

# MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the  
**LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY**  
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library  
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied  
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

LEGISLATIVE RECORD

OF THE

*One Hundred and Seventh  
Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1975

KENNEBEC JOURNAL  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

## HOUSE

Friday, April 25, 1975

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

Prayer by the Rev. Lawrence W. Hathorne of Auburn.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

**Papers from the Senate**

From the Senate: Bill "An Act Relating to Additional Roads on Indian Reservation at Indian Island" (Emergency) (S. P. 499) (L. D. 1851) (Approved by a Majority of the Committee on Reference of Bills pursuant to Joint Rule No. 10)

Came from the Senate referred to the Committee on Transportation and ordered printed.

In the House, the Bill was referred to the Committee on Transportation in concurrence.

**Non-Concurrent Matter**

Bill "An Act to Change Weights and Related Provisions for Commercial Vehicles" (H. P. 1223) (L. D. 1211) which was indefinitely postponed in the House on April 1.

Came from the Senate passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "D" (S-84) in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mr. Fraser of Mexico, the House voted to recede and concur. (Later Reconsidered)

**Non-Concurrent Matter**

Bill "An Act Increasing the Number of Associate Justices of the Supreme Judicial Court" (Emergency) (S. P. 147) (L. D. 510) which failed passage to be engrossed in the House on April 23.

Came from the Senate with that Body having insisted on their former action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mr. Hewes of Cape Elizabeth, tabled pending further consideration and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 29.

**Orders**

Mr. Farley of Biddeford presented the following Joint Order and moved its passage: (H. P. 1540)

WHEREAS, the Committee on Energy was formed to study and to propose legislation for the conservation of energy; and

WHEREAS, there is a critical need to conserve energy; and

WHEREAS, the use of heating energy in homes comprises 21 percent of the total energy consumed in Maine; and

WHEREAS, there is no standard for home construction to maximize the efficient use of energy; and

WHEREAS, there is little incentive for prospective new home owners to construct homes that will maximize the efficient use of energy; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Government is in the process of developing or helping the several states develop standards for home construction to conserve energy; and

WHEREAS, the State of Maine has not formulated a standard for home construction for energy conservation purposes; now, therefore, be it

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Council be authorized, through the Joint Standing Committee on Energy, to study the subject matter of "An

Act Concerning Loans Made by Savings Banks for Housing Meeting Certain Energy Conservation Standards," House Paper 60, Legislative Document 746, as introduced at the regular session of the 107th Legislature to ascertain the type of housing construction standard bank loan policies that will best served the energy conservation program of the State; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Maine State Housing Authority, the Office of State Fire Marshal, the Department of Health and Welfare, the Bureau of Banks and Banking and other departments and agencies be respectfully directed to provide such technical advice and assistance as the committee deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Order; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Council report the results of its findings together with any proposed recommendations and necessary implementing legislation to the next special session of the Legislature; and be it further

ORDERED, upon passage in concurrence, that suitable copies of this Order be transmitted forthwith to said departments and agencies as notice of this directive.

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

**Tabled and Assigned**

Mr. Ault of Wayne presented the following Joint Order and moved its passage: (H. P. 1543)

WHEREAS, the 104th Legislature enacted a broad based state income tax; and

WHEREAS, the citizens of Maine voted to retain that state income tax by a 3 to 1 margin; and

WHEREAS, the state sales tax contains numerous inequities, such as the imposition of the sales tax on sales of some fuel commodities but not others and on the sale of necessities, such as water; and

WHEREAS, it is the belief of the 107th Legislature that the state income tax must be recognized as the primary source of state income and the sales tax as only a secondary source; now, therefore, be it

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Council be authorized, through the Joint Standing Committee on Taxation, to study the sales tax statute, Title 36, chapters 211 and 213, in order to determine those changes necessary to provide for equitable and fair sales taxation, to determine if those changes will result in a loss of revenue and, if so, to determine what change in the state income tax is necessary to make up for that loss; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Council report the results of its findings, together with any proposed recommendations and necessary implementing legislation, to the next special or regular session of the Legislature; and be it further

ORDERED, upon passage in concurrence, that suitable copies of this order be transmitted forthwith to said agencies as notice of this directive.

The Order was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Ault.

Mr. AULT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This order is in relation, as far as I am concerned, to item 13 on page 5, which is a bill I presented to Taxation which exempted certain uses of gas and electricity from taxation under the sales and use tax law. I agreed to

withdraw the bill because I know very well that we can't give up \$3 million in state revenues as a result of it, but I am just very concerned at the sales tax law. It is grossly unfair in what it does tax and what it doesn't. So I have presented this order and I move its passage.

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

Mr. DRIGOTAS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The Taxation Committee is in the process of preparing a much more comprehensive study reform. I have consulted with Mr. Ault, and he has agreed, so I would kindly ask someone to table this order for two legislative days.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Finemore of Bridgewater, tabled pending passage and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 29.

**House Reports of Committees Ought Not to Pass**

Mr. Burns from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Pertaining to Junked Cars" (H. P. 169) (L. D. 207) reporting "Ought Not to Pass"

Mr. Gould from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Relating to the Regulation of Private Detectives and Watch, Guard and Patrol Agency" (H. P. 471) (L. D. 570) reporting same.

Mr. Shute from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act to Provide for Public Rest room Facilities in Shopping Centers" (H. P. 1472) (L. D. 1724) reporting same.

Mr. Norris from the Committee on Performance Audit on Bill "An Act Relating to Payments of Aid to Families with Dependent Children" (H. P. 1465) (L. D. 1731) reporting same.

Mr. Kauffman from the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act Relating to Emergency Call Facilities on the Maine Turnpike" (H. P. 106) (L. D. 124) reporting same.

