

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

Ninety-Fifth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

VOLUME II

1951

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Thursday, April 26, 1951

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Everett Pender of Friendship.

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

The gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, last week Representative Bubar tabled his Gross Income Tax Bill for assignment today, apparently believing, when he did it, that it would come up for consideration before the final vote on the Sales Tax. The Sales Tax is on the calendar this morning ahead of Mr. Bubar's assignment of his bill. In order that he may have an opportunity to present his bill to the House before the question comes up on the Sales Tax, I ask unanimous consent to assign Mr. Bubar's bill as a special order of business for consideration this morning immediately after Orders.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, requests unanimous consent that the House take up as a special order of business, directly after Orders on today's calendar, the House Divided Report on Bill "An Act Imposing a Gross Income Tax." Is there any objection? The Chair hears none and the matter is so made a special order of business.

Papers from the Senate**Senate Reports of Committees Ought to Pass in New Draft**

Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Creating a Zoning Board for the City of Lewiston" (S. P. 346) (L. D. 812) reporting a new draft (S. P. 554) (L. D. 1313) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report of the Committee on Welfare on Bill "An Act relating to Aid to Dependent Children" (S. P. 405) (L. D. 948) reporting a new draft (S. P. 555) (L. D. 1311) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Came from the Senate with the Reports read and accepted and the Bills passed to be engrossed.

In the House, Reports were read and accepted in concurrence, and the Bills read twice, and tomorrow assigned.

Ought to Pass

Report of the Committee on Claims reporting "Ought to pass" on Resolve in favor of Peter Spanos of Portland (S. P. 485)

Report of the same Committee reporting same on Resolve in favor of George Panages of Portland (S. P. 486)

Report of the same Committee reporting same on Resolve in favor of Merle Libby of Caribou (S. P. 211)

Report of the same Committee reporting same on Resolve in favor of Robert George Llewellyn of South Portland (S. P. 143)

Report of the Committee on Highways reporting same in favor of the Town of Nobleboro (S. P. 525)

Came from the Senate with the Reports read and accepted and the Resolves passed to be engrossed.

In the House, Reports were read and accepted in concurrence, and the Resolves ordered printed under the Joint Rules.

Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment

Report of the Committee on Claims on Resolve Appropriating Moneys to Reimburse Town of Phippsburg for Snow Removal (S. P. 296) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

In the House, Report was read and accepted and the Resolve ordered printed under the Joint Rules.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relative to Fishing Contests" (H. P. 727) (L. D. 418) on which the House accepted the Majority Report of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reporting a new draft (H. P. 1725) L. D. 1280) and passed the new draft to be engrossed on April 17.

Came from the Senate with the Minority Report reporting "Ought not to pass" accepted in non-concurrence.

In the House:

On motion of the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Bearce, the House voted to insist on its former action and ask for a Committee of Conference.

On motion by Mrs. Moffatt of Bath, House Rule 25 was suspended for the remainder of today's session, in order to permit smoking.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the special order of business on today's calendar, House Report, Majority "Ought not to pass" and Minority "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Imposing a Gross Income Tax," (H. P. 759) (L. D. 455) tabled on April 19th by the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar, pending acceptance of either report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. BUBAR: Mr. Speaker and Honorable Members: We read about that old Gallilean Wedding where they kept the best of the wine until the last of the feast, and evidently that is what they have done, for some reason or other,

Now I am to discuss the Income Tax. I know it is a controversial subject, and I wish that I might be able to discuss it calmly and in fairness to everyone. I wish I could discuss it and not hurt anybody's feelings. You see, no matter how fair you want to be, in the heat of argument sometimes, well we blow up and "bust" and some get their feelings hurt, but here in this House we have learned, or we should have learned by this time, that we run up against too many people to carry chips on our shoulders, and that we do not want to run around holding a grudge. So this morning I wish I could be so fair and so square and so careful that I wouldn't hurt anybody's feelings.

Now you and I know that we must have some more money to carry on the affairs of this State. I have on a suit here—two years ago I bought one like it for \$21. I paid \$55 for this, and it isn't a mite better. I am only wearing one suit,

and I didn't have to borrow it either. (Laughter) But I had to have a suit and it cost me more to buy it.

I don't live any better than I did back ten or fifteen years ago but it costs me double or three times as much. I don't eat any more or any better meals, but they cost me more. And I am telling you, Ladies and Gentlemen, we have got to have more money or somebody is going to suffer. You know who is out on the limb; it is the old people, the underdog, the fellow that is in need; he is going to suffer. Oh, you and I will get by. You have got enough in your home and your larder is full; you have got a little bank account, but let me tell you there are thousands in this State that will go hungry unless we come across.

Now the question in my mind is just how to raise the money to carry on the running expenses of the State. Well, I believe in all sincerity that it is by an income tax, and I just want to open this briefly, and I am not going to say what almost everybody has been saying now—"I will only speak a few minutes—I don't want to take any of your time"—that is what we are down here for, to take all the time we want. Otherwise we never should have come. We are here to pass bills the best we can and the only way we can do it is by discussion, meditation, consideration and argument until the thing boils down and sugars off. That is the way of all Republics. That is the way with Democracies. There isn't any other way. I don't care what the bill or who put it in, he should have his time to present it, otherwise he is not using his constituents right nor the State at large.

Now this Income Bill: It is the most simple of any bill that ever has been or ever will be submitted to this body of men and women or to any other State, and it is the cheapest and the easiest to administer. Now this calls for a one per cent gross income tax, one per cent of your earnings, one per cent of your salary. I want to keep away from that word if I can, a touchy word it is, that makes the hair stand up on the back of some fellows' heads, when you say "ability" to pay, so I will try and keep away from it.

Now this tax, I just want to look at it as calmly as I can, one per cent of your earnings, or your income, with exemptions. Now everyone will have \$1,000 exemption. You will have that much to start with; you have got to earn more than \$1,000 before you pay any tax in the income tax. It should, of course, be up to \$3,000 because the Federal government tells us that an average family must have at least \$3,000 after the taxes are paid, to live on. But this tax puts it at \$1,000, and we only have to pay one per cent, remember, after the \$1,000, after we get above it.

Now with the retailer, we use him a little better, because 67 per cent of all money exchanged in this United States will be passed over the retail counter and the small business man is the foundation of business, and the foundation of this government, and if you kick the feet out from under him, you kick the foundation out from under our economy. So we exempt him \$3,000. He must have earned \$3,000 before he pays a tax, and he only pays one-half of one per cent; that is all.

Now the wholesaler, the man who must keep his warehouses full all the time in order to supply the retailer, and he must carry a tremendous stock he is exempted \$1,000 and he only pays one quarter of one per cent. That is all. How can he object to that? I don't want to say anything about this miserable sales tax if I can help it, but there is the comparison, one quarter of one per cent or two per cent or three per cent.

Well, then there is the farmer. Now if the farmer is a wholesaler, well he has \$1,000; he has got to earn that much before he pays anything. If he is a wholesaler, he only pays one-quarter of one per cent. Now if he sells at retail, he only pays one-half of one per cent. Now isn't that simple? Anything complicated about that? Anything that a schoolboy cannot understand? Anything that a housewife cannot understand and figure out? There is nothing complicated about this. This isn't any patchwork. This isn't any hodgepodge. Any schoolboy can understand it.

Well then, there are your banks, your insurance companies and se-

curity companies. They don't pay on the deposits; they pay on their earnings, the earnings, that's all, and they have an exemption the same as everyone else of \$1,000.

Now I don't know where you can find anything as simple and reasonable and acceptable as a tax like that.

Well, all schools, public schools, parochial schools, all churches of all denominations, any creed, they are exempted. The pensioners are exempted. Can't you see what this means, how simple it is? You can call in anyone from the grammar grades and they can figure it out. You don't have to have an attorney, and it don't have to be notarized; it is very simple. But you figure out the sales tax if you can. Let a schoolboy try that.

Now here is a question that has been hurled at me I suppose fifty times in these corridors. If the income tax is enacted in Maine, big business will leave the State. Oh, that is so laughable and so silly! Where would they go? That's the question. When thirty-six other states have some form of an income tax, where are these fellows going that want to get out of Maine? They will be like Pat when the first time he had a brand new suit on was when they had him laid out on the bier. He had always worn overalls all his life, but this time they said they were going to dress him up, and they dressed him up. The poor fellow was in his casket, and one of his cronies came along and looked at him and he said: "Poor, poor Pat, all dressed up and no place to go!" (Laughter).

Well, where are these fellows going? Now I called him Pat because I suppose he was Irish, but I don't want anyone with any Irish blood in him think I am against the Irish because I am not; there is some Irish in me, but I am glad there isn't any more than there is. (Laughter) Well, that is all right, I like the Irish; I like them because they are funny; they like fun and they can see a joke.

Well, where will they go? They will stay right here in Maine. They are in Maine because they love Maine. That is the reason they are here. They like the State; they love the State. What would you

think of a man who married a woman and just simply because she cost him a little something, he ships her off and gets rid of her? Now when I found a woman that I loved, and I would have been an old bach today if I hadn't—I came pretty near being one as it was, an old bach or an old maid, I don't know which—but when I found the woman that I loved and finally we were keeping house and I discovered that she liked chocolates and she wanted chocolates, and I had to buy her chocolates, but do any of you think that just because she liked chocolates and I had to buy her chocolates that I was going to leave the mother of my children and run off, just because I had to buy chocolates? Lord Harry, no! Because I loved her, see? Members, I loved her. And I am telling you that these fellows love Maine and they are not going to run off to some other state just simply because they have to pay an income tax. Foolish!

Big Business! We want big business. I am not against the rich man. Don't think that I am. I am glad he can have his automobiles and his summer home in Florida and winter home in California. He can come up here when it is hot in other places. I don't care how many homes he has. I am glad he can. I am glad he can have all the yachts and all the motor boats that he wants, but I want him to pay his proportional share in the running of the government that makes it possible for him to have these things, and not crowd it over onto the little fellow.

The little fellow never owned anything; he never had even a car; he doesn't have any summer home here or in New York. All he has is a wheelbarrow and a buck-saw, and a one-room shack. You don't want him to pay do you? No, we can't do that.

This tax is a tax that is just and everybody, everyone should be interested in it, but listen: The sales tax, members, and you know it, falls upon the man with the big family. Tax on every child that comes into the world. You already tax his dog and his hog and his hens, and you tried to put a tax on his cat here. And now you want to tax his children. That is what

it means, and because it costs just as much, and it should cost just as much, for the poor man's child to live as it does the rich man's child,—he should wear just as much, and he should be able to eat as much—this tax falls heaviest upon him. Members, do you want a birth control law here in Maine? They are fighting it in other states. Do you want a birth control law in Maine? All right, if you want one, I will tell you a good easy way to get it. Pass the sales tax, and members, you'll have it because they will have to cut down on the number of children.

