

# 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 Sixth  
Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

Volume III

June 6, 1973 to July 3, 1973

Index

KENNEBEC JOURNAL  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

## HOUSE

Wednesday, June 20, 1973

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. James A. Smith, Jr., of Hallowell.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

### Order Out of Order

Mr. Whitzell of Gardiner presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that Michelle Whitzell, Robbie Bergeron and George Bergeron of Gardiner be appointed Honorary Pages for today.

The Order was received out of order by unanimous consent, read and passed.

### Papers from the Senate Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Relating to Sale of Crawfish or Imitation Lobster" (S. P. 237) (L. D. 688) which the House indefinitely postponed on June 19.

Came from the Senate with that Body insisting on their action whereby they passed the Bill to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-244).

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Addison, Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS: Mr. Speaker, I move we adhere.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fryeburg, Mr. Trumbull.

Mr. TRUMBULL: Mr. Speaker, I move we insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

Thereupon, Mr. Greenlaw of Stonington requested a vote on the motion.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Fryeburg, Mr. Trumbull, that the House insist and ask for a Committee of Conference. All in favor of that motion will yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

Thereupon, Mr. LaPointe of Portland requested a roll call vote.

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 Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Garsoe.

Mr. GARSOE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: After yesterday's vote, I think my best course of action would be to stifle myself, but I would like to suggest that this is an opportunity to refer this to a committee to see if some compromise could be worked out. Because I want to point out again, if this statute is left on the books and is found unconstitutional, the very argument that was advanced for it yesterday, that it protects the lobster industry, is going to be wiped out, and the industry will then be left to the same fate of the crab industry where there will be no provision whatsoever for any manner of identification or labeling of materials, that would possibly be in competition with the lobster.

So I hope you will go along this morning with the motion to have a Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Greenlaw.

Mr. GREENLAW: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am sure it is the feeling of the members of the Marine Resources Committee, and if it isn't someone can stand up and say that I am wrong, that there is no compromise involved. It is a cut and dried matter.

I think the people behind this bill are trying to have the legislature enact a law which will prevent them from taking this issue to the courts, and I quite honestly don't know whether it is constitutional or not. I am more than willing to let the courts decide it, and if it decides that the matter is unconstitutional, we certainly can come back and present legislation that would protect the lobster industry.

I am very concerned that if crawfish — if this law is enacted, crawfish tails would be sold in the State of Maine and we would just cause enormous problems in the short lobster trade. This crawfish meat and the lobster are very similar, and if crawfish were allowed, we would see short lobsters being taken up and down the Maine coast, perhaps to the point where we might even deplete the resource. I urge you to vote no on the pending motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Southport, Mr. Kelley.

Mr. KELLEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I, too, plead with you to vote no on the pending motion. The problem is that I along with the rest of you hate to be taken. You go into a restaurant, if we pass this bill, and you will get a lobster stew that has only got a small percentage of lobster in it and a lot of much cheaper crawfish.

I have travelled out of the State of Maine and I have had Maine lobster served to me that was crawfish, and on calling the attention of the management of the restaurant in Miami, he admitted this was the case. He said that Maine lobster was too expensive to buy. But when I buy Maine lobster, I want Maine lobster and not a mixture of this crawfish.

People say you can't tell the difference, this is only partially true. My experience with crawfish is that it has the consistency of a rubber boot and just about as much taste.

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

Mr. SIMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This morning I want to address you very unofficially in my capacity. I just want to call your attention to a couple of things. I really appreciate the view of the lobstermen in this body and the people who naturally are involved in the Maine lobster industry. But to give you some personal experiences in this thing and some of the reasons why the Restaurant Association would like to be able

to use crawfish and why this opinion was sought, there is no doubt about it that if this bill passes or doesn't pass, there will be a test case taken to the courts because of it.

But a few years ago, I believe when this bill was put on the books it was the intent to protect the Maine lobster and keep it here in the State of Maine and isolate it. However, over the last few years, I really appreciate, as all of you do, that jet transportation has made an awful difference. No longer does lobster just go out of here on a truck loaded with ice and so forth, you can get them any place in the world now and any place in the United States overnight. Therefore, what has happened to the restaurant people in this state is, I know myself that time and time again in the summer, right in the height of the summer season you cannot in a good many instances buy lobster and have to stretch the lobster meat. And when you do, you find yourself in a position of being in the State of Maine that is supposed to have some kind of lobster on the menu and you can't get it. The price gets extremely high, I am sure you are all aware of what the price of lobster is today and everything else.

All the Maine restaurant people are asking is that they be allowed to place on their menu and advertising, not fooling around with any punches — I can take you to some restaurants right now that use king-size crabs in lobster stew, too, and advertise it as lobster stew. But you will find that right here in this bill, if you are using crawfish, it would be advertised as crawfish and people would know the difference. I will tell you, I agree with the gentleman from Southport, Mr. Kelley, there is not a bit of comparison, but I believe that the restaurant people ought to have the alternative to be able to use both in this state at the present time with the condition of the lobster industry the way it is.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a potato grower, I can't help feeling that the lobstermen are as inconsistent in their position on this matter as I would be if I attempted to bar Idaho potatoes from the markets of the State of Maine. I have eaten this crab, and I can't see much difference between that and lobster and I can't always get lobster if I want it and I can't always afford it if I could find it. So I think that lobster people should reconsider their position and realize that you can't keep out competitive products such as the crab meat that is in competition with lobsters any more than we can, much as we might like to, could keep out Idaho potatoes or the apple producers could keep out Washington apples. I think this is a very inconsistent position that they are taking. I hope they reconsider their position.

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

Mr. SHELTRA: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I was at Cape Cod last summer and in this particular restaurant I ordered a baked stuffed lobster. It cost me about \$12.50 and the middle of it was stuffed with crabmeat, which I readily detected. My situation on this particular bill here, it appears to me like the lobster people want both ends in the middle. They have created a tremendous outside market for their product, and by the same token, they have created a whale of a shortage here at home whereby the prices have become almost prohibitive.

I suggest to you that I believe in fair competition, and I think that we should allow the crawfish to come to Maine and let the people especially — we are always talking about the poor people. Well certainly the poor people today certainly can't afford lobster in Maine, so I say let's go along with this situation. I think it would be good for the state.

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

Mr. GAUTHIER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I had to agree with Mr. Simpson in his remarks a few minutes ago, and I would like to tell Mr. Sheltra that I didn't go to Cape Cod, I came to Augusta, and I went to two places and I bought what I thought was lobster plates and they was just a little bit of lobster, but I paid for lobster, and I had a little piece of lobster in the middle and the rest of it was all crabmeat.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunkport, Mr. Tyndale.

Mr. TYNDALE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to comment on a few of the remarks that were made by the two previous speakers. Number one, it isn't the lobsterman's fault that there is a shortage of lobsters. It just so happens that this might be blamed on a number of situations which even the Research Department of Sea and Shore Fisheries couldn't come up with an answer. However, if you do flood the market with crawfish, you are going to undermine one of the principal industries of the State of Maine which involves some 7,000 licensees. And from a pure economic viewpoint, you will not only cause a great deal of confusion along the coast, but certainly you will dishearten the 5,000 lobstermen along the coast who are already having a very difficult time in making a living.

I urge you to vote no on the pending motion.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I read and saw a picture in the paper yesterday where the head man in Russia was enjoying lobsters as served to him by the President of the United States at a dinner. I think that we are world famous for lobsters. We are not world famous for crawfish or for crab meat or what have you. We are world famous for lobsters.

I can appreciate the fact that the lobsters are high. I can also appreciate the fact that some of

the boys in Aroostook County hang onto their potatoes this time of year, those who have got some left, and that is getting to be almost as expensive as lobsters, so expensive that as a matter of fact I have asked the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Parks, to bring me some potatoes so that I could plant some in my garden this year. It is a toss up between potato prices and lobster prices. As far as I am concerned, let's not lose our reputation of being lobsterland. As far as potatoes are concerned, you can go into several restaurants and where they will say Idaho potatoes, but they are really serving Maine potatoes.

I can recall many years ago going into a hotel and going into the kitchen, I was that infuriated, because it showed on the menu Idaho potatoes in Boston. I went into the kitchen, and mind you I saw some bags labeled Maine. They didn't have an Idaho potato in the place, but they were better, and there certainly is no comparison between our fine potatoes in Maine and the Idaho potatoes. Let's not lose our identity with lobsters.

The only thing I can say to my very dear friend Mr. Sheltra, knowing him as I know him — I mean, I know that he picks up the tab and at \$12.50 per, it didn't bother him any. It is the same thing I have to pay when I go to Shawmut Inn at \$12.50 per, plus, and it doesn't bother me, and if it does bother me, there is only one thing for me to do, go home and have hamburger.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bristol, Mr. Lewis.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am talking as a member of the Marine Resources Committee. The bill came out of committee with a leave to withdraw.

I am going to repeat more or less what Representative Jalbert said. For years we have been known and recognized in Maine as producing the Maine lobster. Are we about to tear down that reputation by substituting something that I am sure would tear it down?

I certainly hope that we kill this measure this morning.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Fryeburg, Mr. Trumbull, that the House insist and ask for a Committee of Conference. A roll call has been ordered. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Baker, Berry, P. P.; Binnette, Birt, Bragdon, Brown, Carrier, Curran, Dow, Dudley, Dunleavy, Fecteau, Ferris, Fraser, Garsoe, Gauthier, Hamblen, Haskell, Henley, Huber, Kauffman, Kilroy, Littlefield, Mills, Parks, Perkins, Peterson, Rollins, Shaw, Sheltra, Simpson, L. E.; Susi, Trumbull, Walker, White.

NAY — Albert, Ault, Berry, G. W.; Bither, Boudreau, Brawn, Briggs, Bunker, Bustin, Cameron, Carey, Carter, Chick, Chonko, Churchill, Clark, Conley, Connolly, Cooney, Cote, Cottrell, Crommett, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Davis, Deshaies, Donaghy, Drigotas, Dunn, Dyar, Emery, D. F.; Evans, Farnham, Farrington, Faucher, Finemore, Gahagan, Good, Goodwin, H.; Goodwin, K.; Greenlaw, Hancock, Hobbins, Hunter, Jackson, Jalbert, Kelleher, Kelley, Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Knight, LaPointe, Lawry, LeBlanc, Lewis, E.; Lewis, J.; Lynch, MacLeod, Maddox, Mahany, Martin, Maxwell, McCormick, McHenry, McKernan, McMahon, McNally, McTeague, Merrill, Morin, L.; Morton, Mulkern, Murchison, Murray, Najarian, Norris, O'Brien, Palmer, Pontbriand, Ricker, Rolde, Ross, Shute, Silverman, Smith, D. M.; Smith, S.; Snowe, Soulas, Sproul, Stillings, Strout, Talbot, Theriault, Tierney, Trask, Tyndale, Webber, Wheeler, Whitzell, Willard, Wood, M. E.; The Speaker.

ABSENT — Cressey, Dam, Farley, Flynn, Genest, Herrick, Hoffses, Immonen, Jacques, LaCharite, Morin, V.; Pratt, Santoro, Tanquay.

Yes, 35; No, 102; Absent, 14.

The SPEAKER: Thirty-five having voted in the affirmative and one hundred two in the negative, with fourteen being absent, the motion does not prevail.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Davis of Addison, the House voted to adhere.

The Senate of Maine  
Augusta

June 19, 1973

Hon. E. Louise Lincoln  
Clerk of the House  
106th Legislature  
Dear Madam Clerk;

The Senate voted to Insist and Join in a Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill, "An Act to Insure Permanent Funding of the Maine Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Academy" (H. P. 1575) (L. D. 2004).

The President appointed the following conferees on (H. P. 1575) (L. D. 2004):

Senators:

BERRY of Cumberland  
JOLY of Kennebec  
CLIFFORD

of Androscoggin

The President appointed the following conferees on Bill, "AN ACT to Amend the Land Use Regulation Commission Law" (H. P. 627) (L. D. 851):

Senators:

SCHULTEN of Sagadahoc  
CUMMINGS of Penobscot  
MARCOTTE of York

Respectfully,

HARRY N. STARBRANCH

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

The Senate of Maine  
Augusta

June 19, 1973

Hon. E. Louise Lincoln  
Clerk of the House  
106th Legislature  
Dear Madam Clerk:

The Senate voted to Adhere to its action whereby it accepted Report "A" — Ought Not to Pass on Bill, "AN ACT Establishing the Office of Constituent Services" (H. P. 427) (L. D. 576).

Respectfully,

HARRY N. STARBRANCH  
Secretary of the Senate

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

### Orders

On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the legislature on Bill "An Act Relating to the Maine Development Act" (S. P. 536) (L. D. 1756) the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House:

Messrs. GAHAGAN of Caribou  
CURTIS of Orono  
LYNCH  
of Livermore Falls

### House Reports of Committees Ought to Pass Printed Bill

Mr. Soulas from the Committee on Public Utilities on Bill "An Act Increasing Indebtedness of Berwick Sewer District" (H. P. 1616) (L. D. 2036) reporting "Ought not to pass"

The Report was read and accepted, the Bill read once and assigned for second reading tomorrow.

### Passed to Be Enacted

An Act Authorizing the State Housing Authority to Establish Capital Reserve Funds (H. P. 1596) (L. D. 2022)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed, passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

### Orders of the Day

The Chair laid before the House the first item of Unfinished Business:

Bill "An Act to Create the Maine Guarantee Authority and to Amend the Maine Industrial Building Authority and Maine Recreational Authority Statutes" (S. P. 667) (L. D. 2033).

Tabled — June 19, by Mr. Simpson of Standish.

Pending — Adoption of Senate Amendment "A" (S-242)

Thereupon, Senate Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence.

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

Mr. Ross of Bath offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" (H-580) was read by the Clerk.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This session I sponsored two bills, one to abolish the MIBA and the other to do away with the MRA. They were reported out of committee leave to withdraw as covered by other legislation, which I never saw at the time so there was no chance for debate on these.

I was amazed at how much support they had. I had mail from all over the state all in favor of these bills and none against. Also several legislators are extremely interested in them.