Mr. Jacques from the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act Relating to Relocating the Maine Turnpike Authority Toll Booth from Augusta to Gardiner" (H. P. 1121) (L. D. 1400) reporting same.

Were placed in the Legislative Files without further action pursuant to Joint Rule 17-A.

**Leave to Withdraw**

Mr. Farley from the Committee on Energy on Bill "An Act Concerning Loans Made by Savings Banks for Housing Meeting Certain Energy Conservation Standards" (H. P. 603) (L. D. 746) reporting Leave to Withdraw.

Mr. Burns from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Relating to Public Rest Room Facilities in Shopping Centers" (H. P. 1241) (L. D. 1542) reporting same.

Mr. Carey from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act to Change the Status of the Maine Municipal Association" (H. P. 1245) (L. D. 1546) reporting same.

Mr. Lunt from the Committee on Public Utilities on Bill "An Act to Amend the Charter of the Sanford Water District" (Emergency) (H. P. 352) (L. D. 445) reporting same.

Mr. Kelleher from the Committee on Public Utilities on Bill "An Act Relating to Ogunquit Village Corporation and the Ogunquit Sewer District" (Emergency) (H. P. 879) (L. D. 1053) reporting same.

Mr. Albert from the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act to Change the Definition of 'Compact Area' in the

Highway Statutes" (Emergency) (H. P. 1105) (L. D. 1384) reporting same.

Mr. Cox from the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Exempting Certain Uses of Gas and Electricity from Taxation under the Sales and Use Tax Law" (H. P. 764) (L. D. 933) reporting same.

Mr. Drigotas from the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act to Create a Maine State Income Tax Credit for the Creation of Additional Jobs" (H. P. 1010) (L. D. 1277) reporting same.

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

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

Mr. JENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move we reconsider our action on Bill "An Act to Change Weights and Related Provisions for Commercial Vehicles," House Paper 1223, L. D. 1211.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Jensen, moves that the House reconsider its action whereby it voted to recede and concur earlier today on L. D. 1211.

Mr. Lynch of Livermore Falls requested a vote on reconsideration.

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

Mr. GOODWIN: Mr. Speaker, may I have this item tabled for two legislative days?

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Goodwin, that this matter be tabled pending the motion of Mr. Jensen of Portland to reconsider and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 29. The Chair will order a vote. All in favor of this matter being tabled for two legislative days will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

93 having voted in the affirmative and 20 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

#### Order Out of Order

Mr. Hinds of South Portland presented the following Joint Order and moved its passage: (H. P. 1541)

WHEREAS, the state budgetary process which currently extends over the biennium is no longer responsive to contemporary needs; and

WHEREAS, the state budget cycle does not currently coincide with the budgetary processes of other levels of government; and

WHEREAS, requirements of time and form have become unduly restrictive and detrimental to the overall objective; now, therefore, be it

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Council be authorized, through the Joint Standing Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs, to study the present budget process and recommend such further changes as it deems necessary and the means by which those changes may be most expeditiously effected. The Department of Finance and Administration is directed to cooperate with the Joint Standing Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs in said study and to provide such assistance as may be requested by the committee. A report of the study, together with recommendations and legislation deemed necessary, is to be made to a special session of the 107th Legislature.

The study shall contain, but not be limited to, the following matters:

1. The state budget process, including the present budget cycle, when agencies are required to submit budget requests for the next biennium and when the Governor is required to submit the budget to the Legislature; and

2. The requirements of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, which makes October 1st the beginning of the federal fiscal year; and

3. The fiscal year of local communities and special districts and the information they require from the State and the State's ability to provide said information when needed; and

4. The possible further automation of the budget process, following adoption of program budgeting, to provide for qualitative analysis and long-range or life-cycle forecasting; and

5. The time allowed for the Governor-elect to prepare the budget before submission to the Legislature; and

6. The form of the budget submission to the Legislature; and be it further

ORDERED, that the council report the results of its findings, together with any proposed recommendations and necessary implementing legislation, to the next special session of the Legislature; and be it further

ORDERED, upon passage in concurrence, that suitable copies of this Order be transmitted forthwith to said agencies as notice of this directive.

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

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This order is being recommended by the Performance Audit Committee. There was an L. D. sponsored this session to do the same thing, and the committee felt that it was more properly a joint order. It was a study by the Appropriations Committee of the budgetary process. So we have submitted a report of Leave to Withdraw, which this legislature has accepted on the L. D., and this order is to take the place of that L. D.

I move its passage.

Thereupon, the Joint Order received passage and was sent up for concurrence.

#### Ought to Pass in New Draft New Drafts Printed Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Twitchell from the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act to Increase the Veteran's Property Tax Exemption" (H. P. 52) (L. D. 64) reported same in New Draft (H. P. 1174) (L. D. 1172) under same title and that it "Ought to Pass"

Report was read.

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

Mr. MULKERN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: There is at least one person on this "ought to pass" report, namely myself, that has reconsidered my position, and I was wondering if it would be in order to debate the bill at this time or should we wait until it goes on further?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that he may make a motion at this time and debate the motion.

Mr. MULKERN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The bill you have before you today, L. D. 1172, was a bill that came out of the Taxation Committee with a unanimous "ought to

pass" report. It was debated on the House floor and recommitted to the Committee on Taxation, only to reappear here again unchanged in committee.

Although I do not deny the unique and often selfless contributions made by many Maine veterans, and I believe these contributions should not go unrecognized, I signed this bill "ought to pass" with grave reservations because I realize that many communities, including my own, would not qualify for state reimbursement under this measure, and these losses of tax base would only be shifted to other property owners in these communities.

After some deep soul searching on this bill, I have decided to change my position and vote "ought not to pass," knowing that any proposal to correct the inequities in this bill would more than likely not receive the support of this legislature in this session.

