and he did so at the request of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Porteous. At no other time has he been requested to undertake this. I would hope that the request of the Senator from Sagadahoc, Senator Reed would prevail.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is the request of the Senator from Sagadahoc, Senator Reed, to be excused from voting and that he be allowed to pair his vote with that of Senator Brooks of Cumberland.

A division of the Senate was had.

Twenty having voted in the affirmative and seven opposed, the request was granted.

The PRESIDENT: The question now before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from York, Senator Lovell that the reports and the bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. WYMAN of Washington: Mr. President, I request permission to pair my vote with the Senator from York, Senator Letourneau. If he were here, he would vote for indefinite postponement and I would vote against it.

The request was granted.

Mr. LOVELL of York: Mr. President, as a third party on this matter and being for the indefinite postponement, I talked about five minutes ago with Senator Noyes and he would like to vote for indefinite postponement. Would it be permissible for Senator Noyes to pair his vote with Senator Kimball who is not for indefinite postponement.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair would reply to the Senator that this is entirely up to any member of the Senate who may wish to pair his vote. This is entirely a voluntary action.

Mr. FARRIS of Kennebec: Mr. President, having no question whatsoever in regard to the good faith of the Senator from York, Senator

Lovell, I am certainly happy to make the request that my vote be paired with the Senator from Franklin, Senator Noyes. If Senator Noyes were present, he would vote for indefinite postponement. If I were to vote I would vote against indefinite postponement. Therefore I request to be excused from voting.

The request was granted.

The PRESIDENT: Is the Senate ready for the question? A division has been requested on the motion of the Senator from York, Senator Lovell, that the reports and bill be indefinitely postponed.

A division of the Senate was had.

Nine having voted in the affirmative and fifteen opposed, the motion to indefinitely postpone did not prevail.

The PRESIDENT: Is it now the pleasure of the Senate to accept the Majority Ought to Pass report?

Mr. WHITTAKER of Penobscot: Mr. President, I request a division and at the same time request to be excused from voting in order to pair my vote with the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Hinds with whom I have talked this morning. He would vote for the bill; I would vote against it.

Mr. PORTEOUS of Cumberland: Mr. President, I have purposely waited until this stage to arise and speak on this bill and see that it does pass and that it is probably inevitable as everybody has said in the last several months that it would be.

I would request serious consideration for two amendments that are on your desks, having been recently placed there. They are S-285 and S-286. One of these two amendments I would sincerely hope could be adopted and attached to L D. 406 to reduce the effect on our travel and vacation business. Now, 286 calls for the reduction of the transient rental tax from three to two percent, in the event we go to four percent, and 285 calls for holding it at three percent. I would submit to you, ladies and gentlemen that either one of these two if adopted, while not costing any measurable amount of money in terms of the \$18½ million that the one percent is supposed to raise in addition

to that already raised that the psychological —

The PRESIDENT: The Chair would respectfully interrupt the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Porteous by saying that the amendments are not now before us and his arguments are now irrelevant. The only issue before the Senate at the present time is the acceptance of the committee report. If the report is accepted and the amendments are offered, there will be ample time for debate at that time.

Mr. PORTEOUS of Cumberland: Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. REED of Sagadahoc: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I dislike starting this thing off again but I feel that I did make a bargain and therefore, I would like to pair my vote with the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Brooks. If he were here he would vote for the Ought to Pass report, and if I were to vote I would vote against it.

The request was granted.

Mr. WYMAN of Washington: Mr. President, I request to be allowed to pair my vote with the Senator from York, Senator Letourneau. If he were here he would vote against the bill. I would vote for it.

The request was granted.

Mr. WHITTAKER of Penobscot: Mr. President, I am not sure that my request was granted, may I have a ruling?

Thereupon, the request was granted.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Washington, Senator Wyman, that the Senate accept the Majority Ought to Pass report.

A division of the Senate was had.

Fifteen having voted in the affirmative and eight opposed, the Ought to Pass report was accepted and the bill read once.

Mr. PORTEOUS of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate, the reason for my urging you to adopt one or the other of these amendments — and let me say that the adoption of S-285, holding it at three percent, would cost about \$270,000 for the biennium according to figures from the office of the Bureau of Taxation as compared

with the \$18½ million to be raised by going to four percent.