At the hearing, I had several supporters, although only one spoke. Three had to leave and two had been so close to the operation that they decided it unwise to express their knowledge vocally in public. The opposition were all employees of the MIBA or the MRA or board members except for one. She was a young housewife associated with the League of American Voters from Bangor. Last Saturday, she called me up to apologize because after reading the new draft, she admitted that she was wrong and should have been on my side.

In my opinion, this new draft is just a coverup for a poor operation which has always been financially unsound and has cost the taxpayers of Maine many millions of dollars. I believe that it is a snare and a delusion. It sets up a new authority to handle these two monstrosities plus two others. It consists of nine members. The chairman will receive \$100 a day and the other members only \$75. It spells out that it must work very closely with the Department of Commerce and Industry, whose chairman is automatically on the board. This department must agree with all of their recommendations and reports.

The MIBA was the first such scheme which came along in 1957. Many legislators realized what a gamble it was with taxpayers' funds. It would only attract some marginal companies whose operation was so dubious that they

couldn't get their financing through legitimate channels. It barely passed the House and in the waning hours of the session was defeated in the enactment stage in the other body by 11 votes. A one half hour recess was called and strangely enough, 12 men changed their minds in this scant one half hour. Many have regretted it ever since. Still, that is how our delightful monster was born.

In a couple of years, he took a mate called the MRA. The reason this was allowed was, he was still too young to be dangerous yet. As he started to grow up, he developed a craving for sugar beets and other indigestible goodies. His insatiable appetite gobbled up a great many millions of dollars from the State of Maine. His mate learned very quickly, but she had a craving for ski areas, campgrounds, golf courses and above all, motels about to go out of business. They made a dandy pair.

Now it is found out that they need stepparents as guardians to keep them in line. The Department of Commerce and Industry is delighted because they have always wanted in on the action. I think the time has come for some brave souls to slay the dragons before they gobble up more of our hard-earned tax dollars.

The Senate amendment includes our municipal oriented industrial sites which has worked out well. This would cost an additional \$1.2 million.

Yesterday I stated that I had a simple amendment; this is it. It does away with the whole necessity of this bill by correcting our past mistakes. In the long run, it will save many, many millions of dollars. Just to defeat the bill would accomplish nothing, because it would leave the MIBA and the MRA exactly where they are now. So this is the purpose of my amendment and I move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Calais, Mr. Silverman.

Mr. SILVERMAN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: At this time, I would like to move indefinite postponement of



House Amendment "A" and speak to my motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Calais, Mr. Silverman, moves the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "A".

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. SILVERMAN: My first reason for moving indefinite postponement is that Representative Ross from Bath I think didn't state the things particular to this bill that I think are so important to our State of Maine. The MIBA and the MRA have made mistakes, they have also had a lot of criticism, but along with this they have also done something for Maine that is so needed. In 1971, because of MIBA direct guaranteed loans, there are now 7,556 new jobs in the State of Maine. How else are we going to possibly give job opportunities and job employment to the people of the State of Maine if we do not have an agency such as this to provide funds so manufacturers and recreation businesses will come to the State of Maine and set up their enterprises?

Along with this and this is 1971 and the figure has gone up considerably in 1972 — \$1,434,311 for municipal taxes came from these projects. There is no question that every state in this country of ours, as well as every other country, tries to attract new industry. It is the only possibility of getting employment for our young graduating students from high schools. To do this, we must have some organization, some authority within our state.

Although the MIBA got lost in a very, very expensive program with the sugar beet firm in Aroostook County, let us not look at one mistake, even though costly it may be and destroy the good and the many things that have been done, as I have stated, in improving our economic climate in the State of Maine.

Therefore, the people who are responsible for MIBA and MRA have tried, under this bill to protect the State of Maine against future happenings such as the sugar beet industry in Aroostook County. Under this bill, they have cut down the loaning capacity to one firm to two and one half mil-

lion dollars from the original eight million and then four million. This is a safeguard in loaning our state funds and guaranteeing our state loan funds.

Secondly, they have now bank participation, which is very important that the banks who give these loans are also going to be responsible for a part of that loan which comes to 5 percent or more.

Therefore, I would ask for the indefinite postponement of this bill and the amendment.

Now the most important part of this bill for me —

The SPEAKER: The Chair would inform the gentleman that we have to deal with the amendment before we can discuss the bill. The pending motion is the motion that you made to indefinitely postpone the amendment.

Mr. SILVERMAN: The amendment affects what I am going to talk about.

The SPEAKER: Did the gentleman indicate that he wanted to indefinitely postpone the bill?

Mr. SILVERMAN: No, it is to indefinitely postpone the amendment.

My major work in the 106th Legislature is L.D. 1572, which is an act to provide deprived areas in Maine, middle-size communities in Maine with the opportunity to have community investment buildings which in turn will help these areas compete for new manufacturing plants to aid them in giving job opportunities to their areas to aid them in getting an improved tax base which is so essentially needed. This bill is Senate Amendment "A" now to L.D. 1722 if I am correct. Many people in this House can tell you that through community investment building how a community in Maine which has one now instead of dying is living. People there now have job opportunities where they are taking home salaries or weekly paychecks, supporting their families, contributing to taxes in their community and have a good reason for living in Maine. This amendment will provide such opportunities for all areas of Maine, and is so important in our future to provide jobs, manufacturing plants and communities with an oppor-

tunity to have something to look forward to than to be slowly, what we might call dying in our State of Maine.

It is believed that responsibility in Maine State Government should help in this area, in this field, to provide these funds, the \$1,200,000 of which Mr. Ross spoke as a non-lapsing, revolving fund — very important — nonlapsing, revolving. Once the building is built in a community, it is sold or leased by a client, then this money will return to the fund and in turn be used in another area of the state to build another plant and help that area.

I do not wish to take too much of your time; I could speak a long time on it. Therefore, I hope you will support the opposition and vote yes. Remember the green light to the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "A."

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would pose a question to the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, as to whether or not House Amendment "A" is similar to the two bills that we had earlier this session?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, who may answer if he wishes.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I know it is difficult to catch everything in a speech that is fairly long, although I never speak over five minutes. I mentioned in my speech that it was similar to those two bills, but those two bills were reported out "leave to withdraw," and I was never asked whether I gave permission for that or not; but I had never seen the new draft, so these bills never had a chance to be debated in the House.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from York, Mr. Rolde.

Mr. ROLDE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Earlier here we had a strenuous debate, as you may

remember on the site selection law, and many speakers expressed their feeling that the state had gone too far in environmental laws and that the other side of the coin, the economic side, should be considered. My position then and still is that you cannot achieve economic development by weakening environmental laws. I also stated that I would support bona fide efforts to give the state the tools it needs to bring jobs to our state.

The bill before us today is, in my mind, a responsible effort to improve our existing institutions for economic developments such as the MIBA and the MRA, and it also adds an important new tool, the Community Investment Building Program. If we follow Mr. Ross, we will be killing the Community Investment Building Program before it even has a chance to get off the ground.

I urge you to support the motion to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A" and to allow our officials charged with economic development to operate with responsible programs and to lessen the temptation that we will try to promote economic development on the cheap by weakening environmental laws.

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: If you people happen to take the "Bangor Deadly," as Representative Briggs from Caribou calls it, and read it this morning, you will see an article in there on the editorial page called "Overloading the Pork Barrel."

I think Representative Ross, who I have the highest respect for and who has served a number of terms in this legislature, wouldn't suggest to put in an amendment such as this if he didn't really feel that we would be doing a service to the people of this state by killing the very monster that this legislature created a few years ago. Had this amendment or his bill been presented two years ago and the tone and the mood of the legislature, I feel quite confidently that this legislature probably would sup-

port it almost unanimously. But since then, some of the opinions have changed, some of the peoples' opinions have changed in this legislature. I think that the suggestion that Representative Ross has presented and given to this house this morning is a sound one.

I think the people — particularly the people in my area or a considerable number of them — are very much disgusted with the MIBA with the loans they have given out. It has been a fiasco in a great sense of the word, and I am sure my very capable seatmate, who I know believes in the MIBA to some extent, will try to show you and other members of the House will try to show you that they have been successful, and they probably have; but we certainly suffered some very tremendous financial burdens under the MIBA. I think Representative Ross' amendment — I am sorry that the bill came out 'leave to withdraw' that he presented a few months ago and didn't get a chance to come in in the bill form, but this amendment seems to be very reasonable.

I would ask the House not to support my very good friend from Calais, Mr. Silverman's, motion to indefinitely postpone it and accept the amendment.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I find myself in a situation this morning where I have got to attempt to explain my position with regard to this matter.

It is well known that I have been critical at times of the idea of state guaranteed loans. I have been through this for some time since the beginning of the Vahlsing fiasco, if we could call it that. I did sit on a committee that studied some of the things, and out of that came a revision and a scaling down of the Maine Industrial Building Authority.

I think perhaps before I proceed any further, I had better state that I do favor the motion of the gentleman from Calais, Mr. Silverman.

Now, as probably many of you know, this bill — it is pretty diffi-

cult to debate Mr. Ross' amendment without getting into a complete debate on the whole bill, and I hope the Speaker will be lenient and allow us a little latitude to explain the situation as best we can. This bill of Mr. Silverman's appeared first, as you may know, before the Appropriations Committee. In it, I recognized a very useful tool, especially for small communities, to make available these buildings which were not to cost a large amount of money, and they could become a valuable agent to small communities having buildings like this ready and the amount involved was not great to create two or three of such buildings in various communities. This was the motive behind.

The State of New Hampshire at the first of the hearings before the Appropriations Committee there was a representative, I believe of the State of New Hampshire, may have been Vermont, appeared before the committee. Apparently, they are using this type of a program very successfully.

I have — one criticism that I have had in the past of MIBA and MRA was that there were no obligations on the part of the loaning authority to share part of the expense. My understanding now is that we have corrected this because of the hearings and so forth that we had on the sugar beet deal, so that now the loaning institution does have to obligate itself to at least 10 percent. I could have gone even higher than that, but perhaps it would have curtailed somewhat the usefulness behind the idea. This idea of local participation is still written into Mr. Silverman's bill, as I understand it.

So I find myself in the position — and to get back further to it, I think it was the idea that originated in the Appropriations Committee, and Mr. Sewall, the chairman of the committee, was very receptive to it — that we attempt to marry this idea to the Maine Industrial Building Authority and the Maine Recreational Authority and attempt to curtail them and hold them in reasonable bound and let them continue. This is the situation that we are now in.

This bill does provide — the bill we are discussing provides for continuing these two functions and bringing into the fold with one management the idea which Mr. Silverman has touched upon and probably will enlarge upon as the debate on this goes further.

I don't know as I can add any more; however, my position is that this was a darn good idea. I am not presently buying the idea of attempt to eliminate outright either the MRA or the MIBA, and I feel that one board with these three functions set up under it can do a valuable service to the state.

I hope you go along and indefinitely postpone Mr Ross' amendment. I believe that is the motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Haskell.

Mr. HASKELL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think probably all of us view this bill from a different perspective. The representative from Bath, Mr. Ross, very obviously comes from a community with a very secure industrial base.

If my memory serves me right, about two sessions ago, we were asked in the legislature to raise the guaranteeing amount to \$50 million to accommodate the Bath Ship Building that, at that time, had prospects of a very substantial destroyer escort contract, which was done. Unfortunately, the contract was not achieved.

Currently, Representative Ross sits in a community with a good industrial base; whereas, a great many of us are in communities that are working very hard to replace lost agricultural units with industrial development in order to support the existing municipal bases. And you don't have to work actively at industrial development in the community for more than a week before you realize that the vehicle that we are discussing this morning is absolutely vital, we must have it, and the communities that are working the hardest for industrial development are the ones that need it the most, very obviously. But it would be, in my view, a tragic mistake for us to adopt this amendment of Representative Ross' which

accomplishes the destruction of the agencies involved here.

I think that this is an excellent bill. I think that it has corrected some of the main objections by reducing the total amount of the guarantee that the unit can make, I think it has achieved substantial economics in personnel. I think the addition of bank participation is a very valuable feature of it. I think that we now do have a very good vehicle to achieve the industrial development that we need.

I think the addition by Senate amendment of the speculative building is an extremely promising development, and I think that it should have the wholehearted support of all people who recognize the urgent necessity of a great many of our communities to achieve additional industrial payroll.

I urge you very strongly to support the indefinite postponement of this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Gahagan.

Mr. GAHAGAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have supported this bill as a member of the State Government Committee, and I would also like to go on record as being in support of the bill and opposed to the amendment as a representative from an area which was seriously affected. Without MIBA, we couldn't have had Maine sugar industries, but also we might not have had the many other projects they have.

So I hope you will kill the amendment and support the bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Emery.

Mr. EMERY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Those of you who were in the 105th Legislature will remember a rather long and detailed presentation that I made at the Special Session relative to the MIBA situation with the Maine Ship Building facility in Rockland. Basically, the two conclusions that I drew in my speech were one, that the main problems with that particular default — and I believe also with other defaults — has

been unwise selection of those to whom the guarantees were to be made.

The second conclusion that I drew is that generally, MIBA has succeeded in projects of reasonable financial size; but yet, they have run into difficulties whenever they have attempted to guarantee loans that are exorbitant in cost. I would point to the \$8 million sugar beet loan as opposed to the several projects of \$100,000 or \$200,000 that have succeeded very nicely.

Also, I think I ought to point out that the track record of MIBA, although everyone points to the large failures, most especially the sugar beet incident and the ship-building facility in Rockland, the track record has been rather good. Out of some 75 or 80 projects, only about 10 or 15 have met with failure, and obviously, the vast majority have succeeded.

I think that it would be a tremendous mistake in a state that constantly has problems with unemployment to cut off one of the most important, functional methods that we have to bring jobs and industry into the State of Maine; in a state that has transportation problems, has problems in all the areas that are really important to industrial growth and development, I feel that we have to be willing to take a few chances to attract jobs and industry. I feel that although MIBA has been operated inefficiently and that they have gone overboard, they have taken unnecessary chances, they have had poor management, I feel that these are functional problems, not problems in philosophy. We can correct these problems, and I think this legislation, as it stands without Mr. Ross' amendment, is a good step in improving MIBA. I hope that you would move to indefinitely postpone that amendment, and I would ask for the yeas and nays.