My reason for taking this action is my deep concern over the recent disclosure of \$18.3 million deficit for the funding of education and the possible serious consequences of that deficit to the many already over-burdened Maine property owners.

None of the proposals presented by our Governor the other day to solve this problem will do anything to remedy the situation. It will only add to the burden of the local property tax which is already inflated beyond reason. The only answer in my mind is to shift away from the property taxation to an equitable income or corporation tax increase, which our Governor has clearly and unequivocally rejected in this session.

My community, for example, faces the possibility of as much as a \$5 per thousand dollar valuation increase in property taxes next year, which can only be avoided by cutting back on city services or possibly staff people. Such an increase in property taxes is quite unacceptable to me, and I certainly do not wish to add further to that crunch with this bill. This bill as written will almost double the veterans exemption in Portland from its present \$89,900 to over \$175,000. Just value does not help at all because Portland is already at 100 percent valuation, going to just value will do little or nothing for communities at or close to 100 percent valuation.

Take a look at the fiscal note on this bill. Municipal reimbursements for veterans' exemptions — nothing in 1975-76 and \$10,000 in 1976-77. Apparently, not many communities qualify for reimbursement under this bill at all.

In caucus, the other day, a majority of the members of the Democratic Party in this House pledged itself to oppose any proposals of funding education, which would result in an increased tax burden to the local property owner, an action for which I commend the members of my party. Now I am asking my fellow Democrats, once again, to bite the bullet and oppose another measure which adds to the burden of the local property owner.

We could let this go to the Appropriations Table and die there, but I think we should do the honest and responsible thing now by killing this bill. I ask my Republican and Independent colleagues in the House to join us, to begin to give some measure of relief to the property owner.

Mr. Speaker, also, you have been made aware today of a proposal for an Order that is coming out to study the whole tax structure of the State of Maine. This is going to include this whole business of tax

exemptions and I would suggest that it is premature for this legislature, at this time, to be granting an increased tax exemption. So with that in mind, I am going to move the indefinite postponement of this bill and all its accompanying papers and I ask for a division, ladies and gentlemen.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Najarian.

Mrs. NAJARIAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise to support the gentleman from Portland, not only because it means the tax exemption of the \$179,000 in the city of Portland but primarily because this is a property tax exemption for all veterans across the board and is not based on need. We now have the Property Tax Relief and Rent Refund Program for the elderly and any veteran who can meet those eligibility guidelines fully deserve the property tax exemption.

This bill discriminates against all those who, through no fault of their own, did not qualify for military service during a federally recognized war period. It discriminates against those who happen to be born a few years too early or too late, against all those who were rejected because of a physical disability and whose need for tax relief may be even greater than many of those veterans. This will even discriminate against other veterans, as the Representative from Eastport, Mr. Mahany, pointed out the other day, those who rent their homes. There is nothing in this bill for them. Realizing fully the political implications, I fully support the motion to indefinitely postpone.

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

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am not going to debate this but this is just to correct one unintentional mistake that Mr. Mulkern has made. This does not go to the Appropriations Table; the loss of revenue is by the municipalities.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Jay, Mr. Maxwell.

Mr. MAXWELL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This happens, to be my bill. We have debated it here on several occasions. I still think it is a good bill and in the bill are the words 'just value,' which changes it immensely and in my own case and in my own town, even though it goes to \$7,000 valuation exemption, I probably will be paying more tax than I am now paying and this is going to be true in many, many towns in the State of Maine, until every town in the State of Maine goes to 100 percent valuation.

It is only fair that these veterans be given a raise in exemption. They haven't had it for a good many years. Back when the \$3500 was picked out as a sum, \$3500 was a pretty good home; \$7,000 today, is a very poor home. So I don't feel that this is asking for anything unnecessary and I would hope that you would defeat the motion to indefinitely postpone so that this bill can go on its way.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Woolwich, Mr. Leonard.

Mr. LEONARD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I talked at great length on this bill before and I hoped that I wouldn't have to again and I shall not belabor this subject.

I do think that the delegation or those who have spoken from the delegation in Portland have somewhat misled you. As Mr. Maxwell has said, it will not, in many cases, benefit veterans. As a matter of fact, it will hurt them. In my town, nearly all veterans will probably — and this is off the top of my head — but I would say that roughly they would take a severe cut, say \$200 or \$300 that they will have to pay in additional taxes this next year. All towns in my district, as a matter of fact, will benefit.

The word 'just' is a word that should have been in there a long time ago, and to correct the lady from Portland, this bill is no more than a redraft somewhat of the existing law.

If the fact that we gave no consideration to a veterans' needs or whatever is a problem, then possibly we should have presented some other bill and correct the laws that exist.

There is really nothing wrong with this bill. It might hurt the City of Portland, and for that I am very sorry but, frankly, in years past, somebody passed the bill up here without the word 'just' in it and it severely hurt my town and towns in my district.

We have been giving nearly all of the property tax exemption to the veterans. For example, if he had a \$400 tax bill in our town, nearly all of that was wiped off the books by this exemption and in the City of Portland there was very, very little credit given to the veterans. This is only correcting something that was wrong in the first place.

I tend to agree with the gentlewoman from Portland; she is correct. This bill, the law exists, probably leaves a lot to be desired but certainly this bill is not the one that undermines the system, the original one did.

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

Mr. GREENLAW: Mr. Speaker Men and Women of the House: I would like to pose a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore. I believe he indicated a minute or so ago that this bill would not go to the Appropriations Table and that it would be a loss of revenue on the local level. I would also ask him to refer to L. D. 346, in which the state reimbursed a number of communities to the tune of \$130,000 for property tax exemptions for veterans over the past two years and I would ask him if I misunderstood what he said?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Greenlaw, has posed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore, who may answer if he so desires.