I was coming up the street the other afternoon, and I talked to a woman with two children; she had one by each hand; it is hard work for me to get by a child without speaking to them. I love children and the most of the kids think a lot of me somehow or other. If I have any spare change I generally tell them to buy a bag of popcorn. So I overtook this woman and I commented on the children and spoke to her and told her how beautiful they were, for they were beautiful. Well, just across the road Councilor Good and Dwight Dorsey were on the other side and they begun to yell at me at the top of their voices; I guess they thought I was trying to date her (Laughter) but I told them they needn't worry; they were noted for ladies' men all over the State, but I wasn't trying to date her; I was just complimenting her on the children. I said: "How many have you got?" She said: "I have only got two." Well I said: "If you can have children like these you ought to have all you can have." Well, she said: "My mother had fourteen." Well, I took my hat off then to her, and I said: "You will have to go some if you overtake your mother." "Oh," she said, "I can't do that." I said: "Why don't you?" "Well," she said, "if they put the sales tax on I can't feed them; that's why."

Members, that happened right down here. That is the way they feel about it. It taxes the children; it taxes everybody.

Now, this tax falls alike on every man and every woman in the State of Maine. It is a tax that everyone will have to pay. No one is

exempt except the pensioner. Everyone will have to pay. If your children are earning money, and they earn more than a thousand dollars, they will pay this tax.

Now I believe we can pass this tax. I believe that we want it. We know they don't want the sales tax. Members, don't fool yourselves. I was through the fight twice on the sales tax. I know what it is to initiate it. They will do it again. Oh, you say, "we will pass it as an emergency." Go ahead, and you will see what will happen. They passed it down here in New Jersey. I had a letter from my boy only yesterday, from New Jersey, telling me about it, how it happened, when Hoffman was governor and they passed the sales tax, and the people rose up in rebellion and they organized every town in that State. Members, they went right after it, and they organized. What did they do? They never even put it into effect. It remained on the books, and they were running another Governor on an anti-sales tax plank. What did Governor Hoffman do? He called a special session, and he did it in a hurry, and they had the thing repealed.

Now listen, I am no prophet, and I am not the son of a prophet although I have been called a son-of-a-gun a lot of times, but I am not a prophet, but I am going to tell you, Ladies and Gentlemen, and I am telling you now, and you see whether or not I am right, and I am wrong a lot of times — probably more than I am right — I want to be right, but I am not all of the time, because I don't know, but I am going to tell you what is going to take place just as sure as you sit on these seats. The minute this thing is passed or is passed as an emergency, you are going to see every town in this State organize. It is on the calendar now. They are going to rebel against it. Maybe I don't know. I am not wise; I don't pretend to be wise, not like some fellows.

When we discussed the sales tax in here last Friday, you remember, I went out of here and do you know what a man said to me? I hate to tell this because I like to keep calm and cool. He said to me: "Bubar, why don't you get on the

sales tax bandwagon and ride along?" "Well," I said: "You know why I don't." "Well," he said, "You had better." I said: "Why?" "Because," he said, "it is going through." "Well," I said, "How do you happen to be so wise? How do you know it is going through?" "Well," he said: "Next week, when they begin to put the pressure on, you'll find it is going through." I said: "I don't believe it." "Well," he said: "I will tell you what will happen. When they put the pressure on, your men and the men of 'Old Man Jacobs' — I hope he will not be offended at this because it is the truth — "your men and the men of 'Old Man Jacobs' will fly like ninepins."

Members, did you ever have the hair stand up on the back of your neck? Of course you have. It would almost lift your hat. Well, I am not a fighting man, but I am telling you, Ladies and Gentlemen, as sure as you live, if I had been a fighting man I think I would have crowned him right there. (Laughter). I don't believe there is a man in this House—I have looked at you and I have watched you and I have been reading character by physiognomy for almost sixty years facing congregations—and I don't see a man here who can be bought or sold. I asked him "Do you think that you can buy any of these men in this House like you can buy dumb driven cattle in the marketplace?" He said: "Bubar, understand, every man has his price." That is a lie; I don't care who said it. He isn't in here this morning. I am glad he isn't. I haven't gotten over it yet; I could hardly eat my dinner; couldn't get my teeth together. (Laughter). I don't like that kind of business. No, members, they cannot buy and sell me. None of them can buy and sell me.

I know I am called an obstructionist. Now get that will you? Whatever that means, an obstructionist. And they put it on the letter here, "Don't be an obstructionist." Well, what do they mean? I suppose they mean that I am against the sales tax. But who is calling me an obstructionist? The very men who were against the sales tax two years ago and the

very men who wanted the income tax two years ago, they say now, because Bubar is against the sales tax, that he is an obstructionist. Members, you know that is so. It is absolutely so.

Let me tell you what the sales tax does, if you please, if I can put it in plain, everyday, understandable, well I will say Aroostook County potato-digging language, so you can all understand it, it will take the food out of the bellies of the poor man and fill him up with scraps, culls, margarine, steeped-over coffee-grounds and skim milk. That is what it will do. And the people know it.

Listen: I am for the poor man all the time. I do not want to be rich; let the other fellows be rich. If I were the rich, the richest man in the world, when I get through here, and when they put me in a casket, if I had \$10,000,000 with me, my arms would be so stiff I couldn't get in my pockets to get it out. (Laughter). And if I could, it wouldn't pay my hotel bills in Eternity overnight. I don't want to be rich. I don't want anybody to be poor. The Book of the Law says: "Give me neither poverty nor riches, don't make me rich lest I be puffed up, and don't make me poor lest I shall steal." I don't want to see people poor. Nothing breaks my heart like reading the letters I get from the poor people. I can hardly read them. I have taken hundreds of them, maybe, down to the stenographer to make a copy of, because I could hardly read some of them. And I will tell you this: Miss Louise down there could tell you, if she wanted to, I wouldn't care if she did, the heartbreaks that come in and I can hardly sleep at night, begging: "I want to go to the hospital; I am going to die if I don't" and "I am not getting enough to eat." All of these stories. Members, must we do something here that is going to continue and the cry will go up "God will not bless any man that grinds the poor." Let us look out for the poor widow! We have got to have a tax. Now what tax will it be? I say: Let us have the income tax.

Now I found here on my desk a letter that I didn't like very well.

It was distributed on every desk so far as I know. It gave the Governor's stand two years ago and today. I suppose you all got it. It said that he was for the income tax then and now he is for the sales tax. I didn't like it because for the simple reason that they didn't give any reason why the Governor shifted, and it left a bad impression. I don't like it. I think if any man ever tried to do right before God it is the man in the other end of this House. I have watched him. I will admit he comes out now for the sales tax, but let me tell you why. That is my opinion. He has not changed his mind in my opinion; he has simply shifted his position because he had to; necessity drove him to it.

I know I began to preach the Gospel, when I had my first license to preach, in 1898, just a boy, that's all, and I had been preaching before that when I was in knee pantaloons. I wish I had never gotten out of them. (Laughter) I had a great time then and I didn't know any trouble.

Well, then bye and bye I found the woman I wanted and well, we got married. Then children began to come, and sometimes I couldn't make enough preaching the Gospel to take care of them, and I see my good Brother, the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Roundy, looking at me, and maybe he has been through the same thing, I don't know, a lot of preachers have—and so I would do anything to get a little more money to support my family, but I wouldn't give up preaching the Gospel, because I loved it. Necessity drove me to shift my position and do something else. And Members, it is my opinion, I don't know what the Governor would say, but it doesn't make any difference, it is my opinion that he has not changed his mind one single mite, but he had to change his position because of the need and the cry of the old and the blind and the sick and the children. And he couldn't get the income tax, and so he lost his first love and he has taken the sales tax because necessity drove him to it, the cry of the poor drove him to it, but I believe his first love is still

that income tax. Now let's give it back to him will you? Let's not compel him to shift his position to meet the end. Let's give it back to him will you? We can do it. Give him his income tax.

Now here is something else that is in this bill. If there is anything in this bill that you people don't like, there is no need of arguing about it. You can just simply pass an amendment, but here is something that is attached to this bill; you can have an amendment or take it off if you want to. That is the referendum, and I cannot do justice to myself or to the bill unless I tell you why I put it on. The reason I put the referendum on was because that a good many years ago the people of Maine discovered, the voters discovered, that they were losing control of the machinery of the State of Maine. Now I went through it, and the Grange and others got together and they said: "Let's put the referendum into the Constitution and then if five or six men in the Senate want to defeat a measure that we need and is for our good and that the majority demands, we can defeat it. And so Governor Cobb, in 1907, had this put into the Constitution. It is a Constitutional Amendment so that the majority cannot be bulldozed around by a small minority. So that you and I cannot come down to this House and pass a law that the majority of the people do not want. Otherwise they can simply throw it back; throw it out. That is all it is. This is what makes us different from Russia or any other dictator country. Is the right of the referendum the right of the majority to rule? The referendum is simply a sledgehammer to break the hand of a dictator and the chains that he could weave around us. That is what it is. A referendum is this: It is the cry of a Republic or a Democracy for the majority to rule, and I believe that this should go to the people by the way of a referendum, and if it does, I believe it will pass.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I move you that this bill has a passage.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of

the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar, that the House accept the minority "Ought to pass" report of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Imposing a Gross Income Tax."

Is the House ready for the question? All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar, that the House accept the minority "Ought to pass" report on Bill "An Act Imposing a Gross Income Tax," H. P. 759, L. D. 455, will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the majority "Ought not to pass" report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

House Reports of Committees Divided Report

Report "C" of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Open Season on Muskrats" (H. P. 1224) (L. D. 778) together with new draft (H. P. 1752) (L. D. 1296) which were recommitted.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. ELA of Somerset
SMART of Hancock
WIGHT of Penobscot
—of the Senate.
BEARCE of Caribou
PLUMMER of Lisbon
—of the House.

Report "D" of the same Committee reporting same in new draft (H. P. 1752) (L. D. 1296) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. DENNISON
of East Machias
WATSON
of Moose River Pl.
CHASE of Belgrade
FRECHETTE of Sanford
CARVILLE of Eustis
—of the House.

Report was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from East Machias, Mr. Dennison.

Mr. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Now, this bill is to allow Cumberland,

York and Washington Counties to have the spring muskrat season from March 20 to April 20. Now, we had a bill in the House a while ago, a state wide bill, which was defeated so it leaves the law now that thirteen of the counties have fall trapping and what we want is to get these three counties for spring trapping. Now, I have never trapped in my life, but for twenty-five years I have been in a position to observe the difference between spring and fall trapping. About twelve years ago, they had fall trapping in a section where I go; for instance, we have a camp up there, a number of fellows, and for twenty-five years we have gone back and forth on a stream and above and below this lake covering ten miles. Now, when we had this other fall trapping bill, there were two trappers who came into this State and caught 150 muskrats which sold for fifty cents and for a number of years after it is very evident that they have practically cleaned up that area of muskrats. Now, during the years we have noticed on spring trapping the gain in this fur-bearing animal so that right around for four or five years, in this section alone, four trappers have caught on an average of 250 to 300 muskrats. Now last year, last fall, the first fall trapping season comes along* for a period of about ten years and in that same area six trappers caught 500 muskrats. Now, this excess of muskrats, you might call it, had been built up by spring trapping. Now it is the contention of all of these fellows that work in that area that they have nearly cleaned out the muskrats in that area and I believe that they have.