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 Calais, Mr. Silverman, to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A" to L. D. 2033. All those in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Berube, Binnette, Birt, Bither, Boudreau, Bragdon, Brawn, Bunker, Bustin, Cameron, Carey, Carrier, Carter, Chick, Chonko, Churchill, Clark, Connolly, Cooney, Cote, Cottrell, Crommett, Curran, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Davis, Deshaies, Donaghy, Dow, Drigotas, Dudley, Dunleavy, Emery, D. F.; Evans, Farnham, Farrington, Faucher, Fecteau, Fraser, Gahagan, Garsoe, Gauthier, Genest, Goodwin, H.; Goodwin, K.; Greenlaw, Hancock, Haskell, Hobbins, Hunter, Jackson, Jalbert, Kauffman, Kelley, Keyte, Kilroy, Knight, LaCharite, LeBlanc, Lewis, J.; Lynch, MacLeod, Maddox Mahany, Martin, Maxwell, McHenry, McTeague, Merrill, Mills, Morin, L.; Morin, V.; Morton, Mulkern, Murchison, Murray, Najarian, Norris, Palmer, Perkins, Peterson, Pontbriand, Ricker, Rolde, Sheltra, Shute, Silverman, Simpson, L. E.; Smith, D. M.; Smith, S.; Snowe, Soulas, Stillings, Strout, Susi, Tanguay, Theriault, Tierney, Trask, Trumbull, Webber, Wheeler, Whitzell, Willard

NAY — Ault, Baker, Briggs, Conley, Dunn, Ferris, Finemore, Hamblen, Henley, Immonen, Kelleher, LaPointe, Lewis, E.; Littlefield, McCormick, McMahon, McNally, Parks, Rollins, Ross, Shaw, Sproul, Tyndale, Walker

ABSENT — Albert, Brown, Cressey, Dam, Dyar, Farley, Flynn, Good, Herrick, Hoffses, Huber, Jacques, Lawry, McKernan, O'Brien, Pratt, Santoro, Talbot, White, Wood, M. E.

Yes, 105; No, 25; Absent, 20.

The SPEAKER: One hundred five having voted in the affirmative and twenty-five having voted

in the negative, with twenty being absent, the motion does prevail.

On motion of Mr. Silverman of Calais, the House reconsidered its action whereby it adopted Senate Amendment "A."

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

House Amendment "A" (H-585) to Senate Amendment "A" was read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Calais, Mr. Silverman.

Mr. SILVERMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: House Amendment "A" is a clerical work where originally this bill was set up to be a separate bill and then it joined the — what we have voted on today, the Maine Guaranteed Authority, this will help clear up the clerical work and put the bill in with the authority.

Thereupon, House Amendment "A," to Senate Amendment "A" was adopted.

Thereupon, Senate Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "A" was adopted in non-concurrence.

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

Mr. SIMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I raise just one point in this bill. I don't like to see the whole bill scuttled, I think we have come a long way with it this morning. I think we have got a tool to operate with here.

I do see one portion of this bill I personally would like to see amended. I think when we start to set up a commission such as this and then we put in a bill that the chairman is going to get \$100 a day per diem and that the other members of the commission are getting \$75 a day per diem, I think the price exorbitant. I can easily see where this could be abused, we could have a full-time commission working on this thing and at a pretty good rate of pay, a pretty good salary.

If you look at our own position, I don't know if there is anybody in the state that handles any more money or any more respon-

sible items on behalf of the people of the State of Maine than the legislators do, and we pay ourselves \$25 per diem when we are not in session on our activities down here for an all day session, and I don't think we should start setting up commissions with the amount of money that is along that way. I will support the bill, but I do very reluctantly with this amount in it.

On motion of Mr. Henley of Norway, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and later today assigned.

The Chair laid before the House the second item of Unfinished Business:

Bill "An Act to Provide Property Tax Reduction, Rent Relief and Equalization of Municipal Revenues" (H. P. 1620) (L. D. 2038).

Tabled — June 19, by Mr. Martin of Eagle Lake.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

On motion of Mr. Martin of Eagle Lake, retabled pending passage to be engrossed and later today assigned.

The Chair laid before the House the third item of Unfinished Business:

Resolution Proposing Amendments to the Constitution to Provide for Annual Sessions of the Legislature and to Limit the Matters Which May be Considered in the Second Regular Session; to Provide for Single Member Districts in the House of Representatives; to Provide for Reduction of the Number of Representatives and Reapportionment of the House of Representatives and the Senate in 1983; to Establish an Apportionment Commission to Plan for all Reapportionments of the House of Representatives and Senate; to Abolish the Executive Council and Reassign Certain Constitutional Powers to a Legislative Council; and to Provide that Oaths and Subscriptions of Office of the Governor, Representatives and Senators Shall be Taken Before the Chief Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court (S. P. 673) (L. D. 2040).

Tabled — June 19, by Mr. Birt of East Millinocket.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

On motion of Mr. Birt of East Millinocket, retabled pending passage to be engrossed and later today assigned.

The Chair laid before the House the fourth item of Unfinished Business:

Bill "An Act to Improve the Lobster Fisheries. (S. P. 638) (L. D. 1973) (H. "A" H-559) (H. "A" to H. "A" H-569).

Tabled — June 19, by Mr. Jackson of Yarmouth.

Pending — Passage to be enacted.

The PEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Greenlaw.

Mr. GREENLAW: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The gentleman from Yarmouth is out of his seat. He is trying to see if the amendment has been prepared and I would appreciate it if somebody would table this until later in today's session.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. LaCharite of Brunswick, retabled pending passage to be enacted and later today assigned.

The Chair laid before the House the fifth item of Unfinished Business:

Bill "An Act Regulating Agricultural Labor Practices. (H. P. 1606) (L. D. 2027).

Tabled — June 19, by Mr. Bustin of Augusta.

Pending — Passage to be enacted.

On motion of Mr. Brown of Augusta, retabled pending passage to be enacted and later today assigned.

The Chair laid before the House the sixth item of Unfinished Business:

Bill "An Act Relating to Joint Standing Committees of the Legislature." (S. P. 560) (L. D. 1731).

Tabled — June 19, by Mr. Simpson of Standish.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

Mr. Simpson of Standish offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" (H-584) was read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Carey.

Mr. CAREY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I do not want to throw any monkey wrenches into the works here, but I would be interested in maybe having the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson, explain what the amendment does. It appears to me that it just throws in an emergency that wasn't there before and then strikes out the entire bill and substitutes it with a ten page amendment. Maybe he can explain just what it does different.

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

Mr. SIMPSON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Most of us have been talking all year long, of course within the legislative reform package, about keeping the joint standing committees in operation and working with the staff people and so forth. At the present time, the staff that we have taken on, there is nothing in the statutes that provides for where they should be placed, the chain of command and under whose jurisdiction and so forth, so what we have done is that we have taken this bill that created this and we have taken the entire section out of the legislative reform portion of it and we have put it together in this amendment and would like to put it on the bill right now. Afterwards, I would like to table it and keep it there on a day by day basis until we find out exactly what we do with the legislative reform package. Should the legislative reform package not go, this is one bill we would like to keep alive and work with so that we would have the use of the joint standing committees in the interim period.

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

Mr. COONEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to pose a question to the gentleman from Standish. Don't we have a bill which

does bring these things before us right now?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Sabattus, Mr. Cooney, poses a question through the Chair to anyone who may answer if he or she wishes.

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

Mr. SIMPSON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I believe that is just exactly what I just stated, that we do have a bill before us right now that encompasses not only this, but it encompasses quite a few items. In that particular bill we are talking about the entire legislative reform package and the statutory part of it. This is a separate bill that would pertain to just one portion of that.

Thereupon, House Amendment "A" was adopted.

On motion of Mr. Simpson of Standish, tabled pending passage to be engrossed in non-concurrence and tomorrow assigned.

Mr. Kelleher of Bangor presented the following Joint Order and moved its passage:

WHEREAS, Miss Karlene Carter of Bangor, a senior at Bangor High School has been named Miss Black Teenage Maine for 1973; and

WHEREAS, Miss Carter at sixteen years of age received this honor and distinction at the second state-wide Miss Black Teenage pageant held at Portland on June 16th; and

WHEREAS, the charming and accomplished Miss Carter has brought credit to herself and the State and may now represent the State in the forthcoming national pageant at New York City next month; now, therefore, be it

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that we the Members of the 106th Legislature of the State of Maine, now assembled in regular session, pause to extend to Miss Carter our congratulations on her outstanding achievement and offer our warmest wishes for her future happiness and success; and be it further

ORDERED, that suitable copies of this Joint Order be immediately transmitted to Miss Carter and her

proud parents in honor of the occasion. (H. P. 1625)

The Order was received out of order by unanimous consent, read and passed.

The SPEAKER: Would Miss Carter, accompanied by her Uncle Representative Talbot, please come to the rostrum.

Thereupon, the Sergeant-at-Arms escorted Miss Carter and Representative Talbot to the rostrum, amid the applause of the House, and Miss Carter addressed the House as follows:

Miss KARLENE CARTER: Mr. Speaker, Distinguished Members of the Legislature and Friends: It is indeed a pleasure to stand before you and express my enthusiasm as being Miss Black Teenager of Maine. To me, the pageant was a success in the sense that it was a learning experience for me and it brought black people together. This is one point I would really like to emphasize the MABP, the Maine Association for Black Progress, an organization which has been together for two years, sponsored the pageant. Like the NAACP, the National Association for Colored People, their interests lie in the direction of the Civil Rights Movement, however, their interests lie primarily in the direction of the black people of this state.

The pageant brought together teenagers from all over the area and it was really great working with these girls and the coordinators because we worked as one great big unit.

I have learned a lot about people and especially black people from this pageant. Certain forms of discrimination are not as pronounced in this state as they are in others, but that does not mean they do not exist because they do.

In Maine, my knowledge of black people is very limited because of the few programs primarily directed toward black people and because of the scatterness of them. These are my main reasons for entering the pageant. I feel that in order to grow I must learn about myself and about other black girls. My coordinators are really beautiful people and I would like to thank all of them, especially Mrs. Evans



and Mrs. Anderson because they have dedicated their time toward these girls. I am really looking forward to working with them in the next month.

Next month I leave for New York to participate in the National Pageant. That is July 21st and 27th. The pageant is the 27th. In Maine, there has never been a national winner and I am going to do the best I can to bring that crown home to Maine because Maine has a lot to be proud of. Its people, its natural wonders and especially its black people. Thank you very much. (Prolonged applause)

Mr. Haskell of Houlton presented the following Joint Order and moved its passage:

WHEREAS, promotion of the State's vacation and travel programs by means of information centers, mail inquiry services, literature, production and recreational advertising is considered essential for development of the industry; and

WHEREAS, at present such efforts are being performed by both, the Department of Commerce and Industry and the Maine Publicity Bureau; and

WHEREAS, legislation has been proposed to eliminate this needless duplication of efforts as well as terminate town assessments and the practice of transferring promotional efforts at various issues; and

WHEREAS, information is not sufficient to adequately evaluate the proposal should such responsibilities be exclusively placed in the hands of the Maine Publicity Bureau; now, therefore, be it

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee is authorized and directed to study the bill "An Act to Designate the Maine Publicity Bureau as the State's Agent in certain Matters Pertaining to the Promotion of Vacation and Travel" House Paper No. 1377, Legislative Document No. 1833 as introduced at the regular session of the 106th Legislature to determine whether or not the best interests of the State would be

served by enactment of such legislation; and be it further

ORDERED, that the State Department of Commerce and Industry and Maine Publicity Bureau be respectfully requested to provide the committee with such technical advice and other assistance as the committee deems necessary and desirable; and be it further

ORDERED, that the committee report the results of its findings, together with its recommendations and implementing legislation at the next special or regular session of the Legislature; and be it further

ORDERED, that said agencies specified herein be notified accordingly upon passage of this directive. (H. P. 1626)

The Order was read and passed and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Whitzell of Gardiner presented the following Joint Order and moved its passage:

WHEREAS, the Motor Vehicle Division of the Office of the Secretary of State maintains only 11 motor vehicle registration offices in 11 municipalities of the State of Maine; and

WHEREAS, there are 496 municipalities in the State of Maine with a population over 963,000 persons; and

WHEREAS, the 11 motor vehicle registration offices operated by the Motor Vehicle Division of the Office of the Secretary of State are located, in many instances, a considerable and inconvenient distance from many of the motoring citizens of the State of Maine; and

WHEREAS, Maine Statutes require that municipal excise taxes on motor vehicles be paid before said motor vehicle is registered by the Motor Vehicle Division of the Office of the Secretary of State; and

WHEREAS, municipalities, individually and collectively, have consistently advocated their support for municipal registration of motor vehicles at the time of payment of municipal excise taxes; and

WHEREAS, legislative documents have been introduced in

the 106th Legislature to establish new motor vehicle registration offices in Maine; and

WHEREAS, the 106th Maine Legislature has recognized the need to study the delivery of motor vehicle registration services to Maine's motoring public; now, therefore, be it

ORDERED, that the Motor Vehicle Division of the Office of the Secretary of State conduct a 2-year pilot program of motor vehicle registration of passenger vehicles by municipal tax collectors in 4 Maine municipalities commencing no later than January 1, 1974; and be it further

ORDERED, that the municipalities selected for said pilot program be selected by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Executive Secretary of the Maine Municipal Association; and be it further

ORDERED, that the municipalities selected for such pilot program represent, as closely as possible, each of the following population ranges of municipalities: 2,500-5,000; 5,001-10,000; 10,001-15,000; and be it further

ORDERED, that the costs of said pilot program, including the actual expenses of operation incurred by each municipality participating, shall be paid from the gross revenues derived from the registration of motor vehicles throughout the State of Maine; and be it further

ORDERED, that there shall be set aside from the gross revenues derived from the registration of motor vehicles throughout the State of Maine the sum of \$3,000 to be used in equal shares by the Secretary of State and the Maine Municipal Association for the purpose of evaluation of the pilot program by each agency; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Secretary of State and the Maine Municipal Association shall severally report their evaluation of said pilot program to the 109th Maine Legislature.