The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The young members are too smart for me. That is correct; after it goes to 3 percent of the total valuation, then it drops back and 90 percent of that is returned by the state. Therefore, there should be a fiscal note on this if it isn't already on it. I apologize to the members of the House and I appreciate how smart these young fellows are — they pick me up.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gorham, Mr. Quinn.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I take a position somewhat between the gentleman and the

gentlewoman from Portland and Mr. Leonard.

Since this bill was up originally, I have done some homework on the thing and I can quote some figures that are as exact as the Bureau of Taxation is able to give us.

First of all, we must understand that the basic thrust of what the bill tries to do. One of the major disadvantages in Maine State Government are the severe inequities that exist within our property tax system, and this bill was initially designed to alleviate some of these property tax inequities and as such, it is a good bill and it is a good thrust. However, by virtue of the fact that at the same time the Taxation Committee tried to even out this inequity in taxes, they doubled the exemption for veterans and as a result, you have some good and some bad from the point of view of property taxes.

If you wish to see how this would apply in various communities throughout the state, let's just take Cumberland County. The City of Portland is valued at 100 percent. The town of Otisfield is valued at 10 percent. Under the present system of property taxation, the veteran living in Otisfield has an exemption of nine times that of the veteran in Portland. It is clearly an inequity. If a valuation is worth \$3,500 in Portland, it is worth well over \$30,000 in Otisfield for the same veteran, or the same type of veteran. This clearly is an inequity and should be addressed. And Mr. Leonard is absolutely correct when he says that the phrase in the bill referring to 'just value' eliminates that inequity and as such it is a good thing, it is something that all of us should support. It will improve our state and our government.

If you wish to see how the second portion of this bill applies to your particular circumstance, use the figure 50 percent. If your community or your municipality is appraised at 50 percent of value at this time, this bill makes no difference to you whatsoever. From the change from \$3,000 to \$3,500 to \$7,000 and then multiplying by 'just value' means that your veterans will enjoy exactly the same benefits they do now in cash value. If, however, your community is valued at 60 percent, then your community is going to lose one fifth of whatever they currently are providing for veterans, 10 percent being a fifth of the 50 percent. If, as in the case of Portland, as Mr. Mulkern exactly pointed out, you are at a 100 percent, then you would double the amount of money that your veteran saves and this means, as a result, that every county in the State of Maine, with the exception of Hancock, will lose money on local taxes. Hancock's veteran exemption is currently \$2,084,000 and under this new proposal it will reduce to \$2,603,000; so Hancock will, in effect, pick up slightly more money from the veterans. In the other 15 counties, this is not the case. I will quote just a couple.

In Cumberland, the current veterans exemption is \$13,471,000. Under this proposal, it jumps to \$22,092,000. In Androscoggin County, the present exemption is \$4 million and it jumps to \$5,700,000. In York County it is \$6 million and it jumps to \$8 million. In Washington County, it is \$1 million and it jumps to \$1.5 million; Waldo, \$2 million and it jumps to \$2,400,000, for a net evaluation change throughout the state of \$6,311,000 in increased forgiveness to the veterans, which results, by the computation of the Taxation Department, realizing that each community has a different 'just valuation' of a total tax loss to the communities of the

State of Maine of \$758,439 if this bill is passed in its present form of \$7,000 exemptions.

I would, however, suggest that the initial validity of the bill, that is the desire to remove this present tax inequity, is a good thing and should be saved. I would like to see this legislature pass it and the way, of course, that it could be passed in which it would not make this tax loss to everybody would be to keep the present veterans exemption at \$3,500, pass the bill with its 'just' valuation phrase retained and we would then be curing one of our tax inequities throughout the state and we would not be costing the counties at large, money.

If then, as Mr. Maxwell says, we do feel that at a subsequent time, that our veterans are entitled to more than \$3,500, then, that in fact as a state or a community we owe them an indebtedness, then let's subsequently, separately consider raising them to whatever level we feel they should be at.

I do feel the bill in its present form has a good deal of merit and I feel it should be saved and I would urge that we vote against the motion to indefinitely postpone and then place the motion to send it back to committee and ask them to get that \$7,000 figure out of there.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am Chairman of the Board of Assessment Review in the City of South Portland and I would back up the gentleman from Gorham, Mr. Quinn's statements. He has done a lot of work on that and those figures and things aren't correct to me because I was doing some work on it also. I won't bore you with any more. I think he has done a good job and I hope we can save the bill in order to keep the 'just' figure in there and perhaps reduce the amount back to \$3,500. I hope the House might save the bill for that purpose.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Owls Head, Mrs. Post.

Mrs. POST: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have a question I would like to pose through the Chair. The question is, when exemptions are given for property tax exemptions, is that figured in state valuation for such programs as L. D. 1994?

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Owls Head, Mrs. Post, poses a question through the Chair to any member who cares to answer.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gorham, Mr. Quinn.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The answer is affirmative and these exemptions are computed at 'just value,' which is the state valuation.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Najarian.

Mrs. NAJARIAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to pose a question through the Chair to any member of the Taxation Committee or anybody in the House who can answer. Did we or did we not pass an amendment to reduce the \$7,000 exemption back to where it was originally and that amendment was defeated and if so can we now do the same thing again in the House or not?

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Najarian, poses a question through the Chair to any member of the House who cares to answer.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Mulkern.

Mr. MULKERN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: There was an attempt to amend the bill with Representative LaPointe's amendment which would have changed the reimbursement formula so that a city such as Portland could be reimbursed under this bill. Currently they can not be reimbursed, but there was no attempt to change the \$7,000 figure. This bill was recommitted to the committee, I think they could have made this change and they didn't make the change. Personally, I could support the bill if it were reduced to \$3,500 figure but I can't see \$7,000. I think we are already having enough problems without adding further to the burden.