Now, in the fall of the year, when the water is low, as everyone knows, these muskrats live on the banks of streams and have their little paths all along and they set their traps in these paths and they are easy to catch, the water is low. And in the spring of the year, the water is high, the same as it is now and the same as it always is and you have twice the area and they have to set their traps on logs or on mounds or wherever they can and it is impossible to catch all of the muskrats.

In my county, the Chief Game Warden, Mr. Clark, has said that he and all of the game wardens in Washington County have a preference and know that it should be spring trapping to save some of the muskrats. He called up Clifford Chase, a short time ago, whom most of you know, he was a former Representative and Senator, and asked him to contact some of the trappers in his section and Mr. Chase — I think he is in the building — contacted ten and they were all in favor of spring muskrat trapping.

We honestly believe that it is better and unless we stop this fall trapping — we can't stop it now in thirteen counties — you will find that in two years you will be back here and have to have a closed season. It is impossible to have this fall season, catching these muskrats when they are so easy to catch and have them. Now, in this section alone, you have caught practically twice as many this fall and it stands to reason that you have caught most of the muskrats.

Another argument is that in the spring of the year you catch the female muskrat and you have destroyed a family. That is very evident. Now, if you catch the same muskrat in the fall, she isn't there in the spring. Now, you have caught all over the State practically twice as many this fall as you catch in the spring muskrat season. Now, there has been a lot of stress put on what we call the Gashwiler Report." A man got this out up to Orono, probably thinking he was right. This man now lives in Salt Lake City; I wish he had stayed there. But he didn't. Now, he says in one part of his report that other men have told him that spring muskrat fur was worth twice as much as the fall muskrat. Well, now, sometimes it is but it is always worth 40 or 50 or 60 per cent more in the spring than in the fall. Now, that stands to reason with all of you because in the fall there isn't one muskrat that is caught that has a fine skin. Everyone knows that. In the spring when they are prime and beautiful, they are worth nearly twice as much. Now, the reports this fall, and I have four of them right here on my desk, from

reliable dealers, one of them right here in Maine. Now, they report last fall, all of them about the same price: Extra large, \$2.50 and in the spring \$4.25, and when they say large, that is the large skin, \$2.00 in the fall and \$3.50 right now and the medium they quoted last fall at \$1.25 and quote them right now at \$2.75. The small ones, some of them call them kits, they quoted them at 45 and 50 cents in the fall. Now, they quote them \$2.00.

Now, the main reason on this is a muskrat born in June or July naturally can only be four or five months old in November. Now that same muskrat in the spring is nine and ten months old and therefore he is twice as large and he comes into the medium class. And so this year, as it happens, they are, according to four reliable reports, worth nearly double so if they had caught half as many last fall as they did catch and if they caught half as many this spring as they did last fall, they have got nearly as much money and let me contend that they are destroying, and they are, most of the muskrats at a very low price.

Now I hope, members, where they have had their way in thirteen counties in the State of Maine that possibly you will allow these three counties to do what most of the people in those counties want and try to preserve what few there are left. Whichever way this goes, most of the muskrats are destroyed. First I say "mushrat" then I say "muskrat." I consider one caught in the fall is a "mushrat" and when he is caught in the spring then he is a "muskrat."

Now, I hope, members, you will accept this Report D. Five of us have signed Report D and five of us have signed Report C. And I move that the House accept Report D in favor of spring trapping.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from East Machias, Mr. Dennison, moves that the House accept Report "D" of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act relating to Open Season on Muskrats," H. P. 1224, L. D. 778, reporting "Ought to pass" in new draft, H. P. 1752, L. D. 1296.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eustis, Mr. Carville.

Mr. CARVILLE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This was probably the most controversial bill that we had in the Fish and Game Committee and I want to make my position clear here.

I do not agree with the theory of the gentleman from East Machias, Mr. Dennison, on the fall and spring trapping although I signed the same report with him. I am definitely in favor of fall trapping but at the hearing there were Cumberland, York and Washington Counties that were definitely in favor of spring trapping. Where we have this University of Maine report out that definitely states that fall trapping is the way to increase our muskrat, I feel it should be given a chance. As yet, it hasn't been given a chance; it has only had one year, and I should like to see it continued. I thought by putting these three counties into the class of the spring trapping that we would have something to judge on at a future Legislature. So I thought it was a good idea to let these three counties have the spring trapping as apparently a majority want to and leave the rest of the State to fall trapping.

I hope that they do give Washington, York and Cumberland Counties a chance to have this spring trapping as they wish, which would be under Report D.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer.

Mr. PLUMMER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I feel much the same as my colleague, the gentleman from Eustis, Mr. Carville, that spring trapping is definitely hurting the muskrats and I felt that way two years ago and I couldn't change my position on this. I think it is all very well to let these three counties have their spring trapping if they wish, but there is another item that enters into it that I am afraid will hurt these counties and that is with spring trapping in these three counties I am afraid there will be an awful lot of trappers in those counties and perhaps they may be sorry for their act. It just doesn't seem logical to me that we can trap or shoot or hunt any animal during its main breeding season. That has been proved by the fact that

we have had spring trapping so long and this matter was brought up only by the fact that muskrats were disappearing from Maine. We have only given the fall trapping a trial for one year and I believe it is for the best interests of the trappers. It is a funny thing, there are only two trapping associations in Maine, that is that amount to anything, and they are both large associations and they can't get together on this thing. One association is definitely in favor and the other is against. So I don't know how they think we can judge intelligently if they can't make up their minds.

I therefore hope that Report C will be adopted.

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

Mr. BRADEEN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I can look back forty years, probably more, and realize that at that time I had a fairly good acquaintance with the muskrat family. My father was a trapper. As a matter of fact, he was a blacksmith but he had plenty of time and he took a little time to do a little trapping and fishing and hunting. I have a very vivid recollection of going with him many times in a row boat around the shores of little Oscar Lake up in York County and we went in the springtime, after the ice was out, because it was at that season of the year when the muskrat had a good coat, the fur was in fine condition. He was ready to be caught and those who got a rat or two got a dollar or two. I can recall, also, that my father trapped foxes in the fall and he did not trap them in the spring for the same reason that he trapped the muskrat in the spring and not in the fall, because in the fall the fox skin was good and fine as was the muskrat skin in the spring.

For that reason, I am very glad to go along with the motion of my friend from East Machias, Mr. Dennison. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lyman, Mr. Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I am no trapper and have no personal interest in this but the trappers down in York County come

to me and want me to support this bill for spring trapping.

Therefore, I want to support the motion of the gentleman from East Machias, Mr. Dennison.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Whiting, Mr. Bucknam.

Mr. BUCKNAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have been in a rather complicated position on this. Two of the trappers in my locality are in favor of the fall and two in the spring and I told them that I would stand neutral for whichever way the committee went; I would vote with the majority report of that committee. And, the bill that was before the committee for hearing was for state wide trapping in the spring instead of the fall. The committee reported that bill out "Ought not to pass" and it was passed unanimously that we should continue the fall trapping.

Now, I notice that Cumberland and York Counties had a bill in to trap in the spring and now they are amending that by putting Washington County in it. There was no hearing on seeing whether we should have three counties open, or Washington County open, with the other counties closed. My objection is that it is not fair for when I went home they had read in the paper that the State had voted to retain the law as it was. Now, I find they have a bill in here to have Washington County in the spring trapping. Now, that is a bad law for the simple reason that there is a certain bunch of trappers who have automobiles, have two or three hundred traps, and they can come down into Washington County in the spring, set the traps in a locality for one night or two, one night is all right, they will get the majority of them. Then they move on to another locality and hunters in the other counties who can't afford to do that feel that, well, they have gone down there, I guess I will go and catch a few around here and I can take them down to one of the trappers down in Washington County and have him turn them in for me. And the honest ones in that county who wouldn't do that, they'd say:

"Well, they broke the law" and they would growl about it. So I feel that for the best interests of the State and the best interests of us all and the fairest is to have a state wide law.

Now, in investigating in my locality, I have investigated my territory and I find by good, reliable sources that there are as many or more rats in Orange River now than there has ever been in any spring for years and years. The dens along the river, last fall, you can notice them; something you haven't seen for twenty years. I don't remember of seeing so many. Of course, some of the rats have been caught out of those dens, there may not be any but in the spring it is just when they are breeding and they are travelling, they are restless, and it is easy to catch them and it is—these rats, you understand, breed about three times in a season and they have from eight to ten in a litter.

Now, in the fall trapping you will find that there might be a good crop of rats and you will catch them but if they go into their dens you are liable to have bloody waters and overstocked. If you do, the blood will drown them and if they are overstocked, the older ones will kill off the weak ones so you don't get them at all.

As far as the price, there is some difference in price. I have a letter here from one of the trappers that in the spring trapping he was doing well to get 60 rats. Last year he got 195 and other trappers on the river I know have done likewise and I feel that the law was only changed two years ago; and what is the sense of coming up here and going before this Legislature and taking up your time to change a law which you feel would be for the benefit of the people and then, before it has a chance to see whether it will work, come up and ask to have it repealed?

My good colleague, the gentleman from East Machias, Mr. Dennison, says that Mr. Clark, the game warden, made an investigation and reported that every one of them wanted spring trapping. It is funny that in his travels he couldn't find somebody that was opposed to it. It looks

to me as if he just went to the ones who were in favor of it. If he hadn't, he could have come down to Whiting and I could have told him where to go and find people who were opposed to the spring trapping. So, I feel that we should leave this at least two years more and then we will know. We have no way of knowing now. But leave it two years more and if I am wrong, or if the trappers who are in favor of the fall trapping are wrong, I will be glad to come over here and go before the committee at my own expense and admit that I was wrong.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gorham Mr. Sanborn.

Mr. SANBORN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do not know of any bill in this House that has created any more excitement in Cumberland County unless it is horse racing. I have here a petition from approximately 50 trappers in and around my section and they want me to place them on record as being in favor of the spring trapping.