When I first proposed this and it was urged by members of the leadership of the other body to make it known through the medium of the press, it was to throw this thing out to see what kind of reaction it got. I got a very favorable reaction from many people in the vacation and travel business. They felt, as I did, that this would be a good psychological move to demonstrate to the visitors whom we spend thousands of dollars attracting to the state that we do not expect them to pay for all our health and welfare and educational measures and for our institutions and that we do so through the reduction of the rate of the transient rental tax. This tax was imposed as a stopgap measure two sessions ago and it was bargained through at that time. It was unpopular. It is not a tax that a state with so much at stake in the vacation and travel business should have.

I would urge at this time the adoption of Senate Amendment A.

The Secretary read the amendment.

Mr. EDMUNDS of Aroostook: Mr. President, I request a division.

Mr. WYMAN of Washington: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I don't know just what the position of the Taxation Committee would be on this amendment. I suspect though that they would have voted on it as they did on the original sales tax bill.

It seems to me that this is just another partial exemption. We have been talking about removing exemptions and the legislature has gone on record against it. The good Senator from Cumberland, Senator Porteous, has favored removing exemptions and it does disturb me now to put another partial exemption in the sales tax and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the adoption of Senate Amendment A. A division has been requested.

A division of the Senate was had.

Seven having voted in the affirmative and nineteen opposed, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the bill was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

#### Committee Reports — Senate

##### Ought to Pass — As Amended

Mr. Boardman from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill, "An Act Amending Certain Statutes to Conform to the District Court Law." (S. P. 150) (L. D. 581) reported that the same Ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-284)

Which report was read and accepted, Committee Amendment "A" was read and adopted, and the Bill as amended, was read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

##### Conference Committee Report

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of Legislature on Bill, "An Act to Revise the Boating Law and Extend Boat Registration and Safety Law to Cover Coastal Waters." (S. P. 585) (L. D. 1542) reported that the Senate Accept the Conference Committee Report, and that the House recede and concur with the Senate and Pass the bill to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendments "A" and "B".

Which report was read and accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

##### The Committee on Bills in the Second Reading reported the following Bills:

##### House

Bill, "An Act to Provide for the Reorganization of School Administrative District No. 3." (H. P. 1101) (L. D. 1579)

Which was read a second time and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

##### Senate — As Amended

Bill, "An Act to Reactivate Maine Committee on Problems of the Mentally Retarded." (S. P. 203) (L. D. 513)

Bill, "An Act Permitting Selectmen of Certain Municipalities to Act as Voting Registrars." (S. P. 472) (L. D. 1324)

Which were read a second time and passed to be engrossed, as amended.

Sent down for concurrence.

##### The Committee on Engrossed Bills Reported as truly and strictly engrossed the following Bills:

Bill, "An Act Relating to Mileage and Expenses for Members of Legislature." (H. P. 1065) (L. D. 1531)

On motion by Mr. Edmunds of Aroostook, placed on the Special Appropriations Table pending enactment.

Bill, "An Act Providing for a Full-time Chairman of the Liquor Commission and Increasing the Compensation." (S. P. 157) (L. D. 433)

On motion by Mr. Edmunds of Aroostook, placed on the Special Appropriations Table pending enactment.

Bill, "An Act Providing for Area Directional Signs on Maine Turnpike for Andover-Rumford and Washington County Areas." (S. P. 360) (L. D. 1026)

Which was passed to be enacted.

##### Emergency

Bill, "An Act Reactivating the State Committee on Children and Youth." (H. P. 1098) (L. D. 1574)

On motion by Mr. Edmunds of Aroostook, placed on the Special Appropriations Table pending enactment.

##### Orders of the Day

The PRESIDENT: With regard to Item 1-1, Bill, "An Act Relating to Matching State Funds with Local Chambers of Commerce to Obtain New and Aid Expansion of Present Industries" (S. P. 47) (L. D. 97) the Chair appointees as Senate conferees, Senators: Lovell of York, Jacques of Androscoggin, Noyes of Franklin.

The President laid before the Senate the 1st tabled and today assigned item Conference Committee Report on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Resolve, Providing Increases in Retirement Allowances for Certain Retired Fish and Game Wardens (S. P. 255) (L. D. 629) reporting that they are Unable to Agree; tabled on May 23 by Senator Harrington of Penobscot pending acceptance.