On motion of Mrs. Najarian of Portland, tabled pending the motion of Mr. Mulkern of Portland to indefinitely postpone the Bill and all accompanying papers and specially assigned for Monday, April 28.

Mr. Jensen from the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act Relating to Reciprocal Registration of Vehicles" (H. P. 732) (L. D. 908) reporting "Ought to Pass" in New Draft under New Title Bill "An Act Relating to Reciprocal and Apportioned Registration of Vehicles" (H. P. 1542) (L. D. 1853)

Report was read and accepted, the New Draft read once and assigned for second reading the next legislative day.

#### Ought to Pass Printed Bills

Mr. Finemore from the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act to Repeal Certain Tax Exemptions" (H. P. 650) (L. D. 802) reporting "Ought to Pass"

Mr. Morton from the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act to Exempt Incorporated Nonprofit Volunteer Literacy Programs from the Sales Tax" (H. P. 790) (L. D. 963) reporting "Ought to Pass"

Reports were read and accepted, the Bills read once and assigned for second reading the next legislative day.

#### Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs reporting "Ought to Pass" on Resolve, to Reimburse A. L. Stewart and Sons of Cherryfield for Loss of Beehives by Bear (H. P. 335) (L. D. 418)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. CHANCHETTE of Somerset  
CORSON of Somerset  
DANTON of York  
— of the Senate.

Messrs. DUDLEY of Enfield  
GOULD of Old Town  
PERKINS of Blue Hill  
HUNTER of Benton  
SHUTE of Stockton Springs  
CAREY of Waterville  
FAUCHER of Solon  
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. JOYCE of Portland  
BURNS of North Anson  
COTE of Lewiston  
— of the House.

Reports were read.

Mr. MacLeod of Bar Harbor moved the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Anson, Mr. Burns.

Mr. BURNS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise to explain my "ought not to pass" on this resolution. It is my feeling that these resolutions that are coming in to us are for payment, regardless whether they are the beehive bills or the other bills involved, that we do not have an opportunity to really look at the evidence and these claims. I feel the way they should be handled is as a request to sue the State of Maine and then allow it to go through that way if we feel there is a possible suit and then let it be handled through the accuracy type area so we get both sides of the story. That was my reason for signing "ought not to pass."

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would say just a few words in support of the majority report. I was asked by the chairman of the committee, where it was in Ellsworth, down in that area and it was quite near me and I knew a lot of people there to make a little bit of an investigation of this, which I did, and found that it was a legitimate case that should be paid. It didn't involve enough money to sue the state. The lawyers would get more money than what it would take to sue the state to bring the case before them. I don't have it before me but I think it is \$1,500. It was a small amount of money, too small to sue the state and it was a legitimate bill and it is caused because we now protect the bear and it has been customary to pay these bills since Maine has been protecting the bear population in Maine. So the majority of the committee felt it should be paid. It is a small amount of money.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Bar Harbor, Mr. McLeod, that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report on Resolve, to Reimburse A. L. Stewart and Sons of Cherryfield for Loss of Beehives by Bear," House Paper 335, L. D. 418. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken. 86 having voted in the affirmative and 15 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

Thereupon, the Resolve was read once and assigned for second reading the next legislative day.

#### Consent Calendar First Day

In accordance with House Rule 49-A, the following items appear on the Consent Calendar for the First Day:

Bill "An Act Establishing an Annual Sentencing Institute for the Maine Criminal Courts" — Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought to Pass" (S. P. 320) (L. D. 1097)

No objections having been noted, the above item was ordered to appear on the Consent Calendar of April 28 under listing of Second Day.

Bill "An Act to Revise Certain Provisions of the Act Creating Hospital Administrative District No. 4 in Piscataquis, Somerset and Penobscot Counties" — Committee on Legal Affairs reporting "Ought to Pass" (H. P. 933) (L. D. 1213)

On the request of Mrs. Najarian of Portland, was removed from the Consent Calendar.

Thereupon, the Report was read and



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

Bill "An Act to Expand the Right-to-Know Law to Cover the Boards of Trustees of the University of Maine and of the Maine Maritime Academy" — Committee on Legal Affairs reporting "Ought to Pass" (H. P. 1018) (L. D. 1316)

Bill "An Act Concerning the Powers of Officers of Religious Societies" — Committee on Legal Affairs reporting "Ought to Pass" (H. P. 1164) (L. D. 1463)

Bill "An Act Relating to Railroad Crossings" — Committee on Public Utilities reporting "Ought to Pass" (H. P. 1013) (L. D. 1271)

Bill "An Act Increasing Indebtedness of Jackman Sewer District" — Committee on Public Utilities reporting "Ought to Pass" (H. P. 1029) (L. D. 1318)

Bill "An Act to Tax the Personal Property of Domestic Life Insurance Companies" — Committee on Taxation reporting "Ought to Pass" (H. P. 695) (L. D. 872)

Bill "An Act Relating to Motor Vehicle Inspection Mechanic Licenses" — Committee on Transportation reporting "Ought to Pass" (H. P. 951) (L. D. 1189)

Resolve, Reimbursing Mars Hill Utility District for Bonds Issued for Sewer Construction — Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-196) (H. P. 14) (L. D. 22)

Bill "An Act Relating to Sources of Supply and Authority of Yarmouth Water District" — Committee on Public Utilities reporting "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-195) (H. P. 1076) (L. D. 1356)

No objections being noted, the above items were ordered to appear on the Consent Calendar of April 28, under listing of the Second Day.