This bill will allow spring trapping in Cumberland, Washington and York Counties only. There is just a little here I would like to read. "There are several groups of people affected by the said muskrat trapping law: Number 1. The trapper. Number 2. The fur buyer. Number 3. The fur garment manufacturer. Number 4. The people who buy and wear the furs. In the number one group, fall rat pelts never have and never will sell for over sixty per cent of their value in the spring. Most men would rather have a dollar than sixty cents. Number 2. The fur buyer. Certain types of fur buyers like to buy fall rats as the margin of profit is larger for them with a smaller amount of capital invested. Number 3. The fur garment man. These people buy their fall rats much cheaper than the spring rats but the finished garment of inferior quality furs always sells to the public for the same price as garments made of prime quality furs. Number 4. The people who buy and wear the furs. This group comprises a very large percentage of the people. These people, whose coats are

fur-trimmed or fur coats are also trimmed out of thousands of dollars annually."

I do have a little article here signed by the Howe Fur Company. I would like to read it to you. It is dated September 30, 1950. It is signed Cooper's Mills, Maine. "In reply to your letter of September 21st, which was acknowledged on September 25th during my absence, you have my permission to the effect that it is my conviction that the fur buyers will get a greater benefit out of a fall muskrat trapping law than the trappers themselves will.

"This statement is based on over thirty years experience in the raw fur business and it is definitely established that muskrats purchased in the fall usually show the dealer a greater profit compared to what he may get on spring-caught muskrat.

"This may lead some of the readers of this article to wonder why we are in favor of spring muskrat trapping. It is only for the fact that the value of the pelt is at its best at that time of the year and it is naturally of greater value to the trapper. They will receive more income from a less number of pelts. Intelligent conservation measures, I am sure, will result in the continued supply of muskrats when trapped in the spring of the year." And that is signed by the Howe Fur Company.

I want to go on record as favoring the motion of the gentleman from East Machias, Mr. Dennison.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Guilford, Mr. Campbell.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have no personal interest in this matter; I never have caught a muskrat in my life, but we have several trappers in the district that I represent who are very much interested in it, and they are all in favor, as far as I know, of fall trapping. I believe that if it is all right to catch muskrat in the spring our laws of conservation are all wrong. Why don't we shoot deer in the spring when they are carrying their young? I can think of no better way to exterminate the muskrat than by allowing spring trapping.

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

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I suppose that in the position I am in I should say something on the muskrat. Possibly there are more lakes or streams in my district than any other section of the State of Maine; it probably affects the people as much if not more than in any other section of the State of Maine.

I sat in on the hearing that we had in the House on the muskrat law. One thing that was brought here by the witnesses who appeared from my district was the fact that they would like to have trapping in the spring because it is at that time of year when they cannot haul pulpwood and do many other things. If they can trap they can get by. They earn a little that way, and thus it carries them along until the other work starts in that area. So I think that is the most important factor of all.

I want to support the motion of my good friend and colleague from East Machias, Mr. Dennison. Possibly this will get me in difficulty because I come from the northern section of the county, my wife comes from Whiting where Mr. Bucknam comes from, so there may be a family feud over this, but I will take the consequences.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from East Machias, Mr. Dennison, that the House accept Report "D" of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act relating to Open Season on Muskrats" H. P. 1224, L. D. 778, reporting same in a new draft H. P. 1752, L. D. 1296, and that it "Ought to pass" and the same gentleman requests a division.

All those in favor of accepting Report "D" will please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER: Seventy-eight having voted in the affirmative and eighteen in the negative, the motion to accept Report "D" prevails.

The new draft having already

been printed, the bill was given its two several readings, under suspension of the rules, and tomorrow assigned for third reading.

Leave to Withdraw

Mr. Frechette from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act relating to Guides" (H. P. 1004) (L. D. 592) reported leave to withdraw as it is covered by other legislation.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Bearce from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Hunting and Fishing by Certain Persons" (H. P. 314) (L. D. 172)

Report was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. March.

Mr. MARCH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I introduced this bill and I would like to speak very briefly on its merits.

The purpose of this act is to accomplish two main objectives: To get revenue from the youths sixteen and seventeen years of age who are not now paying for hunting and fishing licenses and to permit the few elderly people who enjoy fishing and hunting and whose health permits to do so without expense.

I have obtained some figures from the census bureau, and they reveal that in 1940 there were 31,232 in this sixteen and seventeen-year-old group. An estimate of 100 per cent for the boys and 20 per cent for the girls gives a figure of just under 19,000 potential sportsmen who would accordingly be added to the number paying for licenses if they care to participate if this bill has passage.

To me it does not seem unreasonable to ask these young people in the sixteen and seventeen year age groups to pay for their hunting and fishing licenses, since at fifteen years of age they are obliged to pay for their automobile operators' licenses if they care to drive automobiles on our highways.

The census figures further reveal that there are over forty-nine

thousand residents in the State—this is the 1940 census—between the ages of seventy and a hundred. I have discarded the figures except between seventy and eighty, and there are about thirty-nine thousand. Most of these elderly ladies will do very little hunting and fishing, which would cut the figure to about twenty-five per cent of the whole, so fifty per cent of the gentlemen between seventy and eighty is probably a liberal estimate. Twenty-five per cent of that figure just under 40,000 gives us just under ten thousand potential sportsmen between seventy and eighty years of age. I also maintain that the ardor of these elderly people would not equal that of the younger enthusiasts.

If this bill is passed, as I hope it will be, the Department will obtain an increased revenue, and while only about ten thousand elderly people will avail themselves of the privilege, it will show over forty-nine thousand elderly people that we are thinking of them and trying to do something to help enhance their welfare and happiness besides old age assistance.

No doubt someone will say that many of these older people can well afford to pay, which is probably true, but there are few cutting coupons and getting social security benefits too. No law can be one hundred per cent perfect.

Let us see how the figures balance. Let's take the older people first. If we lose the revenue from just under ten thousand potential purchasers of combination licenses we lose \$39,964. If we add the revenue from the nearly nineteen thousand youngsters who are not now purchasing but will be if this bill is passed, then we get a revenue of just under \$75,000, a net gain to the Department of a strong thirty-five thousand. And what will we have accomplished? We will have improved the finances of the Department of Inland Fisheries and Game; we will have made over forty-nine thousand elderly people realize that we are thinking of them and trying to do something to enhance their happiness and welfare. We will have accomplished these objectives simply by asking the youngsters who have assumed the responsibility of paying for an

automobile driver's license at fifteen to take on two years later, at sixteen and seventeen, the added responsibility of paying for their hunting and fishing licenses if they care to participate. And I would remind you that over thirteen hundred deer were tagged by those young people under eighteen years of age in 1950.

I think that this bill is unique in that it creates so much gratitude, so much good will from so many people for so little sacrifice, and I move that the bill be substituted for the committee's report, and I ask for a division when the vote is taken.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. March, moves that the House substitute Bill "An Act relating to Hunting and Fishing by Certain Persons," H. P. 314, L. D. 172, for the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Bearce.

Mr. BEARCE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House: Reporting for the Fish and Game Committee, I will say that we have taken this under due consideration, and it is our belief that when a man takes his son or daughter fishing or hunting under the age of eighteen, that he or she should not have to buy a license. It is true that it probably will bring in some more revenue to the department, but we believe that there is a place where you have to stop even if it does return more money to the department.

In regard to the seventy-year-olds, I think Mr. March has very well outlined that argument in that most of those people are able to buy a license. Those who are not able are very, very few. For that reason I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. March, does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. March, that the House substitute Bill "An Act relating to Hunting and Fishing by Certain Persons," H. P. 314, L. D. 172, for the "Ought not to pass" report of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game, and the same gentleman moves for a division.

All those in favor of substituting the bill for the report will please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER: Fifty-two having voted in the affirmative and thirty-four in the negative, the motion to substitute the bill for the report prevails.

This being a printed bill, under suspension of the rules it was given its two several readings and tomorrow assigned for third reading.

Tabled

Mr. Delahanty from the Committee on Judiciary reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve in favor of George S. Bradbury of West Franklin (H. P. 1483) (L. D. 1090)

Report was read.

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

Mr. DUNHAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I happen to be very well acquainted with this resolve and I want to ask your indulgence to lay this on the table until tomorrow so that I may get some information about it and I assure you that I will take it off the table just as soon as I get the information. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Dunham, moves that the report and Resolve in favor of George S. Bradbury of West Franklin lie on the table pending acceptance of the committee report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the report and accompanying papers were tabled pending acceptance of the report.

Mrs. Fay from the Committee on Judiciary reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve in favor of Laura B. Sanborn of Kents Hill (H. P. 1548) (L. D. 1109)

Report was read.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I haven't my notes on this particular case and it has been quite some time since I introduced the resolve. However, I don't want to hold up proceedings and I will do the best I can from memory. But I would

like to substitute the resolve for the report of the committee.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman so move?

Mr. BROWN: I so move, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BROWN: Laura B. Sanborn, in whose favor this resolve is, is a retired school teacher. She is seventy-four years old. She has fifteen years accredited service in the State of Maine. She had two years service in Massachusetts, for which she did not receive credit in Maine. She also taught four years at Kents Hill in Readfield, for which she did not receive any credit upon her retirement.

Her teaching career was interrupted by the serious illness of her mother and for many years she had to leave the profession to take care of her mother who was ill. But, at the age of sixty-five, her mother having passed on and due to the fact that teachers at that particular time were very, very difficult to get, she taught in the Town of Chelsea for a period of about eight years.

Now, she receives a pension, ladies and gentlemen, of \$23.95 a month, which I submit to you with today's cost of living is a very small amount of money. The question has been asked why doesn't she apply for Old Age Assistance; she is seventy-four year old and has no property. Miss Sanborn, during her lifetime, was able to save \$2,000, which she has in a savings account in a bank, which she wants to keep there for her last sickness and last expenses and I commend her for it. If she wanted to spend that amount of money, then she probably would be eligible for Old Age Assistance but she is proud and wants to make her own way and take care of herself. Our average grant, as I understand it, under Old Age Assistance is around \$42 a month and I submit to you that I believe that this retired school teacher is certainly entitled to as much as our Old Age Assistance recipients.

I hope my motion prevails.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Brown, moves that the House substitute Resolve in favor of Laura B. Sanborn of Kents

Hill for the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mrs. Fay.

Mrs. FAY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of this House: I rise in support of the committee report, having signed this particular report. I believe that our intention was to be consistent in passing these out. I do believe that the time has come when we must stop our courtesy to the members who have been willing to put in these measures to substitute the bill for an "Ought not to pass" report and go through a lengthy and time-consuming procedure of having the other House do it for us.

In the case of Miss Sanborn, our sympathy on the committee is with the people but we felt that it would be an extension of the retirement fund and all we could find out was that she had fifteen years of credit towards retirement.

At no time have we tried to give people nine or ten years of creditable service. It is not to the interest of your retirement fund and it is against the interest of all other teachers who might come within that classification. Therefore, because we felt that it was too long a period to give her as creditable service, we passed this resolve out "Ought not to pass" and I do hope that the motion of the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Brown, will not be sustained.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Brown, that the House substitute Resolve in favor of Laura B. Sanborn of Kent's Hill, H. P. 1548, L. D. 1109, for the "Ought not to pass" report of the Committee on Judiciary.