The Order was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mexico, Mr. Fraser.

Mr. FRASER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: My good friend beside me here has many qualities, not the least of which are determination, persistency, stubbornness and these are all capped with a whole lot of energy. These qualities will stand him in good stead as the years go on providing he stays on the right track, otherwise they could cause him a lot of damage.

There is already an order submitted by the Transportation Committee covering this same study along with others. Therefore, I now call for indefinite postponement of this order.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Whitzell.

Mr. WHITZELL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my wise and gentle seat-mate: I would like to respond by saying that the idea that is presented in this order is that on a voluntary basis municipalities may elect to initiate local motor vehicle registries which would be accomplished by city clerks. I have talked with representatives in the House who tell me that they are some 100 miles in some cases to the nearest registry of motor vehicles. I feel the government was really meant to serve and, therefore, I feel that this is a service that should be available to the greatest number of people.

In the legislature this year there were 10 bills submitted which called for new motor vehicle registries to be located in the 10 different municipalities. The reason for these local registries, state-run and operated by registries was to bring services to their communities. In conjunction with that, I would like to say that I attended the public hearing on the bill, and the bill that was intended to do this was withdrawn when the gentleman who introduced the bill, Mr. Finemore, was spoken to by Mr. Wyman from the Division of Motor Vehicles. Since then, Maine Municipal Association and myself have contacted Mr. Wyman and he said that he could live with this order because, first of all, the order asks for the establishment of four different mo-

tor vehicle registries on a voluntary basis to be decided by the Secretary of State of which towns who made applications would be acceptable.

It is true that there is a study looking into the needs for some form of motor vehicle registry, some change in the law, for instance, staggered registration. This order would in no way affect that because even under the staggered registration, everybody who owns a motor vehicle, who would like to register that vehicle, would have to go to his town clerk, pay the excise tax and then do one of two things, either mail it in or bring it into the motor vehicle registry.

When I lived in Westbrook, the motor vehicle registry was only eight miles away, yet there were many people who were in business during the time that motor vehicle registration — during the deadline, who made a profit by carrying all these slips in. I am not trying to put the guy who is making a little money on the side, out of business, but it seems to me that what the people were saying was that it is an inconvenience. The motor vehicle registries in most cases are open during the business hours, the same hours that the man on the street is also working. Many times one has to either make arrangements to leave work early or to take time off work and go in.

I would hope that you would not indefinitely postpone it, one, because it is on a voluntary basis. The community must make some kind of a gesture toward going into this type of program. Two, it is limited; there are only four communities that will be considered, those under 2,500, those between 2,500 and 5,000 population, those between 5 and 10 and 10 and 15. It is on a voluntary basis, there is no price tag involved on this. It meets the approval of Mr. Wyman, the Director of Motor Vehicle Registration, and I don't see any reason to indefinitely postpone the order.

It will bring service. It will bring convenience to the people who are inconvenienced by having to make a double stop each time that they

register their motor vehicles. It will only affect automobile registration at this time.

The earlier bill that Mr. Finemore sponsored would have established almost a mandatory motor vehicle registry from the clerk's office. I felt possibly, and I think Mr. Finemore and Mr. Wyman also felt that the nature of the Motor Vehicle Registry Department was not to fractionalize it and they felt that they could never train that many people in the 496 communities to perform motor vehicle registry. But it is an attainable goal to train for, evaluate it and see if it works, and bring it back in two years and report to the 109th whether this is going to work or not. Otherwise, one of the threats that I saw in the hearing concerned with motor vehicle registry was that the municipalities may lose that advantage, that collection of the excise tax and opt it to the state who would then collect the excise tax in the registry of vehicles. No longer would the municipality be involved in any way. I would hope that you would not indefinitely postpone the order.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mexico, Mr. Fraser.

Mr. FRASER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I do not want to get into a hassle with my very good friend, but these four that he talks about, I am sure will be handpicked and I am sure too that there will be four people who will be capable of taking care of it, but I am also just as sure that you cannot find 490 who can. These four will be a foot in the door and you will want more later on. Can you imagine what confusion there will be in Augusta with all these applications coming in from these town officials and here is what they would have to do: Validate licenses, make up duplicate licenses to replace lost or mutilated licenses, do corrections on licenses, obtain renewal numbers and type up licenses when renewal was not received from Augusta and has been lost, accept applications from nonresidents who wish to obtain Maine licenses, accept reinstatement fees and issue

temporary licenses to people who have had them suspended, give eye examinations when necessary, obtain clearance from Augusta for customers who are required to file evidence of insurance of either registration or licenses. To me, that is an important thing.

You go to a town clerk and he might grant you a license when he doesn't have any right to and the next thing you know, you will be getting communications from Augusta saying go give it back. He said this is not going to affect clerks in any way, so we will leave this out. Collect sales tax when a customer has made a purchase of a motor vehicle from a private owner if the cost is \$100 or less and it is mandatory otherwise that it is optional. Oftentimes the customer likes to pay it up to us rather than wait for a billing. We accept and notarize numerous affidavits which are necessary in registration, issue duplicate tabs when people misplace them, issue duplicate learner's permits. These are all the things that it would lead up to if eventually the town offices did it, and I don't believe that they could do it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Morton.

Mr. MORTON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise this morning to support Mr. Whitzell in his attempt to get this order. I think we should consider this as supplementary to the order that has already been passed by the House and comes from the Committee on Transportation. I think it is a very concrete way to add to the information that will be available for study. What is called for here is nothing but a pilot program, a limited number of towns, limited to two years, that will provide on-the-spot opportunity to see where, if any, the bugs are in such a system.

The Motor Vehicle Department has agreed — I have talked to Mr. Wyman personally on this — they have agreed they can train and supervise four communities and therefore, they can develop the techniques that are necessary in such community offices.

All that Mr. Fraser says may be true. I have no way of knowing nor do I think anyone has any way of knowing until it has been tried. Here is an attempt to try it on a limited, four-community basis for a limited two year period. If at the end of that time it has not proved successful, if it has not developed the information that we need, then we can go on from there.

Certainly there is need for improvement in the registration process in this state, and how better to find out than to try it on a limited and circumscribed basis. I hope you will not indefinitely postpone this order.

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

Mrs. McCORMICK: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I, too, will go along with the indefinite postponement of this order. As some of you might have noticed in the last two or three minutes, I got out of my seat, I went into the office, used Mr. Birt's phone, called Charlie Wyman at the office downstairs and asked about this particular order and he was in favor of this. He said he was in favor of a study, but not a two-year pilot project to commence no later than January 1, 1974. For that reason, I will move the indefinite postponement and vote along with it.

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

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am sorry, I did not know this was indefinitely postponed, I was called to the phone. I was the one who presented this bill, a similar bill to this to the Transportation Committee, and I asked a leave to withdraw for the simple reason that after a lengthy talk with the Secretary of State, Joseph Edgar, and he was talking with Mr. Wyman, they did not want this bill at this time.

And as far as was quoted this morning that there is no expense incurred, there is. They would have to give a fee to the municipal tax collector to collect this. They

would also have to audit the books every so often, which is required under the law and more and more often they were town books, so I have been told by the Secretary of State. And Mr. Joseph Edgar, Secretary of State, is strictly 100 percent against any plan of this kind, and I hope you will go along with indefinite postponement.

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

Mr. GOODWIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise to support this order. I have found in my brief career as a legislator that it is very easy for bureaucrats to find problems with new programs that they don't propose. I feel that a major priority of this legislature is to find programs and ideas to better serve the people of this state. The government of this state is here to serve the people; the people are not here to serve state government.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. McNally.

Mr. McNALLY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think there are a good many of you folks who were here when we purposely raised the excise tax on automobiles to help the municipalities. Now what this thing would do, as you have been told, it would remove the excise tax from the municipalities, and when you do that, there has got to be only one or two things — either the state will have to come up with some sort of subsidy to offset it or else you will have to have your taxes raised in each one of your municipalities. I hope you will think that over.

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

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is one of those problems that my subcommittee of the Research Committee studied all summer. We have had several hearings, and the proponents of this type of legislation was the Maine Municipal Association. At least at that time Mr. Wyman was very much opposed to that type of workings,

and I feel that if we are going to do that with this at this time, it is very wrong.

There is an order on the table to examine and study the tax structure which I introduced — I think it was the first order introduced to the Research Committee this year, and this order is only going to end study, if implemented is only going to standardize the structure of the excise tax to all the municipalities so that one municipality won't charge more than another.

If we are going to fragmentate automobile registration, I think it is very wrong, especially with the title law coming into being — it is on the Appropriations Table in the other body — also with the staggered motor vehicle — it is going to be handled through computer system, should be handled from one central location and not fragmentated all over the state. So I support the indefinite postponement of this order at this time.

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

Mr. LACHARITE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am from Brunswick where we have one motor vehicle registration eight miles away and another 26 miles away — one in Bath and one in Portland. But I do feel that we are here to serve the people of Maine and for the people who are in Fort Kent or other municipalities, they do have to go a long way. Therefore, I would hope you would support this order and I request the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dixfield, Mr. Rollins.

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: One thing that hasn't been mentioned this morning is the cost of a tax machine which each one of these offices at the present time has. I expect that if any more were instituted, we would have to have these and they are very expensive.

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 vot-

ing. 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 Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Whitzell.

Mr. WHITZELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would just like to make one brief point. The geography of Maine is such that it is 320 miles long, it is 210 miles wide. That is a big area to serve with 11 Motor Vehicle Registration offices, and there are currently 11. There were 10 bills in that would have upped that to around 21. The problem is that even with 21, some people are still driving over 100 miles one way to a motor vehicle registry to register their automobiles which must be done once a year. I don't feel that is fair, and that is why I did sponsor the order. It is limited. It is a trial basis. It does offer some of those communities that are that far away from a motor vehicle registry an opportunity on a voluntary basis to enter into this. We can study anything we want, but the relief that we could bring at least on a temporary basis and to see if this really works can be obtained now through passage of the order.

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

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It was stated the large territory that we have. And the only thing I have to say, an 8-cent stamp will cover all that territory.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bethel, Mr. Willard.

Mr. WILLARD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I was going to say the same thing that the gentleman from Lewiston said. For the last 40 years or so, U.S. mail has served me fine for getting my registration.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Norway, Mr. Henley.

Mr. HENLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Briefly, I was going to say some of the things that have already been said, but the only thing that I will add is that I don't believe we should pass an order to implement a program for which a bill has been defeated. All of these reasons, as I understand, were given as to why a bill under that system was defeated and I don't think that we should do something by order that we failed to do by bill.

I have always managed to get my license almost always by mail, and we have from January to March to do it. I don't know why we need a registry in every town.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Town, Mr. Binnette.

Mr. BINNETTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wholeheartedly agree with Mr. Cote. It only takes an 8-cent stamp to do the job, and especially these people who live out in the rural area, they have a mail box at the end of their drive and all they have got to do is put the letter in it. They don't have to walk very far and they will get the same results as if you went down to the Registration Bureau. So I don't think this order is needed.

Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston moved the previous question.

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

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

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is, shall the main question be put now? This is debatable for no more than five minutes by any one member. All those in favor of the main question being put now will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

102 having voted in the affirmative and 8 having voted in the negative, the main question was ordered.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mexico, Mr. Fraser, that this Order relative to a pilot program for registration of passenger vehicles by municipal tax collectors in four Maine municipalities be indefinitely postponed. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

### ROLL CALL

YEA — Albert, Ault, Baker, Berry, G. W.; Berry, P. P.; Binnette, Birt, Bither, Boudreau, Bragdon, Brawn, Brown, Bunker, Bustin, Carey, Carter, Chick, Chonko, Conley, Cooney, Cote, Cottrell, Crommett, Curran, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Davis, Drigotas, Dudley, Dunn, Emery, D. F.; Farnham, Faucher, Fecteau, Ferris, Finemore, Fraser, Good, Goodwin, K.; Hamblen, Hancock, Haskell, Henley, Herrick, Hoffses, Huber, Hunter, Immonen, Jackson, Jalbert, Kelleher, Kelley; Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Kilroy, Knight, Lawry, Lewis, E.; Lewis, J.; Littlefield, MacLeod, Maddox, Mahany, Martin, Maxwell, McCormick, McKernan, McMahon, McNally, McTeague, Merrill, Mills, Morin, V.; Mulkern, Murchison, O'Brien, Palmer, Parks, Perkins, Ricker, Rollins, Ross, Santoro, Shaw, Sheltra, Shute, Silverman, Simpson, L. E.; Snowe, Sproul, Stillings, Strout, Susi, Talbot, Theriault, Trask, Trumbull, Walker, Webber, Wheeler, White, Willard, Wood, M. E.

NAY — Berube, Cameron, Clark, Connolly, Dow, Dunleavy, Dyar, Garsoe, Gauthier, Genest, Goodwin, H.; Greenlaw, Hobbins, Kauffman, LaCharite, LaPointe, LeBlanc, Lynch, McHenry, Morin, L.; Morton, Murray, Najarian, Norris, Peterson, Rolde, Smith, D. M.; Smith, S.; Soulas, Tanguay, Tierney, Whitzell.

ABSENT — Briggs, Carrier, Churchill, Cressey, Dam, Deshaies, Donaghy, Evans, Farley, Farrington, Flynn, Gahagan, Jacques, Pontbriand, Pratt, Tyndale.

Yes, 102; No, 32; Absent, 16.

The SPEAKER: One hundred two having voted in the affirmative and

thirty-two in the negative, with sixteen being absent, the motion to indefinitely postpone does prevail.

Mr. Talbot of Portland presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that Robin, Rachel and Regina Talbot of Portland be appointed Honorary Pages for today.

The Order was received out of order by unanimous consent, read and passed.