#### Consent Calendar Second Day

In accordance with House Rule 49-A, the following items appear on the Consent Calendar for the Second Day:

Bill "An Act Concerning the Definition of Child and Student under the Workmen's Compensation Statute" (S. P. 353) (L. D. 1153)

Bill "An Act Concerning the Acquisition, Maintenance and Replacement of Multi-level Private Parking Facilities under the Municipal Securities Approval Act" (S. P. 331) (L. D. 1117)

Resolve, to Refund Clyde Wardwell of Mexico a Portion of Liquor License Fee Due to Loss of Business by Fire (S. P. 376) (L. D. 1227)

No objections having been noted at the end of the Second Legislative Day, the Senate Papers were passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

#### Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act Amending the Lead Poisoning Control Act" (H. P. 1531) (L. D. 1847)

Bill "An Act Relating to the Location of Town Meetings" (H. P. 1532) (L. D. 1848)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Second Reading, read the second time, passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

#### Second Readers Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act to Equalize the Retail Price of Alcoholic Beverages Throughout the State" (H. P. 403) (L. D. 492)

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

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The fine Majority Floor Leader, Mr. Rolde, who happens to be on the opposite side of the fence with me on this one is not present here today and I understand he has got a suggestion or two concerning this bill so would some member please table this.

On motion of Mrs. Najarian, of Portland, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 29.

Bill "An Act to Require Nonresidents of Maine to Use the Services of a Maine Guide when Hunting in Washington County" (H. P. 371) (L. D. 465)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Orland, Mr. Churchill.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The House Chairman requested that I table this for two legislative days while an amendment was being prepared.

On motion of Mrs. Najarian of Portland tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 29.

Bill "An Act to Permit Pharmacies to Advertise Drug Prices and to Provide Retail Price Posting Information to Pharmacies" (H. P. 1538) (L. D. 1849)

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

Mrs. Morin of Old Orchard Beach moved this matter be tabled for one legislative day. Whereupon, Mr. Goodwin of South Berwick requested a vote on the motion.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentlewoman from Old Orchard Beach, Mrs. Morin, that this matter be tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Monday, April 28. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken. 74 having voted in the affirmative and 30 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

Bill "An Act to Establish County Commissioner Districts in Cumberland County" (H. P. 223) (L. D. 279)

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

(On motion of Mr. Higgins of Scarborough, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 29)

Bill "An Act to Provide for Supervision of Elections by Municipal Clerks" (H. P. 907) (L. D. 1106) (C. "A" H-191)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Boudreau.

Mrs. BOUDREAU: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have already prepared two amendments for this, what we thought was a simple little bill. We still have problems, so I would ask

somebody if they would table that for two legislative days.

On motion of Mr. Farnham of Hampden, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 29.

#### Passed to Be Enacted

An Act to Permit Reimbursement of Attorney General's Cost of Investigation when a Permanent Injunction is Issued (S. P. 206) (L. D. 696)

An Act to Increase Certain Fees of Registers of Deeds (S. P. 249) (L. D. 830)

An Act to Clarify the Definition of Approved Alcohol Treatment Facility and to Allow Payments to be Made Directly to the Facility (S. P. 273) (L. D. 879)

An Act Converting Mount Chase Plantation into the Town of Mount Chase (H. P. 59) (L. D. 71)

An Act Converting Dallas Plantation into the Town of Dallas (H. P. 578) (L. D. 713)

An Act Relating to the Employment of Veterinarians by the Commissioner of Agriculture to Ensure Compliance with the Harness Racing Statutes (H. P. 616) (L. D. 761)

An Act Relating to Construction Requirements for Sanitary Facilities in School Buildings (H. P. 942) (L. D. 1181)

An Act Relating to Minimum Group Life Insurance Premiums (H. P. 983) (L. D. 1246)

Were 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.

An Act Relating to Contracts of Teachers with Municipalities (H. P. 1033) (L. D. 1339)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Hewes.

Mr. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I was wondering if somebody might explain what this bill is all about. It is one-sentence bill and it apparently is an exception to something else and I was wondering if there might be an explanation?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Hewes, poses a question through the Chair to any member who may care to answer.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Carpenter.

Mr. CARPENTER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In reference to the question by Mr. Hewes, all this bill does is to clarify existing town ordinances and make it uniform throughout the state that a teacher may run for municipal office without penalty, providing they do not cast a decisive vote on any matter relating to schools.

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

An Act Concerning the Qualification of Persons Allowed to Vote at District Budget Meetings of School Administrative Districts (H. P. 1108) (L. D. 1385)

#### Finally Passed

Resolve, Providing Funds for Clients in Special Age Groups Served by Cerebral Palsy Centers (S. P. 327) (L. D. 1113)

Resolve, Authorizing the Destruction of Student Fingerprint Cards Maintained by State (S. P. 380) (L. D. 1231)

Were reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed, Bill passed to be enacted, Resolves finally passed, all signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

#### Orders of the Day

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

House Report — "Ought to Pass" — Committee on Education on Bill "An Act Relating to Access to Written Records Concerning Elementary and Secondary School Pupils" (H. P. 975) (L. D. 1269)

Tabled — April 23, by Mr. Bustin of Augusta.

Pending — Acceptance of the Committee Report.

On motion of Mr. Lynch of Livermore Falls, retabled pending acceptance of the Committee Report and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 29.

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

An Act Providing for a State Developmental Disabilities Planning and Advisory Council. (H. P. 871) (L. D. 1077)

Tabled — April 23, by Mr. Ault of Wayne.

Pending — Passage to be Enacted.

On motion of Mrs. Post of Owls Head, retabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for Monday, April 28.