All those in favor of substituting the resolve for the report will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the "Ought not to pass" report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Fuller from the Committee on Judiciary reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Increasing Retirement Allowance of Albert F.

Barnes of Belfast (H. P. 1623) (L. D. 1182)

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Tabled

Mr. Harding from the Committee on Judiciary reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve in favor of Alice Knight Spinney of Eliot (H. P. 1624) (L. D. 1183)

Report was read.

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

Mr. GOWELL: I would like to have Item 7 lie on the table pending acceptance of the report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Gowell, moves that Item 7, Report of the Committee on Judiciary on Resolve in favor of Alice Knight Spinney of Eliot, H. P. 1624, L. D. 1183, reporting "Ought not to pass" lie on the table pending acceptance of the report.

Mr. GOWELL: Mr. Speaker, in the way of explanation I would like —

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the matter is not debatable.

Is it the pleasure of the House that the matter lie on the table?

The motion prevailed and the report with accompanying papers was tabled pending acceptance.

Mr. Hayes from the Committee on Judiciary reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Increasing Retirement Benefits for George H. Woodbury of Belgrade (H. P. 1640) (L. D. 1204)

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Tabled

Mr. DeBeck from the Committee on Towns and Counties reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to the Salary of the Judge of Probate in Penobscot County" (H. P. 939) (L. D. 544)

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Fuller of Bangor, tabled pending acceptance of the committee report.)

Ought to Pass in New Draft

Mr. Dennison from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game

on Bill "An Act relating to Guides' Qualifications, License and License Revocation" (H. P. 1005) (L. D. 593) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1783) (L. D. 1340) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was read and accepted and the New Draft, having already been printed, the bill was read twice under suspension of the rules and tomorrow assigned.

Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Watson from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act relating to Bulldozing of Streams" (H. P. 1643) (L. D. 1211) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1784) (L. D. 1341) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was read.

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

Mr. BAILEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: On this bill, in the early days of this session there was a rumor that there was going to be a bill similar to this come before the Legislature and, as a result of that, I got several calls from people in the southern part of the State, especially those engaged in farming operations, objecting to the bill.

When this bill first came out, it stated "streams and brooks in unorganized territory." We felt that was something for the benefit of those in the northern part of the state and it would not affect us there in the least. Therefore, no objection was raised.

This morning I see placed upon our desks there is a new bill, a revised edition, which eliminates those words "in unorganized territory." Therefore, under those conditions, Mr. Speaker, I would like permission and I move accordingly that this bill lie on the table and be specially assigned for May 3rd.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Woolwich, Mr. Bailey, moves that the Report of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act relating to Bulldozing of Streams," H. P. 1643, L. D. 1211, reporting same in a new draft, H. P. 1784, L. D. 1341, and that it "Ought to pass" lie on the table

pending acceptance of the committee report and be specially assigned for Thursday, May 3rd. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the report and accompanying papers were so tabled and so assigned.

Mr. McGlaulin from the Committee on Judiciary on Resolve Granting a Pension to James E. Harvey of Readfield (H. P. 1016) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1785) (L. D. 1342) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. March from the Committee on Liquor Control on Bill "An Act relating to the Liquor Commission" (H. P. 935) (L. D. 543) which was recommitted reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1786) (L. D. 1346) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Reports were read and accepted and the New Drafts, having already been printed, under suspension of the rules, the Resolve was read once, the Bill read twice and tomorrow assigned.

Ought to Pass Printed Bills

Mr. Fuller from the Committee on Judiciary reported "Ought to pass" on Resolve Providing for State Pension for Mrs. Minnie Fenderson of Saco (H. P. 1455) (L. D. 1343)

Mr. McGlaulin from the same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Carrie M. Longfellow of Machias (H. P. 1015) (L. D. 1344)

Mr. Woodworth from the same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Helen G. McShea of Fort Fairfield (H. P. 1585) (L. D. 1157)

Reports were read and accepted and the Resolves, having already been printed, were read once, under suspension of the rules, and tomorrow assigned.

First Reading of Resolves

Resolve in favor of Christian M. Jensen of Westbrook (H. P. 11) (L. D. 1321)

Resolve in favor of Oscar Pinette, of Portland (H. P. 12) (L. D. 1322)

Resolve in favor of Jackman Plantation (H. P. 38) (L. D. 1323)

Resolve in favor of C. Curvin Hovis, of Gorham (H. P. 71) (L. D. 1324)

Resolve in favor of Leo Smith, of Pittsfield (H. P. 579) (L. D. 1325)

Resolve in favor of the town of Warren (H. P. 810) (L. D. 1326)

Resolve in favor of Guy L. Chretien, of Westbrook (H. P. 815) (L. D. 1327)

Resolve in favor of Arthur H. Molasky of Gorham (H. P. 880) (L. D. 1328)

Resolve to Reimburse Percy E. Severance, of Hampden, for Taxes, Etc. (H. P. 965) (L. D. 1329)

Resolve to Compensate Edwin Blanche of Augusta for Personal Injuries (H. P. 1521) (L. D. 1330)

Resolve to Reimburse Freeport Grain Company for Damage Done by Escapee (H. P. 1523) (L. D. 1331)

Resolve in favor of Arthur W. McLellan, of Topsfield (H. P. 1559) (L. D. 1332)

Resolve in favor of Emile Couillard, of Auburn (H. P. 1567) (L. D. 1333)

Resolve in favor of C. H. Mallory, of Strong (H. P. 1569) (L. D. 1334)

Resolve in favor of Dwight D. Dixon, of Clinton (H. P. 1604) (L. D. 1335)

Resolve in favor of W. I. Hamilton, of Bath (H. P. 1648) (L. D. 1336)

Were read once, and tomorrow assigned.

First Reading of Amended Resolves

Resolve in favor of Charles Norton Pratt, of Leeds (H. P. 881) (L. D. 1338)

Resolve was read once.

Committee Amendment "A" was read by the Clerk as follows:

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 881, Resolve in Favor of Charles Norton Pratt, of Leeds.

Amend said Resolve by striking out the figures "\$1,200" in the 2nd line thereof, and inserting in place thereof the figures '\$400'.

Further amend said Resolve by adding at the end thereof the following sentence:

'Provided, however, that the said Pratt shall give to the State a release of damages'.

Thereupon, Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Resolve was assigned for second reading tomorrow.

Resolve in favor of Folsom Brothers of Monticello (H. P. 1074) (L. D. 1339)

Resolve was read once.

Committee Amendment "A" was read by the Clerk as follows:

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1074, Resolve in Favor of Folsom Brothers of Monticello.

Amend said Resolve by striking out the figures "\$1045" in the 2nd line thereof, and inserting in place thereof the figures '\$750'.

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Resolve was assigned for second reading tomorrow morning.

Resolve in favor of Allagash Plantation (H. P. 1560) (L. D. 1337)

Was read once.

Committee Amendment "A" was read by the Clerk as follows:

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1560, Resolve in Favor of Allagash Plantation.

Amend said Resolve by striking out the figures "\$600" in the 1st line thereof, and inserting in place thereof the figures '\$457'.

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Resolve was assigned for second reading tomorrow morning.

Passed to be Engrossed

Bill "An Act Concerning the Qualifications of Fire and Casualty Insurance Agents and Brokers" (S. P. 551) (L. D. 1310)

Bill "An Act relating to Designation of Through Ways by Highway Commission" (H. P. 1341) (L. D. 916)

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

Tabled

Bill "An Act relating to Taxation of Domestic Fowl" (H. P. 1448) (L. D. 1043)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading.

(On motion of Mr. Dickey of Brooks, tabled pending third reading.)

Bill "An Act relating to Fines for Overloaded Trucks" (H. P. 1779) (L. D. 1317)

Bill "An Act to Confer the Right of Eminent Domain upon Wiscasset

Water Company" (H. P. 1781) (L. D. 1319)

Resolve Opening Meduxnekeag Lake to Ice Fishing for Certain Fish (H. P. 1010) (L. D. 597)

Resolve Designating Bridge at Burnham as Burnham Memorial Bridge (H. P. 1611) (L. D. 1171)

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

Resolve Authorizing a Reclassification of Highways (H. P. 1780) (L. D. 1318)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Woodworth.

Mr. WOODWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I offer House Amendment "A" and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Woodworth, presents House Amendment "A" to Resolve Authorizing a Reclassification of Highways. The Clerk will read the amendment.

House Amendment "A" was read by the Clerk as follows:

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1780, L. D. 1318, Resolve, Authorizing a Reclassification of Highways.

Amend said Resolve by inserting after the word "cost" in the next to the last line thereof the words and figures 'not exceeding \$15,000.00'

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess.

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Robbins, I would like to oppose this amendment which is, if I understand it correctly, reducing the amount that is estimated will be needed to make the proper reclassification of our highways. I have absolute confidence in the Committee on Ways and Bridges and their estimates arrived at after consulting with the department and the department engineers. It may be too high or it may be slightly too low, I do not know but I am very happy to go along with their best estimate. I am fully convinced of the need for reclassification and I am also fur-

ther satisfied that their estimate is fully as good as any we might make here arbitrarily.

I move the indefinite postponement of the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, moves the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "A" presented by the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Woodworth.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Woodworth.

Mr. WOODWORTH: Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning, I had considerable trouble to try to find out how much this bill was going to cost. I finally found out it would cost \$15,000. I am not the least afraid that it will be too low. I offered the amendment in the hope that it might not become too high. I hope the motion of my neighbor, the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, will not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Addison, Mr. Lackee.

Mr. LACKEE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The estimate of this survey is \$30,000, of which the Federal Government pays half and that would mean \$15,000. If this amendment limits the expenditure to \$15,000, the State would be paying \$7,500 and the Federal Government \$7,500. I believe the estimate is conservative. I think that \$30,000 will take care of the survey but I do not think that we should jeopardize this survey for a few thousand dollars because if made and properly made it will save the Highway Department much more than that.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Woodworth.

Mr. WOODWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I want to be nice to everybody and I will ask again just how much is this going to cost?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Woodworth, requests information. Any member may answer if he chooses.

Mr. LACKEE: Mr. Speaker, I didn't understand the question.

The SPEAKER: Will the gentleman repeat his question?

Mr. WOODWORTH: Mr. Speaker, how much is this going to cost? Yesterday, we heard \$30,000, of which the State Highway Commission digs into its budget for \$15,000. Now I put a \$15,000 limit on it. You say that isn't right, what is right?

Mr. LACKEE: \$30,000 is correct, Mr. Speaker. Does the amendment limit the cost to \$15,000 for the total survey?