Mr. Briggs of East Millinocket presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that Eloise and Peter Larlee of East Millinocket be appointed Honorary Pages for today.

The Order was received out of order by unanimous consent, read and passed.

The Chair laid before the House the seventh item of Unfinished Business:

Bill "An Act Equalizing the Financial Support of School Units" (H. P. 1561) (L. D. 1994) (S. "A" S-227)

Tabled — June 19, by Mr. Bither of Houlton.

Pending — Passage to be enacted.

On motion of Mr. Bither of Houlton, under suspension of the rules, the House reconsidered its action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed.

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

House Amendment "A" (H-579) was read by the Clerk and adopted.

Mr. Murray of Bangor offered House Amendment "B" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "B" (H-586) was read by the Clerk and adopted.

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

On motion of Mr. LaCharite of Brunswick, by unanimous consent, ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

The Chair laid before the House the eighth item of Unfinished Business:

Bill "An Act to Increase Benefits and Reduce Waiting Period Under Workmen's Compensation" (H. P. 618) (L. D. 816) (C. "A" H-463).

Tabled — June 19, by Mr. McTeague of Brunswick.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

The Chair laid before the House the first tabled and today assigned matter:

Bill "An Act Reforming the Administration of the Property Tax and Replacing the Tax on Inventories with an Increased Corporate Income Tax" (H. P. 1384) (L. D. 1862).

Tabled — June 19, by Mr. Simpson of Standish.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

Mr. Simpson of Standish offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" (H-588) was read by the Clerk.

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

Mr. SIMPSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As you remember yesterday, we debated this and we killed the Committee Amendment and we discussed at that time that originally the business community in this state felt that the inventory tax was an unfair tax and so forth and a burden on the business in the state and on growth of business in the state, and I felt that if it was removed they would be willing to pay a tax based on their net profits to reimburse the fund. The amendment that you have before you at the present time does just exactly that.

I know there are going to be some arguments and there are going to be some statement to the point that the New Hampshire law is unworkable and therefore and so forth, so we shouldn't get in-

volved in it. Well I don't believe that we should do everything that the New Hampshire law says or do everything New Hampshire does, I think we should do it the way Maine people want it done and we would have a good workable law.

In this particular proposal, under the business profits tax, it is very simple down here, about half way down where it says any resident, individual, proprietor or partnership filing schedules C, D, E and F — now that is where the key is, right there, which would be under your 1040 — for federal income tax purposes will be required to pay a business profits tax amounting to 3 percent of the total net profit line shown on such schedules of each taxable year. That would mean that in our state income tax we would have to provide the same line on our income tax so that we would then take it off.

In New Hampshire, when they tried to get the bill through, the professional people in the state rose up and put a block to it and therefore it was amended to take them out of it. The argument has been, how do we determine this and what constitutes salaries for lawyers, doctors and this type of thing? By putting it right into the form under the 1040 and putting it under the schedules C, D, E and F, what you would have, you would definitely have your net income right in there, and that is what your 3 percent would be applied to. Those businesses that would have losses would not have to pay. Some people would say, well this is going to start a big push for corporations to be formed in the State of Maine. I would certainly doubt this for the simple reason that if they are going to have their corporate tax increased as well as pay another 3 percent, that is only going to increase their taxes rather than decrease them.

I believe that we have got the vehicle here to pay for it the way the business community wanted to pay for it. The figure that we have is based on a good study of figures on net profits which are easily attainable and workable,



and from there we can put this thing through and I believe that if there should be a weakness in it — I don't believe there is, but if there should be, we have the special sessions or another session to do it. I think this is the way the business community wanted to pay for it and I believe that we ought to do it.

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

Mr. FINEMORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson. Is this 3 percent he is talking about going on the corporation tax too or just on the business tax or the ones who are acting as independents?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore, poses a question through the Chair to anyone who may answer if he or she wishes.

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

Mr. SIMPSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This is a straight 3 percent across the board tax on corporations, individuals, businesses and so forth based on their net income, net profits.

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

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It seems to me as if this is quite a rugged tax on the corporations, not speaking for myself, but we have already got a tax on them above \$25,000 for 7 percent. You add three more and that is going to be 10 percent. You are going to have that 3 percent right across the board from the beginning of one percent. In checking this over it looks to me as if this will bring in more money than \$14,972, not to question the Taxation Department, but we figured that 2 percent on the corporation tax beginning at zero and going up, that 2 percent on that is 2 percent above \$25,000 would bring in \$4 million.

It doesn't look fair to me to put another 3 percent on the corporation tax because we are burdening them to death. We don't want to

drive the corporations, the industry out of the State of Maine. That is one thing in the first place in our committee — I hope that the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Morton, will mention it too — the fact that we didn't want to tax the corporations any more. I think 3 percent is a little too much.

I am not going to make a motion on this amendment, but I hope somebody will.

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

Mr. SUSI: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to give you a little more background on this inventory tax bill. It came before the Taxation Committee, obviously, and as I read the attitude of the members of the Taxation Committee, there was widespread support for the concept of reducing taxes on inventory, hoping to improve the business climate in Maine, and through this hopefully creating more jobs and better paying jobs for Maine people. So in starting, you have a prejudice in favor of an inventory tax, as I read the committee. And as a means of financing this exemption of the inventory tax, which incurred around a \$15 million dollar loss of revenue to the communities, which was unacceptable to the committee, the committee unanimously felt that we couldn't take this amount of money away from our communities, we had to reimburse it, and as a means to make up for this loss of revenue there was offered to us a business profits tax which I believe this is, this amendment has the same content that that proposal made to us.

I believe that the committee reacted just as favorably as you probably are right now to it. I believe that almost unanimously we felt that this was great. Business leaders around the state were at the meeting and they did indicate, as the gentleman from Standish has told you, that they were willing to pick up the load in a different form of tax and that this was acceptable to them. It was almost too good to be true. Here we had something that we wanted to do and a way to finance it. The peo-

ple who were going to be picking up the tab were saying, "Okay, we will do it." So we really felt great about this inventory tax after the hearing.

We referred this to the Taxation Division and asked them to check it out and report back to us. They did this and they came back with a negative report on it. After having worked with our Taxation Division, I for one, have come to respect it very highly. I find experienced people, they are very objective in their presentation on these items.

So I am expressing to you what my experience and the experience of the Taxation Division has been with this. And as one who is thoroughly committed to the idea of an exemption on inventory tax as a means of improving the business climate in Maine if it were possible and this does accomplish something else that the committee wanted. They wanted to put this load on the people who were going to be receiving the benefits, the business community, something that the other means that we finally came up with certainly didn't do. It put it onto the general public to the benefit of the business community.

So I am all prejudiced in favor of this and we came to the conclusion that if it wasn't a workable answer and if you would like to have me document this better by getting evidence from the Taxation Division as to what the problems are, I would be happy to do this if you want to table it until later in today's session or until tomorrow.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Cottrell of Portland, tabled pending the adoption of House Amendment "A" and tomorrow assigned.

The Chair laid before the House the second tabled and today assigned matter:

Bill "An Act Increasing the Gasoline Tax" (H. P. 647) (L. D. 863) (C. "A" H-540) Emergency.

Tabled — June 19, by Mr. Simpson of Standish.

Pending — Passage to be enacted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Solon, Mr. Faucher.

Mr. FAUCHER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hope that today we give a decent burial to this bill; there is no need for it. I have heard the proponents of this bill every session that I have been here and it is like a broken record. The road builders and the contractors of this state are having hands out again. I don't believe the people in the State of Maine want the highest gasoline tax in the nation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I move for indefinite postponement of this bill and all its accompanying papers, and I would request a roll call.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Solon, Mr. Faucher, moves the indefinite postponement of this bill and all accompanying papers, and requests a roll call.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from East Corinth, Mr. Strout.

Mr. STROUT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Last week when this bill was before us we heard a lot of comments about the Highway Department. Since that time I have had a piece of paper delivered to me and I would like to pass on a little information, I am not going to try to influence anyone here to vote for it or against it.

The legislation as proposed provides for only a one cent increase in tax rate. This very small increase would help to move the highway program toward a pay as you go basis, and would really create only a very small annual cost for each motorist.

Based upon statistics published by the U.S. Department of Transportation in 1972, a motorist operating a three-year-old standard size passenger car drives an estimated 11,500 miles, using approximately 846 gallons of fuel at an assumed consumption rate of 13.6 miles per gallon. The total state and federal gas tax in Maine currently amounts to 13 cents per gallon. The one cent increase as proposed in this legislation would only cost an additional \$8.46 for an entire year for this same motorist. That is only 16 cents per week, not really very much of a burden.

I believe that this is a very modest and reasonable amount to pay for the privilege or opportunity to travel at any time throughout the year on the 21,000 miles of highway in this state.

Increasing the fuel tax to support the highway program is the most logical approach of obtaining the necessary monies to provide safe and modern highways in this state.

There are several beneficial aspects relating to this method of taxation, including recognition of the fact that it would create only a modest additional cost to each motorist, the fact that it could be collected through current administrative procedures with no additional cost to people, and the fact that it would allow us to reduce the level of bonded indebtedness by \$3 million. However, I believe that one of the greatest benefits of this method of securing the necessary revenue is the fact that out-of-state motorists provide a considerable portion of the revenue from this source. All of us are well aware of the significant increases in traffic during the vacation seasons, much of which is due to the out-of-state vehicles. An example of the significance of the amount of travel by out-of-state vehicles is contained in the report of travel on the Maine Turnpike where nearly 64 percent of the total number of vehicles using this facility during the summer of 1972 were from out of state. Of course this high percentage may not be applicable to all highways; however, it is quite apparent that the out-of-state vehicles contribute significantly to this method of providing funds for the highway program in Maine. And I say, let them help to pay the bills.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we do not indefinitely postpone this bill.

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise to support the motion made by the gentleman from Solon, Mr. Faucher. I want Maine to be first in the nation, but one

thing I don't want them to be is first in the nation when it comes to gas tax. We seem to be climbing that spiral ladder of taxation in this State before I came here and since I have come here, and I am one of these conservative members of the House. I don't believe the Highway Department is going to stop existing if we don't give them this cent increase. I can't hardly believe they are going to close the doors and stop plowing the roads and paving the roads and doing everything that the Highway Committee is going to tell you that they are doing for us in this House. The idea of the out-of-staters coming in here and paying the tax burden on the roads, they do pay a portion of it but the people you and I represent stay here 12 months a year.

I wouldn't mind if the highway bond issue was \$19 million and send it out. I know people are going to say this is bad financing, well, maybe it is but this is probably the only way that some of the people in the Highway Department and maybe some members of the Legislature will get the message to the people that they are representing, because the people of this state will vote down—and I assume they would vote down a \$19 million bond issue. I am almost sure that they are going to vote down a \$7½ million bond issue and I am going to vote to send it out to them, because some of us supposedly are conservatives, obstructionists, people that are hitting away at the Highway Department. They say that we continually do it every year, but we are trying to give you a message that the people that I talked to have been giving to me. And I am very much against the gas tax.

I have to commend Representative Faucher with the picture of him in the paper the other day, but the people that are talking about a gas shortage and there is an increase now and feds are talking about an increase at the federal level. I think it would be unwise at this time for this legislature to pass an increase in the gas tax.

I certainly ask you to support the motion of the gentleman from Solon, Mr. Faucher. He is a very wise gentleman, he has presented some very good arguments, and I hope you support him this morning.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Madison, Mrs. Berry.

Mrs. BERRY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to commend Mr. Faucher also. But you know, I think that he decided that the early mode of travel wasn't so great after all, because he told me he was exhausted and he asked me for a ride home, and I am one of those people who are willing to go along with the gas tax because I think it is going to do the people of Maine some good.

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

Mr. WOOD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am not going to stand here today and plead for the passage of this bill. It might be good if we defeated it and defeated the bond issue too, tell the people that we are not going to support the maintenance of their roads in the towns and cities and see what would happen. I am going to tell you a few things that the gas tax will pay for and you can make up your own minds whether you want to pay for them or not.

We have on the highway appropriations table L. D.'s brought in and fought for by the members of this House. The Transportation Committee worked all winter on these bills, we found merit in the most of them and passed them out, and if these bills finally pass, it will cost about \$3 million. We have passed on bills that will give every town in the State of Maine an increase in winter maintenance of roads. We have passed out a bill that will give towns over a 5,000 population money to maintain their winter roads in the built-up sections of their towns and cities that they have never had before. That will give every city an increase in the maintenance of the winter roads. We have passed out approximately \$3 mil-

lion on resurfacing of roads that we never had before that the people have been pleading for because they have been riding over the holes for so long it has been putting their cars out of line, and they thought perhaps by getting surfacing, even if they paid a little more, it might prolong the life of their car a little while.

These are the things that this money will pay for. The benefits to the towns, which is nothing more or less than property tax relief, will cost more for two years than what the gas tax will take in for one year. It is up to the people of this House, I am not going to bang my head against the wall and plead for it because I don't care. It is the people back home that care what we do.

I want to help the towns and I want to help the cities. The City of Bangor and the City of Lewiston and a few other of our larger cities will receive more from this than any of the small towns can possibly hope to get. It is up to the people in this legislature right now whether they want to support those programs or let them go down to defeat. So you can make up your own mind how you want to vote on this tax and I will go along with it.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: A one cent increase in the gas tax is not all bad. Since 1955 we have increased it only twice, although many of you think it has been more than that, but since 1955 we have gone from seven to nine cents, and it would yield \$10 million. However, there is more to consider. We would be one of the two states in the country with a ten cent gasoline tax. Gas consumption has just about doubled with the installation of anti-pollution devices. In theory, this would be equivalent to a two cent increase for the consumer. It would cost the average worker who must travel a great distance to his job and the extra that he drives personally about \$25 a year at present consumption. That doesn't

sound like much, but we must also remember that the federal government may increase its tax also.

I do not believe that this is a propitious time to take this action. I sincerely believe it would be looked upon very unfavorably by the people of this state. Perhaps at a special session our economy may be more stable. We will then know what the government is going to do and we might consider the subject at that time.