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

Bill "An Act Creating the Dickey-Lincoln Power Authority" (S. P. 189) (L. D. 662) (S. "A" S-75) (S. "B" S-77)

Tabled — April 23, by Mr. Greenlaw of Stonington.

Pending — Passage to be Engrossed.

On motion of Mr. Davies of Orono, retabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 29.

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

Bill "An Act Relating to Filing Requirements for Perfecting a Security Interest in Mobile Homes under the Uniform Commercial Code" (S. P. 297) (L. D. 1023) — In Senate, Insisted on Former Action Whereby Bill was Passed to be Engrossed as Amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-65) and Asked for a Committee on Conference. — In House, Indefinitely Postponed on April 22, in non-concurrence.

Tabled — April 24, by Mr. Dam of Skowhegan.

Pending — Further Consideration.

On motion of Mr. Dam of Skowhegan, the House voted to insist and join in a committee of conference.

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

An Act Relating to Leasing and Selling of Property Taken or Acquired for Highway Purposes (S. P. 310) (L. D. 1058)

Tabled — April 24, by Mr. LaPointe of Portland.

Pending — Passage to be Enacted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Windham, Mr. Peterson.

Mr. PETERSON: Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House: I believe a brief point of explanation is due the membership today: I brought up some questions yesterday concerning the bill, and a significant number of the members of the House felt that an amendment should be

afixed to this bill which would require that whenever land is taken by the Department of Transportation and then is going to be leased or sold, that the original owner be given first option to buy or to take the lease.

I conferred with the Speaker on this particular bill, and that amendment would not be germane to this piece of legislation. There is a piece of legislation coming before the body that this amendment would be germane to, and I will offer that amendment which would require that whenever DOT acquires land and is going to either lease it or sell it and not use it for highway purposes, that the original owner be given first priority. I promise the members of the House that this will be forthcoming and that we should go along with this bill today, and I will offer the amendment at a later date.

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

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

An Act Relating to Specially Designed Registration Plates for the Maine National Guard (H. P. 733) (L. D. 909)

Tabled — April 24, by Mr. Wilfong of Stow.

Pending — Passage to be Enacted.  
Mr. Wilfong of Stow moved this matter be tabled for one legislative day.

Whereupon, Mr. Strout of Corinth requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Stow, Mr. Wilfong, that this matter be retabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for Monday, April 28. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.  
84 having voted in the affirmative and 28 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

On motion of Mr. Tierney of Durham, the House reconsidered its action of yesterday whereby Bill "An Act to Amend the Employment Security Law as to Separation Reports," Senate Paper 241, L. D. 793, was passed to be engrossed.

On further motion of the same gentleman, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Monday, April 28.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to escort the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Kelleher, to the rostrum to act as Speaker pro tem.

Thereupon, Mr. Kelleher assumed the Chair as Speaker pro tem and Speaker Martin occupied his seat on the floor of the House.

#### (Off Record Remarks)

Mr. Martin of Eagle Lake was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have left the Chair this morning to relate to you the events of the morning regarding what has transpired with the Governor of this State. This morning, Governor Longley spoke to the Maine Human Services Conference in an address which you have now in front of you, a rather lengthy, a rather long and detailed explanation of what faces us in Maine and what the problems are and why we have them.

At 10:15, a member of the press brought

the comments to me and asked me to comment on the Governor's charge that the Democratic Party and the special interests that they represent are proposing a massive tax increase to make up the Governor's budget deficit.

After reading the Governor's speech, which the reporter was kind enough to show me, I was, needless to say, shocked and disillusioned. Frankly, I did not believe that the Governor would make such irresponsible and unfounded statements, and so I called Jim McGregor in the Governor's Office, whom I assumed, since he was his speech writer, that he had written the speech, to ask in fact if the Governor had delivered that speech. McGregor acknowledged that the Governor did indeed give the speech and that he meant every word that he said.

I indicated in a private conversation, a telephone conversation with Jim McGregor, that I thought many of the things in that speech were not responsible.

After my call, about an hour later, a member of the press came to my office and said "Here is a two-page release which the Governor's Office has just issued, issued by the Governor of this State." The Governor issued the statement attacking me personally, and you have a copy of that as well. Frankly, I am amazed, shocked and disappointed.

The entire legislative leadership has worked closely with the Governor on his budget and many, many other matters. We have agreed, and as a matter of fact, we have prodded, and we have held the membership, both political parties, back from attacking the Governor, trying to indicate that we can work together and trying to work out the problems with one another.

The legislative leadership, which includes myself, have agreed in the past to inform the Governor of any action we initiate which would appear to be an action against his administration. But now, apparently because party caucuses in this House, and many Senators have indicated that they do not support the Governor's plan to have the property taxpayers pay for the deficit in his budget, the Governor has decided to stop attacking the problem and to start attacking people.

There are two kinds of politics which can be practiced in a democracy, they are the politics of trust and the politics of fear. The politics of trust say, come, let us reason together. If we work together there are no problems that we cannot solve. The problems of fear, however, say, watch out. They are the enemy, give me your support and I will protect you. It is the politics of fear that is being practiced today, and I do not want to be a part of it.

The Governor is blaming the Democratic Party for the failure of his property tax increase proposal. The Governor seeks to divide the Legislature into partisan camps so that we will be paralyzed by this division, bitterness and an inability to work together to solve our problems.

The Governor also seeks to divide the people of Maine. The Governor would set Democrat against Republican, rich against poor, farmer against city dweller and elderly against children. The Governor seeks to divide us by making us angry and making us distrust our neighbors and our enemies as well. We are not our own enemy. We should fear only the fear makers.

I ask today that we continue to work together as citizens of a great State. For



months, this State and this Legislature has been completely devoid of partisan rhetoric, and for that I thank members of both political parties in both Houses. We have worked together to resolve very, very difficult problems facing this State. Spruce budworm, L. D. 1994 and other extremely complicated issues have, despite their complexity, not divided us, except as they should, on clear matters of conscience.