Mr. WOODWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman was mistaken. What my amendment does is to say that out of the State Highway Commission fund only \$15,000 will come; the balance, as I understand it, is going to be contributed by Uncle Sam.

Mr. LACKEE: No balance, Mr. Speaker. They pay fifty per cent of the cost.

Mr. WOODWORTH: Fifty per cent of \$30,000 is \$15,000.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, that House Amendment "A" to Resolve, Authorizing a Re-classification of Highways, H. P. 1780, L. D. 1318, be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. ROBBINS: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I was not in here when this first came up. My feeling about this amendment is simply this: I presented to the House, yesterday, the best estimate that the Highway Committee has been able to obtain. I think I said that it was only an estimate. If this amendment is adopted and if the survey should cost a few thousand dollars more, two or three thousand or even five thousand dollars more than the figure I gave, it would be impossible to complete it. It does not seem very sound to me to limit it exactly. Estimates are not always accurate. It could cost two or three thousand dollars less, and I hope it does. I hope this amendment is indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, that House Amendment "A" to Resolve, Authorizing a Re-

classification of Highways be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of the motion will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, House Amendment "A" was indefinitely postponed.

Thereupon the Resolve was given its second reading.

Mr. WOOD of Webster: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. WOOD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask that this lie on the table.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman from Webster, Mr. Wood, make that motion?

Mr. WOOD: Mr. Speaker, I make the motion that it lie on the table.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Webster, Mr. Wood, moves that Item 8, Resolve, Authorizing a Reclassification of Highways, H. P. 1780, L. D. 1318, lie on the table pending passage to be engrossed. All those in favor of the motion will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion to table did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Resolve was passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

Amended in Non-Concurrence

Bill "An Act relating to the Salary of the Mayor of the City of Lewiston" (S. P. 313) (L. D. 664)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, read the third time, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" in non-concurrence, and sent up for concurrence.

Amended Bills

Bill "An Act Providing for Construction of Roadside Picnic Areas" (H. P. 72) (L. D. 34)

Bill "An Act to Incorporate Town Finance Corporation" (H. P. 319) (L. D. 185)

Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Public Loan Corporation of Portland" (H. P. 742) (L. D. 428)

Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Public Loan Corporation of Bangor" (H. P. 743) (L. D. 429)

Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Public Loan Corporation of Lewiston" (H. P. 744) (L. D. 430)

Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Exchange Finance Corporation" (H. P. 1052) (L. D. 632)

Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Rumford Finance Co., Inc." (H. P. 1111) (L. D. 691)

Bill "An Act relating to Dealers in Livestock" (H. P. 1398) (L. D. 1011)

Bill "An Act relating to Salary of Justices of the Supreme Judicial and Superior Courts" (H. P. 1657) (L. D. 1229)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, read the third time, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

Passed to be Enacted Emergency Measure

An Act Imposing a Sales and Use Tax (H. P. 1695) (L. D. 1273)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a division was had.

Mr. CHASE of Cape Elizabeth: Mr. Speaker —

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CHASE: I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, has requested the yeas and nays vote. In order for the vote to be taken by the yeas and nays it requires the consent of one-fifth of the members present.

As many as are in favor of having the vote taken by the yeas and nays will kindly rise.

Obviously more than one-fifth of the members having arisen, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mrs. Fay.

Mrs. FAY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have no thought that what I have to say today will in any way affect the vote on the enactment of the sales tax but I do wish to take this opportunity to explain my position. I shall say publicly what I have been saying privately, knowing full well that the implications have been made that a

political career is ending before it is started.

I shall not be as oratorical as the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Delahanty, nor will I be as lengthy as the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar. I have not the wisdom of my good friend, the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, nor the dry humor of Mr. March or Mr. Dow.

I have no illusions as to my position in this minority, and I have fully disliked voting with the losing side on every issue involving spending and in opposition to my friends.

I have neither the perseverance nor the ability of our able Floor Leader, nor the assurance that ever is the rightful characteristic of the male of the specie.

We have been so long in accepting this committee report, and being told to keep it alive and to limit the discussion to the amendments before us, that few of us have had an opportunity to express ourselves on this measure of taxation issues.

I have been told in the last few weeks, since the sales tax has been before us, that I do not know or understand financial problems — and I fully appreciate the courtesy of our Speaker and our Floor Leader; that my position is critical and not constructive, that the voice of the majority having spoken, I must of necessity join it, that it takes courage to vote for taxes; but I say it takes stronger courage and convictions to vote against them, and I have seen many of you gentlemen rise when you looked and saw a majority. Is that courage? I have been told that this legislative process can be compared with a jury trial, and that we must of necessity be unanimous. I shall ever hope to be bound by the will and the expression of the majority, without force or obligation to join it.

Before having had any thoughts of running for office, my position has always been for less control from the administrative level. It has been my good fortune to serve in several organizations, such as the League of Women Voters and the P.T.A. Organization, the Business and Professional Women's Club, the Y.W.C.A. and Boards of

our charitable organizations, and to see the trend of policy being established at the National level and its natural growth. I think it is a dangerous trend.

As to finance, with full admission that these wiser men know and understand such matters, I should like to point out that two years ago we had a seven million dollar surplus, which has been absorbed in this ever-growing need for State expansion. At that time we had 4,233 people on our payroll in the State of Maine. We now have 4,799, which is an increase of 566 people. We had 6,998 people on our Public Assistance programs in 1948, and at one time that was tripled, and we now have 14,041 people. At this time of increased employment we now have 353,000 people on our payrolls in the State of Maine in private enterprise and this number of people on Public Assistance should have declined, but it has steadily increased. They argue that unless we do these things that the Federal government will step in. I say the Federal government has stepped in. Every department in the State is controlled by Washington, and I am completely convinced that Washington aids and abets this progress.

At the 94th Legislature a majority were of the opinion that there was no need for additional money, and this defeated the aims of departments that wished to expand. So we were called back in Special Session to use up and spend what was left, so that the cupboard could be bare. A citizens' committee was created to promote the cause of more government by using every promotion and publicity medium to prove a need to the people. There has yet to be appointed a citizens' committee which decides that we need less service, rather than more, be it smoke control, highways, health or welfare, and I would like to know, and I have yet to find out, whether the subdivision on the "Cost of Government" ever did have a meeting.

The Governor has at one time opposed a sales tax, but he has changed his mind. He did have a second alternative in his budget message, which was to repeal the laws which called for more money

than we have. This suggestion has never had a chance to live nor has it seen the light of day. Ever granting my lack of knowledge of financial problems, may I point out that my understanding of a budget is a method of estimating the funds coming in and allocating such funds on hand, not an expression of the hope of future expanded income. I will admit a lack of understanding of the theory that private spending is inflationary, but not government spending, that because of emergencies the people must be thrifty, industrious, overtaxed, but not government, that cost is an essential factor in all enterprise, but not in government operation. These are some of the issues which I shall never understand.

We have heard a great deal about the fact that services have not expanded, that costs have increased. Is an accelerated spending of \$15,000,000 over the last three years added cost or expansion? And Mr. Harris of the Budget Bureau prepared these figures which show the items I added up, which total \$15,000,000 in the last three sessions. At that rate a sales tax will have to double every two years. Most department heads, very humbly and righteously, express a "Mr. Meekish" attitude of only desiring to administer the laws that the Legislature has passed in its wisdom, with full contempt when saying that last sentence. At all other times their attitude is usually that of the domineering captain of industry of a few generations ago, when, in fact, the majority of the legislation passed over the last ten years has been department-sponsored. We all know that this growing trend has made every occupant of the "Pentagon" more important than your elected officials. The tie-up of every State Department with Washington is ever-growing. And when they have succeeded with acquiring economic control, they shall eliminate your elected officials, first at the county level, and as has already been intimated in our own county. Cumberland County, and there is no telling where this trend will end.

Organizations have had no problem in finding speakers to fill their programs in the last two years. With the best public relations men

of the State Departments in this city of Augusta, cooperating to the fullest, using every monthly meeting of the Women's Clubs, the P.T.A., your Chambers of Commerce, and Service Clubs as well, as a medium to further the premise of a need for additional money. Meanwhile, your State officials are very busy attending State and National conferences and conventions at State expense, to acquire the latest in policy directives, be it safety, health or welfare.

As a result of this campaign, we now have a united front on needs. Industry, labor, merchants, teachers, housewives, no matter who, are convinced we have a need. I am not convinced of a need for expansion of services.

As to the responsibility, or the lack of it, which I have been accused of having, I am convinced that the impasse we have reached is not because of a lack of responsibility to vote additional money, but the lack of responsible representation in voting appropriations, at both this session and in the past, for expanding services that the people, the average citizen, does not demand nor want.

I have before me many booklets of various departments, and the University of Maine, which would prove that point. The gentleman from East Machias, Mr. Dennison, has also referred this morning to the Gashwiler Report, which they have no confidence in. We have "The Snowshoe Hare, Its Life, History and Propagation," "Roadside Stands in Maine," "Abundant Rough Quality Roughage," and that goes on forever. Persons with demands have always been the more vocal, and the natural desire to please has made the legislators forget the average man, who has been the backbone of our past economic growth, and the constructive and productive worker of today. This Legislature has been put in a position and has been told that we must not give that man a right to vote; he does not know what he wants; he wants more than he wants to pay for, and I say that is not true.

We help destroy our heritage with every added function of government. As an example that this need is not for added cost, we have had two bills this session calling for more

salary for employees. Now these bills have had a most difficult time. The Administration, after having asked for the study, has not given them its support. What the government wants is not to keep its workers or to help those that we now have, but to have more of them, unhappy and dissatisfied, all demanding more money and more need.

We have heard a great deal of politics, "Politicians," spoken as if it were a rascal or house thief, all a part of this campaign to say that our elected officials are dishonest or rascals, but not our administrative ones, when the most politically-conscious people have been those in government employ, either in Washington or Augusta, having no other business year-round than to further their cause, and usually belonging to neither party. I should like to see government consist of stronger emphasis on its judicial and legislative powers, and let us put the administrative powers in line with what they should be. Services might well be limited by going back to the heritage and the background of our forefathers and starting from scratch perhaps with postal service, and thereby increasing upwards to education, and fire and police protection, and let us do away with the unnecessary surveys.

The ability and honesty of these administrative officials I have no quarrel with. I believe they have served their State well, but I do believe that the services and training would be better used in private enterprise.

We have heard talk of selfishness, of special interest groups, when in fact we take from the most productive, unselfish, public-spirited citizens, to give the proceeds to the most grasping and most dangerously selfish group, whose destiny they believe is to control the lives of all.

Labor has learned that it is losing ground by cooperating with these government administrators rather than with business, and I think it is destroying itself.

We are told that we need a broader tax base. I quite agree with a broader tax base, but a broader base without additional revenue is not what is popular.