Mrs. HARRINGTON of Penobscot: Mr. President and members of the

Senate, I move that we reject the Conference Committee report and ask for another Committee of Conference and I would like to speak on this if I may.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator may proceed.

Mrs. HARRINGTON: One of the members of the Conference Committee, who was against this bill has made a financial survey of some of these people. Out of the eighteen he has found eleven that are really in financial distress, and for that reason we would like to have a new conference committee. If these eleven are accepted, the sum would be \$26,937.31 and I have cleared this with the retirement office.

Thereupon, the Senate voted to reject the report of the Committee of Conference and to ask for a second Committee of Conference. The President appointed as conferees on the part of the Senate: Senators: Harrington of Penobscot, Boisvert of Androscoggin and Sproul of Lincoln.

The President laid before the Senate the 2nd tabled and today assigned item (H. P. 978) (L. D. 1417) Bill, "An Act Authorizing the Maine Port Authority to Establish Foreign Trade Zones in Maine"; tabled on June 6 by Senator Edmunds of Aroostook pending passage to be engrossed; the same Senator presented Senate Amendment B which was read and adopted, and the bill as amended was passed to be engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

The President laid before the Senate the 3rd tabled and today assigned item (H. P. 296) (L. D. 390) House reports from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill, "An Act to Consolidate the Universalist Church of Maine with Northeast District of the Unitarian Universalist Association": Majority report, Refer to the 102nd Legislature; Minority Report, Ought to Pass, tabled on June 6 by Senator Edmunds of Aroostook pending acceptance of either report.

Mr. STITHAM: Mr. President, I move the acceptance of the Majority report which is to refer the bill to the 102nd Legislature.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Whitaker of Penobscot, the bill was tabled pending motion by Mr. Stitham of Somerset to accept the majority report; and the bill was especially assigned for Tuesday next.

The President laid before the Senate the 4th tabled and today assigned item (H. P. 295) (L. D. 389) House reports from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill, "An Act to Consolidate the Maine Unitarian Association with Northeast District of the Unitarian Universalist Association": Majority report, refer to the 102nd Legislature; Minority report, Ought to Pass; tabled June 6 by Senator Edmunds of Aroostook pending acceptance of either report.

Mr. STITHAM of Somerset: I move acceptance of the Majority Report which is to refer to the 102nd Legislature.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Whitaker of Penobscot, the bill was tabled pending motion by Mr. Stitham to accept the Majority report, and the bill was especially assigned for Tuesday next.

Mr. FARRIS of Kennebec: Mr. President, Page 1 of today's calendar, Item 1-2, "An Act Relating to Establishing of a Personnel Law for Certain Employees of the City of Lewiston", I move that the Senate reconsider its action whereby earlier in the day we voted to adhere.

Mr. COUTURE of Androscoggin: Mr. President, I hope that this Senate will stand by their action at this morning's session.

Mr. JACQUES of Androscoggin: Mr. President, I think we have wasted enough time in this session in reconsidering things and coming back with different items, trying to put pressure on the Senators here from the other body in this building. I think that we can take care of our own linen in Lewiston and I hope that the Senate does not reconsider their action. This bill will just go into a Committee of Conference and more trouble will result and bad publicity for our city. I think that we Senators in this Senate can take care of Lewiston's affairs. I hope the Senate does not go along with reconsideration, and I ask for a division.

Mr. BOISVERT of Androscoggin: Mr. President and members of the Senate, certainly I rise in support of the motion just made. I am sorry not to go along with my two colleagues from Androscoggin county but I feel that this matter should go the course in this legislature and should end in a Committee of Conference and we should expect a report from that. For that reason I support the motion and hope the Senate will go along with the reconsideration.

Mr. JACQUES of Androscoggin: President, I hate to rise again. As you notice on this bill this morning, the Conference Committee had a Lewiston man on it and two men not from the city of Lewiston. We

have six other representatives in the other body but not one of them was put on to this Conference Committee. You take it from there and see what goes on.

Thereupon, a division of the Senate was had.

Seven having voted in the affirmative and eighteen opposed, the motion to reconsider did not prevail.

---

The adjournment order having been received from the House, read and passed in concurrence, the Senate

Adjourned until Monday, June 10 at four o'clock in the afternoon.