We have worked on the budget, our most pressing problem, in the most dignified manner possible. Now, as each day seems to bring a new budget deficit, we are faced with the problem — how are we going to balance the Governor's budget?

The Governor's proposals to balance it have not all been well received because most of us know that our towns can stand no further property tax increase. Most of us believe that the people of Maine have spoken out clearly, loudly, emphatically, on the mode of taxation they prefer. In 1971, Maine people voted by a three to one margin to retain the income tax. They voted this way because they believe that the income tax is a fairer tax than the property tax. They didn't vote this way because they like taxes. None of us do, and none of the people that we represent do either. So we are faced with the difficult task of deciding how to solve the budget deficit. Most of us apparently realize very quickly that the people of Maine do not support an increase in the property tax.

No member of this Legislature, to my knowledge, has made a specific, detailed proposal to increase the income tax by any amount at this point. But most of this Legislature has said clearly and loudly and emphatically that we do not support the Governor's proposal for massive, nearly statewide increase in the property tax.

The Governor's speech today, which you have a copy of, delivered to the Maine Conference on Human Services, is a smoke screen. It is a smoke screen to cover the fact that the budget is full of proposals to increase local property tax as well as some very regressive taxes and fees.

Let me relate to you the fact that the Governor's budget is the largest in state history. It is at least 23 percent larger than his predecessor. If the current deficit is added to the budget, the increase jumps over 30 percent. To finance that part of this huge increase, which is not met by normal revenues, the Governor has hidden several tax increases in his budget.

Two years ago, we passed a two-cent increase to fund the catastrophic illness program. The Governor, in his budget message to us, ended that program but kept the two-cent cigarette tax increase which raises \$2.5 million but provides no help for people in need. To me, that is a new tax.

The Governor would end town road improvement funds and the snow removal program on the local level. These are worth nearly \$4 million to local municipalities which we represent. These towns have a choice — raise your property tax or ruin your cars in potholes and stay home when it snows.

The Governor proposes to increase motor vehicle and trailer registration fees by \$6.2 million. These two actions are equivalent to a cent increase in the gasoline tax, for that increase means people get no new services and the old ones are continued with a couple eliminated on top of that. These various hidden taxes, the most regressive kind in our system of taxation, when added to the \$22 million

biennial deficit, which we have just found out in the past week, bring the total amount of money which the Governor asks the people of Maine to pay themselves through the property tax to \$35 million. He asks them to pay for it in the most regressive manner possible. I personally reject that request. I commit myself to finding a funding mechanism, whatever the source might be in the direction that we might have to take, to a progressive system of taxation. Granted, we may have problems at arriving at that level.

We are the loyal opposition. We can work together. We are not rigid and irresponsible. We do not ask that it be done my way or our way or the Legislature's way or not at all; we ask only that it be done in the best way we can find. In Governor Longley's own words to us this week he said, "A tax is a tax, no matter how you slice it." The property tax to me, that is a tax. The property tax paid by the people we represent, that is a tax increase. I don't think that anyone here in this body or the other body should attempt to try to pull wool over the eyes of the people we represent and say we are going to provide the services, don't worry about it and it won't cost you any more than it did last time. We can only say that if there is going to be a tax increase that it be fair and it be levied upon those who can afford to pay for it, not upon those who cannot afford to pay for the services.

The people who will pay for the politics that is presently being played are the rural poor, the urban poor, the children too young to understand, the elderly too tired to fight for their rights any longer, the mentally ill in our institutions and many other weak or defenseless groups of people who the Governor thinks he can blame for taking too much out of his tax program and tax dollars.

The choice to this Legislature and to this Governor is clear. If we take care of the deficits which, in fact, his budget created, it will mean a tax increase and let no Maine citizen think otherwise, unless you cut the services. If you are going to keep the services, let us all understand that either the property tax will be used to fund those services at the local level or the State will assume the burden.

I, as a member of leadership, and I know I speak for all members of leadership and for every member of this body, intend to work with the Governor in working out a solution to solve the problems of this State. I only hope and I pray the remarks issued today in both the original press release at the Maine Conference on Human Services and that issued as a retractor or an addendum or an explainer later this morning do not occur again. They do not serve in the interest of serving Maine people. They are devices, cruel methods of trying to divide Maine people and Maine legislators.

I call upon the Governor for his cooperation. I have already indicated my own, and I have done so since January 1. And I only pray that when the Governor issues further press releases that they will be clear, that they will be direct and that in the long run they will solve the problems of Maine people. (Prolonged applause)

At this point, Speaker Martin returned to the rostrum.

SPEAKER MARTIN: The Chair thanks the gentleman and the members of the House.

Thereupon, the Sergeant-at-Arms escorted Mr. Kelleher to his seat on the

floor, amid the applause of the House, and Speaker Martin resumed the Chair.

(Off Record Remarks)

The following paper from the Senate was taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

From the Senate: The following Communication: (S. P. 502)

April 25, 1975

Mr. Harry N. Starbranch  
Secretary of the Senate  
Augusta, Maine  
Dear Mr. Starbranch:

The Committee on Reference of Bills has met and decided to extend the date by which all bills must be reported out of committee.

All bills and resolves must be reported from all committees by 5:00 P.M. on May 23, 1975.

Respectfully submitted,

Signed:

JOSEPH SEWALL  
Chairman

Committee on Reference of Bills  
Came from the Senate read and placed on file.

In the House, the Communication was read and ordered placed on file in concurrence.

On motion of Mrs. Najarian of Portland,  
Adjourned until Monday, April 28, at  
o'clock in the morning.