I have admired the able efforts of our Taxation Committee, and I have

often wished I could have been on their team. We have had the ablest men working hard toward creating and substantiating this need. I would be glad to vote for a sales tax which would broaden the tax base, take off the patches we have heard too many complaints about, and thereby bringing in the same revenue. At the time the Taxation Committee met they have said on this floor that they called in representatives of big industry and that industry did not ask for special privileges, but did they call in the smaller business man? Did they call in the man who is in the business of taking used products and selling them over again? Can he have a fair price for his commodity which he is selling, if it is going to be taxed, both in the furniture line and the automobile line. Was the man who is in the small business of selling luxury goods, which are already taxed with an excise tax, called in before he too was taxed an additional two per cent?

For these and for many other reasons I am opposed to voting for new revenue and I am not a merchant, I am not an industrialist, nor do I belong to any union. No one of my family is working for government or receiving direct aid. Personally, neither a sales tax nor an income tax would affect me, but this trend will affect us all. I have been hopeful over the last two years that this trend would be reversed because two years ago, Ladies and Gentlemen, there were ten men in the back of this room who agreed entirely with what I have said here today, but today they have changed, and it is with great personal sorrow that I see these wiser men, representatives of industry, who were our only salvation and our only hope, either in fear of compromise, fear that this trend is inevitable, as I have been told, or compromise to war contracts and the banks of the F.H.A. loans and R.F.C. loans. I have heard it said by individuals in this hall, who have noted and disliked this trend, jokingly say: "I would have no objections if I could be one of the Commissars. I say big business has been socialized. It is one of the Commissars, and I can tell you from personal experience that the lust of men for power is

directly in relation to their success, and that they have no qualms whether that power be tied in with Washington and government or with big business.

Money being control, my only solution, even though my able seat-mate may not consider it constructive, is to vote against more money to control your lives and mine. The same amount spent in the 93rd Legislature, if kept to essential needs, would be more than enough, and at that time we were spending \$51,000,000, and we are now hoping to spend \$63,000,000. Also the fact that this money that is being spent on the government level is being spent by your administrators and also at the University of Maine. The little blue book which they gave us did not list the employees at the University of Maine. I could not find anyone in the State House who could tell me how many were employed there.

A kind lady in the Educational Department volunteered to loan me her book which lists twenty-four names per page, I believe they have over five hundred on the faculty alone, and no one has any idea, here anyway, as to how many people are employed in other services there.

My total count of the number of people who are directly affected, either through your Aid Programs or direct employees of the State of Maine today, is 163,000. You multiply that number by four, which is the average family, and you can see why you have had this impression that we have a need. And I do not believe that it necessarily follows that there is a need for new money, and I do not believe that it necessarily follows in regard to these people who are employed by the State, by the same line of reasoning whether they be employed by official government, your municipal government or your Maine Publicity Bureau.

With my most humble apologies for taking of your time, Ladies and Gentlemen, may I urge you all to carefully guard against these pressure groups, not of private enterprise, not of merchants, but of Bureaus. To safeguard our lives from government by directives, which ends with mandatory sentences for minor infringements of

such directives. This new policy in government, which will gain in ratio to the amount we give it to spend, is considered much more efficient and expeditious, not as slow as the legislative process which has been our protection in the past. I believe that the best government is the least government.

It has been nice to know you all, my many friends, and though I may be the last voice saying "No" on this vote, it will be interesting to note who among you have been the reserve battalion, or who among you have not withstood the pressure of the last two weeks, or should I say "this morning."

With a sincere and honest desire to safeguard our economic and social and political heritage, I shall vote against this tax.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dam-ariscotta, Mr. Gay.

Mr. GAY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I arise without any fear of my political future, despite the fact that I have received a telegram from ten merchants of my district which says: "We, the undersigned, don't like your 'yes' vote on the sales tax. Means no vote for you the next election." I have got some strong words for those men, but I cannot use them on the floor of this House, but you members can guess what it is, because I am master of my destinies, and I am captain of my soul, and I don't care what they think.

I am a small, humble servant of the people of the State of Maine. I am a smaller and a much more humble independent grocer, conducting a business which has been one of the economic structures of this State for more than seventy years, and it wasn't built on opinions of the political minds of my district. I am standing on my feet here today, realizing that we have arrived at a very crucial moment in the life of this State. I know that beyond any reasonable question of doubt this sales tax measure which is going to pass this House this morning is going to be likened unto a shot of adrenalin to the heart-stricken people of the State of Maine for their future prosperity. As I have stated before,

I find inspirational guidance from poetry many times. I have in the past quoted poetry from hence I received inspiration. I shall again this morning read to you the verses from which I am this morning receiving the inspiration which is necessary to stand on my own two feet, attempting to do that which I, in my humble way, believe is for the betterment of the vast majority of the citizens of this State of Maine.

A few days ago, I came across this poem, or poetical inspiration. I would like to read it to you because I believe it will give you guidance at this very crucial time.

“Be **STRONG!**

We are not here to play, to dream,
to drift;

We have hard work to do and loads
to lift;

Shun not the struggle—face it; 'tis
God's gift.

Be strong!

Say not, “The days are evil. Who's
to blame?”

And fold the hands and acquiesce
—oh, shame!

Stand up, speak out, and bravely,
in God's name.

Be strong!

It matters not how deep entrenched
the wrong,

How hard the battle goes, the day
how long;

Faint not—fight on! Tomorrow
comes the song.”

Members, I sincerely trust that you will receive the inspirational value which I have received from these lines, and that you will not allow pressure groups to guide your thought and mind in your vote which you are going to cast very shortly. You are working as humble servants of this fair, lovely, gracious State of Maine, for a people who look up to you for guidance and your better judgment and I believe that they are at this moment praying for deliverance by your vote on this tax measure at this moment.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. MARCH.

Mr. **MARCH**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I can't orate but I would like to say just a few words and that is that I am not aware of any coercion or the

wielding of any party whip. My mind was made up when I came down here after reading the Tax Committee report. I came with an open mind and listening hasn't changed it. I think the sales tax far and away ahead of any form and that it will serve better the whole people of the State of Maine. I have always been a great admirer of the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Fay. I still admire her but I had hopes that she would see the errors of her ways.

I am reminded of a little story as to changing one's mind. An old lady, Mrs. Jones, came to Dr. Center. She wasn't feeling well. After asking a few questions, he said: “I have good news for you, Mrs. Jones.” She said: “No, doctor, I am Miss Jones.” The doctor said: “Oh, Miss Jones, I have bad news for you.” (Laughter)

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

Mr. **DUNHAM**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I know better than to argue with a lady and I have no intention of doing so. At the Special Session of the 94th Legislature, I made certain statements and I was taken to due for those statements. The Lewiston Sun wrote an editorial and they said the most forbidden statement made in the 94th Session of the Legislature was made by L. T. Dunham of Ellsworth and that statement was that I hope we would reach the bottom of the barrel and have guts enough — have guts enough, I don't like that word but I am going to say it—to put on a tax so that everybody would be bearing their responsibility towards the support of their State Government. And they told me that that was a forbidden statement. Forbidden by whom! I made it then and I will make it again. Now, wait a minute. What do they say now? Here is an editorial, Thursday, April 19, and I want to read it to you: “The proponents of a State sales tax at Augusta may be given some encouragement, and its opponents may be given some food for thought, in reading what the president of the American Bankers Association said before the Louisi-

ana Bankers Association the other day on taxation.

"Pres. Shelton was thinking of the national tax picture, but most of what he said can be applied to our own State problem, when he declared that the government must look to persons earning less than \$6,000 a year for new big tax revenue, on the scale sought by the Administration.

* * * * *

"It is perfectly obvious that if large amounts of taxes must be raised, it must come largely from this group, because that is where the income is."

Now, isn't that true of the State of Maine? That is exactly where the income is.

"The most wholesome thing for the welfare of the country would be for the citizens of modest means to learn through taxation what the costs of their government really are.

"Do not those observations apply equally to the nation, and the State of Maine as well? A State sales tax will tap the income class receiving the bulk of the State's total income. Its receipts, also, will go to pay for the services shared, in the main—education, institutional care, health and welfare—by the same people who are paying the tax."

Now, get this last statement, please.

"If these people are not to be taxed, or if they refuse to share the cost of State services, then the scope of the services must be reduced by the Legislature to fit State income. That is the only fair solution."

It isn't only the ladies who can change their minds. We all can do that. There is the question, there is the question right in a nutshell: Either we raise the money or we have the courage to cut the services. We have either got to do one of two things; I say let's raise the money.

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am not going to orate because that is something I am not able to do. I am not going to read any poetry and I am not going to read from the newspapers and I will say here

I have no quarrel with the gentlelady from Portland, Mrs. Fay, because I think she is sound. She has told you some truths and I will go along with her.

You all know where I stand on this sales tax bill but there is one little item in which I feel we are remiss. We have overlooked the work that our Appropriations Committee has done. We have just gone wild and if this bill should pass you will see that inflated balloon, everybody will be in the grab bag; it will be blown up as big as this State House, because I don't blame you, the money is there, go and get it. But there is just one thought, as I see it, the Supreme Court has ruled that we cannot tax the towns unorganized and not tax the towns. That is very true. As I remember, there was a ruling by the Supreme Court some time ago on a building authority here and the court ruled that we could not do indirectly anything that the Constitution forbade us to do directly. So, therefore, I doubt very much if you can find a way to pass it back to the incorporated towns and not to the unincorporated towns by any theory or practice.

But, there is one thought I would like to leave with you members. Many of us here realize that we have a business in this State, the summer business, which is amounting to upwards of \$150,000,000. Many of you sitting here derive your living from it, get a profit from it, and it is the livelihood of many of our citizens in the State of Maine. We have tried to get the amendment on three different times to save the hotel meals without avail. But, perhaps some of you know; I know some of you know—I didn't hear it myself but some of you told me that you heard it on "Stop the Music." We have a program on the air from coast to coast with a listening audience of fourteen million people, which is going to run from eight to fifteen weeks and I happen to be in a position that I can change that script any week and, ladies and gentlemen, I do hope that I will be able to wire "Stop the Music" for their next Sunday program and say: "Vacation in Maine; no sales tax in Maine." I thank you.

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

Mr. McGLAUFFIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wish to commend very highly the essay from my colleague in Portland, the gentlewoman, Mrs. Fay. She has given us something to think about. I find, however, that she has apparently no conception of the problem before us. I do not want to say anything disparaging of this lady. I think a great deal of her. She is a fine, capable woman but she does not grasp the situation here at all. The law requires us to do certain things, the law as it exists now. Perhaps those laws should be changed but you aren't going to get them changed by voting against any tax. The law requires us to meet certain obligations and it has become evident to nearly all of the House that in order to take care of what the law now requires, we have got to have new money with which to do it.