Now, of course this one cent increase has no bearing on the present highway allocation, but would only affect new construction and perhaps it would make the Highway Department realize that not always does money come easy and further economies must be put into effect. I oppose enactment at this time.

Mr. FAUCHER of Solon requested permission to withdraw his motion for indefinite postponement, which was granted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Solon, Mr. Faucher.

Mr. FAUCHER: Mr. Speaker, I now move to oppose the enactment and would request a roll call.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mexico, Mr. Fraser.

Mr. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We have heard this morning about being conservative from the gentleman who is acknowledged even by himself to be a top-notch conservative, and I think that is great. But I don't think being conservative covers the rest of the state. Some years that same conservative person didn't hesitate one bit about strapping the state with a million and a half dollars worth of money to take the tolls of the bridge off a bridge in this area. I thought it was good, and I spoke for it, I favored it, and I am not a bit sorry, but nevertheless, it was a million and a half dollars that the State of Maine has got to pay and now with the bond issue and road construction or the gas tax.

The State of Maine has sent to Washington something like \$15 mil-

lion or so which we won't get back unless we can match it. The matching is much more favorable now than it used to be. It used to be 50-50, and now it is 30-70. But if we don't come up with that 30 we won't get the 70, and if that money leaves Washington and goes to some other state, it will never come back. So I don't call letting \$15 million of our money go to other states being very conservative.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Drigotas.

Mr. DRIGOTAS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: If I could see any improvement, great improvement in the roads in the State of Maine since we last granted them an increase of one cent in 1969 and in 1971, I would gladly vote for this bill, but I can't see a single bit of improvement in that space of time since those statutes have been imposed, and I am opposed to imposing another one at this session.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley.

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This is a long drawn out subject and I don't want to take the time, but I would tell you that if you studied the highway program you would find they had money enough.

I really think I know about this program, I really know about the highway budget and I know where the weak spots are and I know where the good ones are. Let me tell you what some of the good ones are, and you will jump a little. First of all, I think we have one of the greatest engineering departments of any state in the union, and it is acknowledged by other states, well administered and they do a good job. We got the job to engineer the high-level bridge that was built between us and New Hampshire. We got it because we had one of the better engineering departments in the Department of Highways. We didn't get too much on the administration because that is one of the places where we are weak. I haven't had the time, unfortunately, I have had a lot of

visitors and a lot of other things going on here, and I intended to have the figure for you this morning on what it cost per dollar to administer the highway funds. Last time we were before you, two years ago, it was 34 cents on a dollar as I remember it. Now this is strictly from memory, but I am pretty sure I am right. And that is probably one of the highest in the nation — probably. I am not sure, I haven't had time to research it which I intended to do. I was interrupted on many occasions. I now imagine, and I am quite sure that the administration of the state highway funds per capita is greater than it was two years ago, and I am reasonably sure that it was 34 cents on a dollar two years ago.

Now most of you don't know where the problems lie over there, and I can tell you where some of the biggest ones lie, where they lie by the millions. They have an equipment account, and this is where probably the biggest millions are stored away that you can't touch or you can't administer, and it started many, many years ago. We allowed them to buy a little bit of equipment and they set up an account known as the equipment account. Now they regulate this equipment account by what they charge for this equipment to each job whether it be state aid or whether it be highway construction and they are allowed to set their own fee. Now this probably the legislature should say what we charge for a piece of equipment. Now I mean by a piece of equipment, a truck, a tractor or bulldozer or shovel. They set the fee to their own liking. In other words, if this equipment account isn't growing fast enough to suit them by the millions, all they have got to do is say we will now charge, instead of five dollars an hour for a big truck we will charge eight dollars to this particular state aid or this particular highway construction, and this builds up a tremendous account known as the equipment account.

Now they are able to thumb their nose at us people or ignore us completely because they don't

have to have any sanction from us to spend out of this equipment account. And if you will take notice, I think it is in their report how many millions is stored in this equipment account. They can buy 75 trucks at their leisure, they can do nearly everything they want to in this account known as the equipment account. We have no account over it; this is a complete account of theirs.

This gas tax, if we raise it, only produces about \$4 million — only I say, because in terms of them doing business they have more than that in surplus in the equipment account alone.

So it does have some very weak spots, and one of them, in my opinion, is administration and the other one where they are really giving you the business is this equipment account. Now, don't take my word for it, they put out a report, you can find out before you vote on this, you can stall it along and find out what is in the equipment account and what they are doing with the equipment account, and what they are charging, if it isn't enough, the way it stands today they can say, we have to have more per hour for this equipment and they can build that equipment account to anything they want, \$10 million, \$20 million, what have you. So they have got plenty of reserves, how they hide it continuously year after year from the legislature is because you people are like I was yesterday, busy and don't have time to look into these things. They are there for you if you really want to study and inquire.

So I suggest before you vote yes to give them another \$4 million that you at least consider what I am telling you to the extent that you will read their own reports, inquire about the equipment account, see what we are paying for administration comparable to other states. I am sure that we could have a reputable engineering firm administer our highway funds and save us several million dollars.

There are many things we can do, but it is like a little boy years ago when I went to school they told about holding his finger, plug-

ging a hole in a dike with his finger. We in this House down through the years try to plug all these holes with dollar bills, with the taxpayers dollar bills. Frankly, that is not the way to do it. Let's be business people about it, let's study these reports, let's see where the leak in the dam is or the leak in the highway funds, it is leaking out by the millions. Let's not try to plug it with dollar bills, let's try to plug it with common sense, good judgment, and a little bit of knowledge of what they are doing, and then they can't really shaft you like they are, and this really deserves your study and consideration.

I hope this morning, before you vote for this bill to increase the gas tax \$4 million, you will see where all the leaks are over there, and you will see there are many leaks that are more than \$4 million. But if we meet here for the last two or three sessions and increase a cent, they are not satisfied, they would like to have two, and we know that the federal government has already said they are going to increase it four cents, and this is going to be a tremendous burden to the people of the State of Maine. Certainly the federal is going to pass it back to us, so there again we are looking for highway construction; the federal is going to start passing back more, I am sure.

But let me tell you where I live. I live some 50 miles from East Millinocket where a lot of my people that work drive for 50 miles night and morning, a lot more driving to Bangor which is 36 miles, and they don't all work for big pay in shoe factories and paper mills and so forth and this is a tremendous burden to these people. This is why I feel so dedicated and concerned about putting an extra burden on these people. They are barely existing today on the wages they are getting. By the time they take out their transportation cost of driving, and now some people say to me, Mr. Dudley, why don't they share a ride, I think they do on some occasions, but it is unusual. They work shift work, 3 to 11, 11 to 7 and day shift and different shifts; it is almost

impossible for these people to pool rides. It is a good idea when you can do it and I am sure they do it some, but when you get right down to the nitty-gritty of the subject, they have gasoline, and they have got to get to work; and when we do this, we are directly stepping on their pocketbook, and this is one of the things I am here for. I think it is one of the reasons I have been here down through the years. I have tried to watch out for these people whose pocketbooks are being stepped on. There is nothing that hurts people any more. You can do things to them that they don't like, but when you step on their pocketbook, they remember you for it, and I hope you take this into consideration and at least have the good judgment to study the highway report and study the equipment account and see where the leaks are and you will have a second thought before you vote for a gas tax increase.

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I had to leave the House for a few moments a while back when one of the legislators was speaking, and I understand that there was some reference made to tolls by a conservative member of this House, the tolls on a toll bridge. This is what I was told. Let me tell you, I did sponsor a bill in the last session to remove the tolls off the Bangor-Brewer bridge, and I got it through this House, and it sat on the highway table up until almost the final day of enactment. I was very much against the increase in the gas tax then as I am now, and believe me, they had something over there in the other body that was really bugging me, because I wanted to get the tolls off my bridge, and it did amount to a substantial amount of money. I never did vote for the gas tax in the last session, and it was brought up to me more than once "Do you know, Representative, that you have a bridge —

The SPEAKER: Will the gentleman confine his remarks to the gas tax this year and not to some

bill that was before us a year or more ago.

Mr. KELLEHER: Well I am like the lawyer in court, I am trying to build up to what I want to say, if you understand what I mean, Mr. Speaker. I am not so clever at getting there right quick. It takes me just a moment to get there. If you would bear with me, I would thank you and the House.

Anyway, I didn't vote for it, and it finally was enacted. I am not the kind of a person — what I am trying to say is I don't vote for spending packages and not vote for funding. I have never tried to do it since I have been here, and I hope I never do. The bill that I had I thought was fair and reasonable before, and I think that this is unreasonable at this time.

I think Representative Dudley has spoken more times to this House on the Highway Department and I feel very bad, a lot of times very few people listen to him, because he is a very knowledgeable person, he is very knowledgeable with the department. He has spent many many terms in that committee along with the very capable members that are on that committee now. I think the words of wisdom that he is trying to give this House is that let's not support the tax issue this year. There are pending increases in the gas tax in the federal Congress, and this money is going to be coming back to the states, I am sure. I don't believe it is necessary now and I thank you.

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

Mr. SHELTRA: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: On my car radio this morning on my way up here, the American Automobile Association was giving out some statistics; mainly, that three weeks ago 78 percent of your gasoline stations, service stations, were operating on a full-time basis. Two weeks ago that percentage went down to 64 percent. Last week, the week just by us, only 53 percent of the gasoline stations throughout the country were operating on a full time basis.

This only indicates to me that the prices of gasoline are going to

go up tremendously as has already been indicated through your newspaper and other media. So we are not just arguing about a one cent raise here. The American motorist is going to be paying at least 30 to 40 percent more for his gasoline during the next six months or so to come, and God knows if it will ever come down again.

Another situation that sticks in my craw is these anti-pollution devices on our automobiles. I happen to have a new car, and I have noticed that my gas mileage — my cost of my gasoline has increased at least 30 percent since this anti-pollution device has been on. I think that the American motorist is taking one heck of a rooking already without adding insult to injury here especially this session and adding another cent on the gas tax. I do hope you will be persistent and keep going against this tax.

Mr. Fraser was granted permission to speak a third time.

Mr. FRASER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: First, I want to acknowledge the fact that I certainly could not be as busy as Mr. Dudley has been, because I couldn't take it.

There has also been something said here this morning, that the highways have not improved over the last two years, but I think I would take exception to that, they have improved. Perhaps not where one persons travels but statewide there have been some improvements.

One thing that we don't seem to think about is the maintenance cost in our state. The State of Maine has problems that — well, we have been talking about the State of Connecticut. They do not have the problems that we have. They do not have three or four feet of frost in the ground every year and this year especially. We had frost coming out of the ground in January which spoiled the roads, and then they froze again, and then came spring, they thawed out again and that hurt them again. Just normal maintenance would cost between \$2,000 to \$4,000 a mile. We have a lot of miles in this State of Maine, somewhere



around 25 or 30 thousand miles. Just maintaining them alone without any improvement, that money has to be spent.

I don't think this extra one cent is going to hurt anybody, because most people who go to work with their cars, I don't think they buy more than ten gallons a week, so that is an extra ten cents.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from York, Mr. Rolde.

Mr. ROLDE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: What we are considering here today is the way to pay for our highway construction program. The questions facing us are: Is it better to have a \$19 million bond issue, or is it better to have a gas tax increase of one cent and a \$7.8 million bond issue?

Regarding a gas tax increase, it might be that the anger of the people in having another gas tax imposed on them would make them rise up against the \$7.8 million bond issue and that we might be back here in the Special Session looking for another gas tax increase.

I do not know if the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Kelleher, is right, that the people will turn down a \$19 million bond issue. I tend to disagree with him. But if you are worried about having funds for our highway construction program, I think you should be very leary about enacting still another gas tax at a very bad time and thus, jeopardizing the \$7.8 million needed to pay for the rest of the construction program.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bethel, Mr. Willard.

Mr. WILLARD: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am sure that America's prosperity is definitely tied to its mobility. Any society to be prosperous must be mobile, and if we raise millions of bushels of potatoes in Aroostook County and if we can't get them down to market, there is no sense in raising the potatoes, and our people are not going to be prosperous. It is the same in my area.

We have roads on which we truck our wood to our mills, the Oxford Paper and the Brown Company and the smaller mills in the area, and some of these are narrow; and my goodness, we can meet one of those trucks, and they are coming at you 60 miles an hour, it scares the life out of me. I am sure that we have a lot of roads in Oxford County that need to be rebuilt, and I think the only way that we can get them rebuilt is to pay the taxes. I am highly in favor of paying taxes rather than bond issues, and I am very much in favor of this penny tax.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. McNally.

Mr. McNALLY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have been here three terms before, and in our meetings before the former Highway Committee and last term, the Committee of Transportation, there didn't seem to be any yield whatsoever. No matter what you tried to suggest to them, they seemed to be adamant — this is it or nothing.

This year, there seems to be a little bit of difference in the attitude. They have come out of their own accord and said that we must have a stopgap program, and then they admitted it probably would be lots better if we took some of the construction money which they had proposed and put it into the new skinny mix and got more miles of road repaired so that they would be serviceable for the next three or four years instead of building the roads which cost so much in the past and would cost more in the future.

I am going to say to the young folks here that can't see a gas tax and would prefer a bond issue, I don't know why I should worry about a bond issue, because I don't expect to live forever. I don't expect to live long enough to see the end of the bond issue, and they are the ones who are going to be paying the interest on the bond issue. So when you consider whether it is better to have a small bond issue and a gas tax, which is a pay as you

go proposition with the gas tax, that is for them to decide. As far as I know, it isn't going to affect me too much. But the fact is if every time we come here we raise the people that work for the state with a certain pay raise, if we do what we have done in the past, if we remove the tolls from all the bridges and if we have to go along with what inflation has caused us to raise, then there must be some way of paying for it or else there must be fewer miles of roads built.

The gas tax, to my mind, is something that even one or two states in your little state government pamphlet you got has thought of raising, because they thought that there wouldn't be so much gas bought this year due to the necessity of stations being closed down, as you heard, and you may have recalled reading that fact.

As I sit here and listen to it all and thought how I hated to give up the idea of perhaps having the good things that we have worked for, it reminded me of a story. There was a minister that decided they ought to have a new chandelier in this church. So when he announced about taking up the collection, he asked if they wouldn't each one of them donate a dollar extra for the chandelier. And so they took up the collection and after they had counted it, there was only one dollar extra over what they usually got; but on the way out of church, one fellow stopped, and he said to the minister, "You know, you are not going to get any money for that chandelier out of these folks. In the first place, they are poor people, and they haven't any money. Another thing is they don't know how to play it, and besides, we need to put our money into some lighting in this church."

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Morton.

Mr. MORTON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I stand here this morning supporting the one cent increase in the gas tax.

I would like to compliment the gentleman from Enfield on some direct remarks in connection with

the department as against the general criticisms we have heard so frequently. It is pretty easy to throw up a paint brush and generally criticize, but it is a little more difficult to pinpoint an argument. I would like to take a shot at the argument that he expressed this morning.

He talked about the so-called equipment account. I submit this is a very common accounting practice that is used in many communities. We certainly use it in my community, and I am sure the state would be remiss if they didn't use that method of handling accounting for the funds.

He mentioned the fact that it was charging into this fund ex-orbitant amounts. I haven't checked them all. I don't know what they charge for bulldozers and steamshovels, but I have happened to check into the area of trucks for maintenance, and I find that the State of Maine charges itself less money per truck per hour for maintenance than it pays out to the average individual trucking contractor that wants to hire his truck out to the state. I submit to you, they should do this, because the state should be more efficient, but I submit that they are more efficient, and these kind of statistics show it. This is not a nefarious practice, this business of having an equipment account. It is modern, efficient business management of the Highway Department.

The gentleman from Enfield has pointed out that we have a good Engineering Department. I am glad to hear him say that. I agree with him. I think you should remember, ladies and gentlemen, that in the many many years that we have had the present system and well before that, there has been no taint of scandal attached to the Highway Department in Maine. Nobody is accused of getting anything under the table. Compare that, I ask you, with many of the other states that exist in this country and some of the scandals that taint their highway departments.

I think we have a good thing here in Maine and a good Highway Department. It is efficient. The other day I mentioned some sta-

tistics in connection with maintenance and the cost, compared it with other states. Mr. Fraser mentioned Connecticut, we maintain 11,000 miles of two-lane highway at the state level with thirteen or fourteen hundred men. With all the less frost and snow and problems they have in Connecticut, they maintain just 5,000 miles with 2,000 men, and they still don't put in the culverts and put up the guardrails that our maintenance men do. That sounds to me like efficient operation.

I think we have a good thing in our Highway Department in the State of Maine. I think we should support it. Gas tax revenue is dedicated revenue. It goes for highways, it doesn't go for something else. We have maintained that dedicated status in this legislature in spite of attempts to undedicate it.

I believe strongly that my people favor the approach of pay as you go as much as you can, and I don't think they are going to be fooled if somebody throws a 7 or 8 million dollar bond issue at them. They know that is going to be cheaper than a \$19 million bond issue. I believe the people support the pay as you go principle. I think they support the good department that we have, and I hope you will go along with this tax increase.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Dyar.

Mr. DYAR: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am not going to whitewash or use paint, as possibly the last speaker has mentioned. I would like to state some facts as I see them.

Five years ago, I requested highway construction on a primary road, Route 4 between the towns of Strong and Phillips which is the main artery to Rangeley and the Saddleback area. At that time I was told that highway construction was based on fatality rates. I stated to the Highway Department at that time I did not think that we had to create deaths in this state to build highways.

The application was made out and I assume accepted by the High-

way Department. I went back three years ago or two years ago to find out what was going on, and they more or less promised me that the money would be in so that the highway could be constructed in the biennium of 1973-74.

This past spring I received a letter from the department saying they were going to put \$50,000 in the biennium of 1973-74 and another 50,000 in 1974-75 as a stopgap measure. They lacked funds. I will submit that this piece of road I am talking about, 11 miles, you can pass in two places with some safety.

Now, the gentleman from Bethel, Mr. Willard, has mentioned pulp trucks screaming down the highway at 50 and 60 miles an hour. We have these. We have had no fatalities, but we have had many many severe accidents where people have been laid up for years and actually crippled for life.

Now, last week I went over to the Highway Department, and I wanted to see the people in administration. The first three I asked for were all out of the office. I was referred down the line to the Right-of-Way Division. I got no answer there, and they referred me to the district office, and I suggested they have the district office contact me rather than reverse. I received a note from Mr. Scoffield. At the time I had seen evidence of these trucks, 8, 10 or 12 of the big trucks hauling what I thought was skinny mix to this project, the stop gap measure. I was assured by the department that this was not skinny mix. On last Saturday I went up to check out to find out whether it was skinny mix or not, and they were right, it was not skinny mix. It was cold patch.

They put this cold patch on the highway, used a roller to pack it down, then put a grader over it. Well, they did accomplish something, they filled up some of the potholes mechanically and covered up some of the cracks in the road, but they left a crown ball. Now, when you go up that road at 45 miles an hour and hit the crown in the road, you just weave back and forth and you have no

place to go but out in the pucker brush.

Since the date of application, we have had several rains, and I will submit to you gentlemen this morning, if you want to go up and look, you will see the application of the cold patch along the edges of the road. Now, how much they spent there in the last two weeks in this stopgap improvement, I don't know. I will tell you gentlemen here this morning, if I know anything — and I am not too brilliant on that subject, but I can just guess — that the maintenance cost in this 11 miles of road is in excess of what they have got in for a stopgap measure in any given year.

There are landslides into the river. Traffic is blocked sometimes for hours due to the landslides. They send in their maintenance crews to clean the dirt off the road to get highway traffic moving, and yet, they cannot rebuild. What they are doing here on a yearly basis through maintenance costs, over a ten-year period they could reconstruct this highway.

The sad thing is that in Rangeley we have a \$30 million five-year plan at Saddleback to put in a modern recreational area, and we have no highways to get there. Now, the commissioner told me several years ago when we put the I. P. mill in Jay and expended monies that were allocated for Route 2 into a bridge crossing the Androscoggin River for the I. P. Company, that if I could ever come to him and show him a million dollar program, industrial program for millions of dollars, that he would certainly put highways in there. Yet, I have a \$30 million project on the drawing boards, much of it has been approved financially, and yet, we cannot get highways; and these people are putting cold patch on a road as a stopgap improvement and Mother Nature is putting that cold patch out into the ditches. Now, if this is efficiency, I wonder where efficiency begins.

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

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am not here to criticize the Highway Department. I think they do a wonderful job, but I am against this gasoline tax. I would like to congratulate the Transportation Committee who, most of the time, come out with very good decisions on bills before them, and I would like to congratulate further the Highway Division, because I don't know what they do to these committees, but it seems to me that they must furnish them with a record. When they go to bed at night, they put this record on, and this record repeats all night over and over again: soak the motorists, soak the motorists, soak the motorists, soak the motorists. When they get up in the morning, they come here in a trance, and they go for a gasoline tax. I think it is about time we stop soaking the motorists in this state.

It was stated here that out-of-staters will help pay for this. We can give the same argument for raising the sales tax one or two cents, because out-of-state people will help us pay our sales tax. So I cannot see a valid reason today why we must vote for an increase in the gasoline tax. Many many reasons have been given on the floor of this House, good, valid reasons why we shouldn't. The economy of this state and the economy of the United States at this time does not call for an increase in taxes of any kind. So, I am against the increase of the gasoline tax at this time.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Poland, Mr. Dunn.

Mr. DUNN: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: Obtaining funds through this method has several beneficial aspects. For example, the user pays in proportion to his use of the highway.

Those from out-of-state provide income in relation to the use of the highway system. There is only a modest percentage of change in cost to the consumer considering the total cost of operating a motor vehicle. This method of obtaining additional revenue would provide the state with an opportunity to

reduce the bonded indebtedness of the state for highway purposes. Therefore, following the evaluation of all reasonable methods of obtaining funds to continue the operation of what may realistically be called a modest highway program, enactment of this legislation is most appropriate.

I kind of have gotten into the habit of voting no on taxes, but I am going to change today and vote yes on this one.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Deshaies.

Mr. DESHAIES: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: What Mr. McNally has said concerning the interest on bonds may be true, but I tend to agree with Mr. Sheltra, for if the past holds true to form, every time we have an increase in tax, the retailers follow suit. So what is proposed initially as a one cent increase could easily end up as four or five cents. I hope we kill this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Kauffman.

Mr. KAUFFMAN: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: In response to the last speaker's comments, along the New Hampshire border, the distributors have been absorbing the tax for the last two tax increases. Therefore, the filling station did not have to raise his price. However, they are not going to absorb this increase.

Mr. Speaker, I present a question to you. I have a family interest in a filling station in Kittery with my son-in-law runs, and if this tax goes through, he is going to lose business. Therefore, I am not going to vote for it or against it, and I would like to be excused.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may be excused if he feels he has a conflict.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. La-Charite.

Mr. LACHARITE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House: I concur fully with the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Morton. A number of people have stated that the Highway Department doesn't need any more

money. We have also heard from a number of people that Maine does need better roads, and also a number of roads should be resurfaced. Well, the Highway Department has done an outstanding job in their resurfacing program and through this resurfacing program has also saved money from the way that they used to repair their roads.

I submit to you that to keep this program going and to have some needed new construction, the department does need money. I honestly feel that the best way to provide them with this money is on the pay as you go method and that is the one cent increase in the gas tax.

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

Mr. SIMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House: I am sure all of you realize that I am probably not the most liberal person in this body. In the last session, I went a long long ways before I ever gave in on the gas tax. I did so very reluctantly when I realized we were going to lose the benefits of the summer program.

You know, I have to look at this particular proposal in a different light, too. I realize that many of the things that have been stated here this morning, pro and con and so forth, I mean, all are valid reasons to either support or not support. I have listened to the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Dyar, talk about the road that they repaired as a stopgap measure. I can remember last year, very naive about the skinny mix program, I was very much concerned about the same type of operation that they were putting in my area. I was getting more complaints from people than I could really stand.

Finally, I went to the highway people and suddenly realized that the shoulders had to be built up before they could put the skinny mix program on, and we would have to ride on those roads in our area for a period of time while — for one year until the skinny mix program went on the second year.

I have also taken a look at this document which I have got in my hand which is the highway construction program for the next two years. I have gone through here, and I can see some good, worthwhile projects in this thing, and I can see a project on one road right between Route 302 and 114 in Standish over next to Windham where there is one little intersection there that has taken three lives in the last five, six years. That intersection was supposed to have been changed quite some time ago. Unfortunately, all the monies have gone in to the primary road system and gone into the interstate system and not into the secondary roads.

I also look at it from a point of view of the economy of this state. We are talking in this particular booklet right here, added increase in the gas tax to fund it and possibly an increase in the bond, to the tune of some \$80 million worth of work and worth of employment in this state. Now, economists will tell you that a dollar circulates through a community at least eight times before it leaves circulation. At that rate, we would be talking about \$640 million worth of transactions of business in this state.

As I look at it from that point of view and I see the people that would be employed and the amount of money that would be going into Maine people's hands, as I look at it from the point of view that the users are the ones who are paying, that we are also benefiting by the people who visit this state through a gas tax and I see the benefits of the roads that are going to be built through this thing, I can personally look and put aside some of my personal differences with the Highway Department on some things and hope that maybe I can straighten those out by just working with them and meeting with them.

I, therefore, hope that you will go along with the passage of this gas tax. I do, and I really feel that it is something that this state needs and needs in the best interests of the state at this time. I realize that people don't like to be taxed, but I think when you

come right down to it, people realize that if they are going to dance, they have to pay the fiddler. This time, that is just exactly what we are doing.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley.

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I will try to be very brief. I suspect a lot of the new members don't know that the highway program is about four years ahead of us all the time on account of the engineering studies and so forth. In other words, what I am trying to say is the money we appropriate if we do pass this tax is really for programs four years in advance. It is not for today's programs. They are all laid out and already financed.

While I am on my feet, I would like to have some member of the committee — I would like to have the learned member, Mr. Morton, tell us what the balance is in the equipment account. He seems to have some figures there before him. I think he knows, but he is reluctant to tell you. If he doesn't care to, I hope that some member of the highway committee will tell you what the balance is and how much this equipment account is and what the balance is in it. If I was on the highway committee, I would have the figures here before you, and they must have them.

So, we are not talking about this year's building or next year's building. The highway program is about four years ahead of us on account of the engineering. So it doesn't affect the program this summer or next summer, because they are about — the gas tax is ahead of us all the time. I am sure if we give them a five cent gas tax this time, next time they will be back for one more.

I don't have any serious gripe with them. I think they are — probably the department is run as well as any big department could be run or any big industry. It is just the idea that rather than try to find the money within the department, they find it much easier to come here and get the

money from us, the legislature, by increasing it.

Now, I have been listening to the debate here, and I was led to believe by the conversation that I have heard the department didn't have any money. This is not so. They have millions of dollars of income, and it is increasing every year. We register more cars every year, many many thousands more cars. We are selling more gas every year until this thing came along with the shortage of gas, and even then I think we will sell more gas this year than we did last year, at least as much. So we have an increase already by virtue of the fact that we sell more products, we register more cars, we sell more licenses every year. This should take care of the extra cost of a shovel going up or something going up in the department, the mere fact that everything goes up, too. Their revenue is going up without the increase in the gas tax.

So, I hope you weren't led to believe the department doesn't have any money to deal with. They have millions to deal with now, and I hope when I sit down, some member of the highway committee will be kind enough to tell you — or Mr. Morton — the amount of the account and how much surplus there is in the equipment account.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlelady from Madison, Mrs. Berry.

Mrs. BERRY: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I would like to say that on February 1 there was somewhere around a million dollars in this equipment fund. Since then, much of it has been used. So we don't have the millions of dollars that has been spoken of.

This fund is used for maintenance and repairs of the equipment and replacement only. When new equipment is bought, it has to go through the Governor and the Council. So they don't have a prerogative to step out and buy 75 new trucks if they want to unless these are replacements that they feel have to be replaced.

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

Mr. GOODWIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House: Just briefly, I would like to reiterate a little bit what Mr. Dudley just spoke on. I have here on my desk an outline of the York County highway program. When I first saw this, I looked through it, and I noticed one town I represent is Elliot — is scheduled for a complete resurfacing.

I do not know who put this here, but I can well imagine why it was put here. I checked this out, and I found that all this resurfacing is already scheduled, and actually, it is already started in some areas. I would not be affected by this gas tax. So therefore, I am going to continue my opposition to this gas tax. I probably would anyway.

I would hope that anybody here that does have this on their desk would not feel that they are being threatened by the loss of their resurfacing in their area just because they are not in support of the gas tax, because as Mr. Dudley said, this is scheduled many years in advance. It is usually already planned out for this year. I would like to find out who distributed this.

I do agree that we need good roads in this state, but I also agree that in Maine, a car is a necessity, not a luxury, and we are just placing a tremendous burden on Maine people by this increase. If a road is bad, perhaps we should just slow down for a while until we can get to fix it up rather than just redo it so that we can go faster.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from East Corinth, Mr. Strout.

Mr. STROUT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It has been said that this one cent extra in the gas tax has no effect on the next two years. We proposed in committee an additional \$2.3 million of resurfacing be performed in the next two years which is an additional 700 to 800 miles of resurfacing, and this isn't going to be done if this gas tax doesn't go through.

Another thing, we have increased the state aid maintenance for winter roads, so all of the areas with a one million five hundred valua-

tion down has been increased anywhere from \$100 to \$200, one million five and above has been increased \$50. This goes up to five million valuation. All of the built-up areas have been increased \$200. Now, some of these things are going to be affected if this gas tax doesn't go through.

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

Mr. LaCHARITE: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: In answer to the gentleman from South Berwick, Mr. Goodwin, possibly the increase in the gas tax won't affect the roads in Elliot, but without a new gas tax, other roads won't be able to be resurfaced in the future, and we do need the continuation of resurfacing.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. McNally.

Mr. McNALLY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to answer the gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Perkins. I probably am the one that initiated this idea of putting on your desk what your county is receiving for a program in this biennium. It started this. Last week at ten minutes past eight one morning I called Mr. Luettich. I called Roger Mallar but he was out but I got Mr. Luettich and he started work on it. Then of course as you know, Maine Good Roads does have a lobbyist here and I suspect between us that we got them on the desks.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oakland, Mr. Brawn.

Mr. BRAWN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: Any of you that have seen a log drive know someone has to bring up the rear or it wouldn't be a good drive.

Now I don't have a speech prepared for me here this morning by anyone, same as I noticed a lot of them have. I am not a contractor. I don't receive anything from the state directly or indirectly in any way, shape or manner so I don't have any axe to grind here. I like every member that is on the Highway Department.

I have three vehicles which we drive in my family. I figured it

up last night, it is going to cost me from \$75 to \$82 a year if this cent goes through extra out of my pocket.

If this was to go to the people of the State of Maine to vote upon, it would be defeated soundly, because my people have called me and they do not want it.

Now in regards to my good friend from Madison, Mrs. Berry, she said that my good friend Mr. Faucher asked her for a ride. Now you are probably all familiar with the road on the westerly side of the Kennebec River, it is very wooded. I know that Mr. Faucher did not ride home with her and I would like to know why.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I could touch the subject which is a true subject, as I did years ago, that this type of a package definitely means at least 30 percent being paid for by the tourists from out of state. We are not just a three month tourist state, we are a pretty near nine months tourist state. We have a beautiful summer tourist trade, we have a lot of hunting and fishing that comes in here in the fall and quite a lot in the spring. Now, thank God our skiing industry is growing in leaps and bounds, and all one has to do is go to the different ski areas to bear out that point.

The fact of the matter is that the bond issue itself would be borne 100 percent by the state of Maine. But that is not my reason for getting up here this morning. In the first place, in the City of Auburn they have what they call the Hampshire Street project which is a million and a half. They spent a couple of million dollars on Route 4. There is \$600,000 for Minot Avenue. There is some money allocated for the possibility eventually of a complete rebuilding which we are going to need from Lewiston to Winthrop. There is going to be some work done on the Lisbon road, and some work done on Sabattus road.

When the famous Viet Nam bridge first started out, it was a \$4 million project. The bridge was



defeated the first time around and then I, with due sympathy to the gentleman from Yarmouth, a fine young man, Mr. Jackson, I too waited 20 years. Possibly the difference between he and I is that I traveled 28,000 miles. I will never forget if I live to be 100 one place in Portage Lake, which is something like 375 miles away from home. When I distributed a little leaflet asking him to vote for me and the proprietor of the place stopped the music and stopped the noise and said, "If he can come up here to ask us to vote for this bridge, why I can vote for it."

It is well known that I never presented a bill and I shall ever be grateful, however, for the gentleman from Mexico, Mr. Fraser, for presenting a bill at the request, possibly by himself, and also at the request of the Highway Department. It is a well known fact that I killed the proposal myself when it came back here with two appropriations which you refused to do and urged you to pass the bill that was presently under a m e n d m e n t by the gentleman from Bath, my good friend, Mr. Ross. So help me God, I never had any idea at all for the first time I will make my declaration, which I have made before, of having that bridge named after me. Incidentally I have gone across that bridge once.

The SPEAKER: Will the gentleman confine his remarks to the pending motion which is passage to be enacted.

Mr. JALBERT: I am confining myself to the issue Mr. Speaker. The price of that bridge leaked from the time it was finally introduced until it was finally passed to seven million dollars, which was three million dollars more than was anticipated.

In confining myself strictly with the issue, with all the money that has been poured into my county and all the money that I have gotten out of the Highway Department, and all the money that is coming, I would feel like an absolute positive ingrate if I didn't vote for this measure.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Island Falls, Mr. Walker.

Mr. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is probably my first one off the cuff since I have been a member of this body. But I am going to name two or three things and probably a lot of people will refute them. The price of a gallon of gasoline is the best buy on the market today as compared to what it used to be. The price of a quart of milk has gone from five cents to 31, 32. The price of a gallon of gas has dropped from 50 to 60 cents and is not in the 40 cent class, and you can buy a thousand gallons of gas with this one cent tax added for just a ten dollar bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Yarmouth, Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to point out that the bridge in Harpswell the abutments are in and it is in the process of building. I would also point out that it hasn't been named. Beyond that, dealing with the issue more directly, I think we are dealing with something quite historic here, and what comes to mind is a cartoon I saw which the caption was "What do you say to a nasty Arab who has a lot of oil?" And the answer was "You call him Sir."

I think what we are seeing here is the beginning of the end of the gasoline engine as we know it and automobiles as we know it, and I think what we are also seeing is the beginning of where in the legislature and the state you have to start thinking seriously about public transportation.

I personally hope that we do defeat the gas tax.

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

Mr. GAUTHIER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The gentleman from Kittery told you a few minutes ago that the people in his area, the salesmen of gasoline, the station owners, have to absorb the tax. Well, this is what I have been telling you when I put in the bill in order for the liquor tax in Sanford. Quite often we hear, like we did a few minutes ago, hear

speakers say let's soak the tourists coming into the State of Maine. But I am going to tell you one thing, if you continue soaking the tourists coming in the State of Maine, they won't come in the State of Maine, they will go in to the State of New Hampshire which quite a few of them are doing at the present time.

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 passage to be enacted. Thus being an emergency measure, a two-thirds affirmative vote of the entire elected membership of this House is necessary. All those in favor of passage to be enacted as an emergency measure will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Albert, Berry, G. W.; Binnette, Birt, Bither, Bragdon, Briggs, Cameron, Carey, Carter, Churchill, Cottrell, Curran, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Davis, Donaghy, Dow, Dunn, Evans, Farnham, Farrington, Fraser, Garsoe, Genest, Good, Greenlaw, Hamblen, Haskell, Hunter, Jacques, Jalbert, Kelley, Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Knight, LaCharite, LeBlanc, Lewis, E.; Lynch, MacLeod, Maddox, Mahany, Martin, Maxwell, McCormick, McNally, Merrill, Mills, Morton, Norris, Parks, Perkins, Pontbriand, Pratt, Rollins, Shaw, Silverman, Simpson, L. E.; Smith, S.; Soulas, Sproul, Stillings, Susi, Trask, Trumbull, Walker, Webber, White, Whitzell, Willard, Wood, M. E.; The Speaker.

NAY — Ault, Baker, Berry, P. P.; Boudreau, Brawn, Brown, Bunker, Bustin, Carrier, Chick, Chonko, Clark, Conley, Connolly, Cooney, Cote, Crommett, Deshaies, Drigotas, Dunleavy, Dyar, Emery, D. F.; Faucher, Fecteau, Ferris, Finemore, Flynn, Gahagan, Gauthier, Goodwin, H.; Goodwin,

K.; Hancock, Henley, Herrick, Hobbins, Hoffses, Huber, Immonen, Jackson, Kelleher, Kilroy, LaPointe, Lawry, Lewis, J.; Littlefield, McHenry, McKernan, McMahon, McTeague, Morin, L.; Morin, V.; Mulkern, Murchison, Murray, Najarian, O'Brien, Palmer, Peterson, Ricker, Rolde, Ross, Santoro, Sheltra, Shute, Smith, D. M.; Strout, Talbot, Theriault, Tierney, Tyndale, Wheeler.

ABSENT — Cressey, Dam, Dudley, Farley, Kauffman, Tanguay.

Yes, 72; No, 73; Absent, 6.

The SPEAKER: Seventy-two having voted in the affirmative and seventy-three having voted in the negative, with six being absent, this Bill fails of passage to be enacted.

Sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the third tabled and today assigned matter:

Joint Order Relative to Joint Rule 4. (S. P. 672)

Tabled — June 19, by Mr. Simpson of Standish.

Pending — Passage.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I move we indefinitely postpone this joint order.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Brown, moves the indefinite postponement of this joint order.

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

Mr. COONEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to explain why this order is before you and ask you if you might just read it and see if this is an idea that if you don't want to consider favorably this morning you might consider as a way to deal with the problem of legislative disclosure.

As you know we have, at least the two terms I have been here, several bills each session about legislative ethics and legislative disclosure. We had one presented by a member of the other body before state government this year, and the committee felt that it was just too massive a plan, it couldn't

really be implemented, especially in our citizen legislature, so we agreed that it should probably be killed. But the committee also agreed to hold up a day or two on sending it out "ought not to pass" so that I and a couple of my colleagues might have an opportunity to think about some other alternatives that the committee might consider.

The suggestion that I made was amending the House Rules especially House Rule 4, and if you get your Senate and House register out, on page 112 you will find House Rule 4. It was my thought that this rule that reads "No member shall be permitted to vote on any question in either branch of the legislature or in committee whose private right, distinct from public interest, is immediately involved. That this paragraph might be beefed up so that we could have two things which I think the committee agreed were important, but hard to implement; one, some kind of reasonable disclosure, and two, still maintain the integrity of our citizen legislature.

So I wrote essentially what is before you and I presented it to the Senate in the other body who has presented this to you. I realize that it is late in the session and it is an unannounced change in the rules that many of you have not had a chance to think about, but all it says is that you have a responsibility to inform the membership of any special interest you have. It doesn't say that you will be prohibited from acting. It doesn't say you have to tell amounts. It doesn't say you have to talk about minor things. All it says is that if you have some significant source of income or whatever, that you disclose it.

Right now in the Senate and House Register, each one of us tells what our occupation is, and for the most part, this addition to the House rules would feel that disclosure is sufficient. However, I will give you just myself as an example. I am sure that I wrote in here that I am a teacher. Now everyone knows here that I am a teacher. Something that I didn't put in here is that my wife and

I own a piece of real estate which we hope someday will be income real estate. Now I should probably put those two things in here or if I didn't put it in the booklet or publish it in some way in the House and Senate publications, before I debated some issue that had to do with rental housing or commercial rental buildings or something that I should simply inform you I own a building and I favor this bill or I oppose this bill for whatever reasons I have.

So that is all this amendment would do. Perhaps Mr. Brown is right that this should be indefinitely postponed and we shouldn't consider it or we should consider it at a later time. But I frankly feel that it might be a simple way to deal with the legislative disclosure problem that has plagued us for two sessions, still maintaining our citizen legislature, still maintaining our privacy in terms of what we make and all the minor sources of income that we have.

So with that explanation I leave it to your wisdom.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I concur wholeheartedly with the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, my good friend Representative Brown. I feel that disclosure, legislative ethics and everything else — that's your conscience. With me, if I just spend three days here, I tell Mrs. Dubord in the Finance Office that I have been here three days, I put down three days. My conscience says that. If there is a bill here that I know I am involved in financially, I don't need any rule to tell me that, Mr. Speaker. I go into your office, I discuss it with you, I tell you that I am going to ask to be excused, as I have at this session, and I am excused.

Ethics, disclosure — these things come under the heading of conscience and at this stage of the game, after having been here this long, if I don't know how to do things right, I would have my head examined. I concur wholeheartedly

with the gentleman's remarks from Augusta, Mr. Brown.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is indefinite postponement of this Joint Order. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

81 having voted in the affirmative and 33 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

---

On request of Mr. Simpson of Standish, by unanimous consent, unless previous notice was given to the Clerk of the House by some member of his or her intention to move reconsideration, the Clerk was authorized today to send to the Senate, thirty minutes after the House recessed for lunch and also thirty minutes after the House adjourned for the day, all matters passed to be engrossed in concurrence and all matters that required Senate concurrence; and that after such matters had been

so sent to the Senate by the Clerk, no motion to reconsider would be allowed.

On motion of Mr. Simpson of Standish,

Recessed until 2:30 in the afternoon.

---

**After Recess**

**2:30 P.M.**

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

---

(Off Record Remarks)

On motion of Mr. Birt of East Millinocket,

Recessed until the sounding of the gong.

---

**After Recess**

**4:00 P.M.**

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

On motion of Mr. Birt of East Millinocket,

Adjourned until nine o'clock tomorrow morning.