I first came to this Legislature in 1937. At that time, there was no money in the State to take care of the State's obligations. The towns had not received and could not receive their school money. People who had been granted Old Age Assistance were not receiving their pay. They were back several months and, at that time, the Legislature, of which I was a part, borrowed a million dollars, as I recall it, from the Highway Department to make it possible to take care of the needs at that moment, which was afterwards to be paid back. That possibility of borrowing from the Highway Department was killed when they passed that foolish constitutional amendment that made it impossible to use any money, no matter what the emergency, any money from gasoline taxes or registration except on highways.

Now, if we should get in a similar situation once again and these people from York County and other places where they are so set against the sales tax should find that their Old Age Assistance people were not getting their payments, as I saw in 1937, and they found that they were not getting the money to carry on their schools and they should then find that the State couldn't borrow money to meet that exigency—and

I took the trouble to inquire from two departments this morning to see under such circumstances what the State could do and they could not tell me where the State could get any money—there is a provision they can borrow against tax assessments, \$2,000,000 but it takes \$2,000,000 to run this State one month.

Now, I say in York County and elsewhere, if you find that situation arises, I believe some of you will determine there is something worse than a sales tax.

Something was said about the pressure of trying to get this sales tax through. All the pressure that I have been receiving from Dan to Bethsheba is just the other way. They have been telling me not to vote for a sales tax in no uncertain terms.

I am reminded of a situation when Andrew Johnson was being tried for impeachment. William Pitt Fessenden was the Senator from Maine. The pressure to remove Johnson from the Presidency at that time was tremendous. We, at this day, know nothing about what pressure was brought at that time and such able men as Neil Dow wrote to Fessenden urging him to impeach Johnson and this was Fessenden's reply: "I am surprised that you down in Portland who know very little about this matter are trying to tell me what to do in Washington when I have been following this thing through for months." And that is exactly the way I feel with all due respect to my constituents in Portland and I love Portland and its people but I am saying right now that I know better what the problem here in Augusta is today than the people back home who haven't studied it at all. You know my views. I am not particularly enamoured of the sales tax. I could vote for an income tax but as I stated on the Floor of this House a few days ago, you can't get an income tax through this House this term under any possible circumstances and the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar, and the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, might just as well get that through their heads because it is a pipe dream and nothing more.

We are coming now to the question of whether we shall have an emergency clause on this bill. It

is perfectly evident to me and it must be evident to you all that there are votes enough in this Legislature, both in the House and the Senate, to pass this sales tax. The only question now is shall we pass it with an emergency clause or shall we pass it without, because pass it is going to be.

I want to remind you before this final vote is taken that your vote may count tremendously today. President Johnson was saved by only one vote, William Pitt Fessenden voted against impeachment and that impeachment would have been a blot upon the history of this country as is recognized by all historians. Your vote, today, may save the expense of a special election. Your vote, today, may save the additional expense of another special session of the Legislature. Your vote, today, may save somebody from suffering because they can't get their Old Age Assistance.

It has been most remarkable to me what a lot of people are suddenly interested in the poor. Those poor merchants down in Portland; how they bleed for the poor! Look at the inconsistency here. I have got to point it out. My friend, the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar, a lovable man, a man whom I like to greet. He stands up here and fights for the old age people. He asks for money for the children at the hospitals and then when it is as plain as day that you can't get this income tax and that the only tax we can pass is the sales tax, whether it is good, bad or indifferent, he is going to vote against the sales tax so that not a dollar can be provided for the very things that he professes to stand for and I merely point out that that is totally inconsistent.

I heard the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Rollins, say yesterday that he didn't propose to go home until they had raised some money to take care of the needs; as I understood it. He doesn't think we need as much as I do but I am telling you as I said the other day when you vote against the sales tax in this House today you are just throwing your vote away.

I can't tell you how to vote but I am convinced of this fact: That the greatest reward that any of us will ever receive for the services we try

to perform is the consciousness in our own soul that we have done the best we could with what we had to do with. If it is true, as some of us believe, that the soul lives forever, then when you have performed that duty in spite of opposition, just look to Almighty God for guidance and for the welfare of the State of Maine, you have the satisfaction forever of having done your part when you were here at this Legislature.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vinalhaven, Mr. BARTON.

Mr. BARTON: Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to speak today on this sales tax measure but I find myself compelled to because of the convictions which are mine. The gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. March, spoke of the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Fay, hoping that she would see the error of her ways. In my opinion, here is one person who has seen the error of his ways in voting for the sales tax and every other vote which has been taken in this House. The gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Dunham, in his remarks, spoke of everyone paying their fair share of the tax burden. I cannot see where this sales tax measure would place upon each and every individual in this State any fair share of tax. The bill is loaded with exemptions which play favoritism to one group or another, some in varying degrees. The manufacturer has been given decided and tremendous exemptions. The farmer has been given concessions. The fishermen have been given one, thanks to your generosity, but which in no way, at least in very small part, relieves the burden placed upon him by this sales tax.

I do not know whether you are aware of it or not but in the lobster fishing industry, particularly, the lobster fisherman spends some fifty per cent of his income at the present time on expendable materials that are necessary for him to operate. Any additional expense which might be involved for these materials can not be passed on to his consumer. We have a situation in which we meet foreign competition and it controls price. If we, today, placed this sales tax upon him I feel that we are adding an-

other insurmountable burden in his fight for existence. Furthermore, in this bill we have been offered a sugar plum. It has been held out to us and now we find that it will be snatched away. I refer to the elimination of the State property tax. The bill, to my way of thinking as a layman not as a lawyer, said that if this bill becomes effective the property tax will be eliminated and then we find out instead of that we will still pay the property tax.

This bill in its present form will not raise \$10,000,000; this provision will raise some \$15,000,000. Furthermore, we, in this House and this Legislature have been on a spending spree. We have gotten the Appropriations Bill to a point where it is way out of reason. It is far beyond any figure which is reasonable and desirable. I feel we have come to the point where we have got to stop the waste of money in our State government and must run our State government the same way as an individual must run his individual affairs. I cannot vote for this sales tax. I feel that it is discriminatory; it is unfair; it is not an equal placing of burden of the tax responsibility.

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

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended this morning to trouble the House further with my views on this subject upon which I have already talked at length.

During this session a number of brickbats have been thrown in my direction and I have tried to endure patiently and with civility without bothering to reply to every attack which did not seem to me to be too important.

I suppose, at this point, I might cry a little but I am afraid that you would think it a bit out of character. I do resent the suggestion that any pressure has been applied by me in connection with this measure other than the pressure of my weak powers of logical persuasion. As far as I am concerned, this rests on the conscience of every member of this House.

We face these alternatives: Either you must pass a tax or you must cut from the Appropriations Bill three to four million dollars a year.

By committee action, accepted by the House and by many under protest, we did cut \$650,000 a year through the reference to the Committee on Ways and Means which was accepted by the House but to bring the matter into balance if no tax measure is passed, you have got to go to work to cut it five times as much approximately as you were able temporarily to cut the other day.

The other alternative is to pass some kind of a tax measure. I have been here now through three Legislatures, in each of which we have tried to create a tax measure which was fair and which could be passed. Of all the suggestions which have ever been made the measure which is now before you has received far more support than any other bill which we have devised. If you don't pass this bill now and you are not willing to cut that Appropriations Bill three million dollars a year or so, then you will have to stay here a week or two beyond the probable time of adjournment otherwise trying to create some other kind of a tax measure which will be more popular than the most popular one which three Legislatures have been able to create. The matter rests squarely on your own conscience. The decision is up to you; those are the alternatives.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Friendship, Mr. Winchenpaw.

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker, I feel as though I should say just a few words to substantiate my voting for the sales tax consistently and I would like to bring out one point that the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Fay, made, that all during the session when I have heard about these cuts that we ought to make, nobody came up with any constructive form of cutting. Nobody said let's roll back Old Age Assistance to \$40 a month. The only bill I saw concerning Old Age Assistance was one asking to boost it to \$75 a month and I am told now that the average grant on Old Age Assistance is about \$43 a month and the law says they should be paid \$50 a month. Then, on ADC, there was some talk of cutting ADC but that was going to cut out one whole branch; that wasn't going to

roll anybody back \$5 a month or \$3 a month, which would have made a substantial cut across the board. Nobody brought that out. Then the school census. Somebody could have put in a bill to take away the school census if they felt like it but nobody did that. Or, perhaps you remember the blast of oratory we got when the Senate began fooling around with the school census a little bit and we thought maybe we could absorb it in some other item but not even the Democrats wanted the school census done away with. Then this tuition and teaching positions and the old MacKinnon formula that calls for so much on each teaching position, no one has tried to roll those back. We just talked about cuts; just about cutting the budget.

Now, the Governor recommended that either we raise the money or change the laws and we have come to this position where nobody has tried to change very many laws except change them upward. So, I am just speaking in this manner to substantiate my support of the sales tax all along and I am not in the enviable position of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs.

I have been doing a little figuring here and I find that I represent about 5,355 people and I have received seven or eight cards saying, "Don't vote against the sales tax." Several cards have come to the Governor by mistake that I should have received so I am allowing that about 15 people have protested from my area against the sales tax and that figures out 3/10 of one per cent.

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

Mr. FINNEGAN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The confusion still goes on and is permitted to go on. We are called upon to pass an emergency tax bill the details of which have never been properly explained to the people in this House by the leadership of the House as to just exactly what we are talking about, on this unbalanced budget. I put in a lot of midnight oil myself to find out. I have had assistance from the Budget Director. When you come to the matter of deficits in the budget which the Governor

has alluded to, you are confronted with State appropriations, Federal grants, and they have to be disentangled, they have to be analyzed, and it is not a simple matter.

We have been here since the first of January and the leadership of this House has never once attempted to educate the people of this House as to what they are concerned with in passing this budget. The net result of my analysis, and that is what I am going to pass on to you, as I have done a little work on it myself, is that we are concerned with a deficit, as suggested by the Governor, of \$7,000,000. The budget is out of balance, by taking the budget recommendation of the Governor, in the first year of the biennium of the matter of Health and Welfare of \$1,787,000 the first year, \$2,084,000 the second year. Now this is increased spending by the State over and above 1949-50 and 1950-51.

The Educational Program contributing to this out-of-balance budget, is \$1,219,000 the first year, and \$1,421,000 the second year. That is over and above the budget under which we are now operating. Altogether, they total \$6,517,000 or a deficit budget of \$7,000,000 or more.

Now we have not had that information. We are entitled to have that information. If some of the discussion and all the talk that has gone on here had been devoted to enlightening the people of this House as to what this is about, we might be able to go home and explain to our constituents just what we voted for. But I will wager a good meal that there is a great percentage in this House who could not go back tomorrow, and if asked "What did you do with the money?", they couldn't tell you where it was; they couldn't give you an idea what it was all about.

Now one of the fantastic things about all this is that little item of two million six on the educational program covers the bill 551, which I have referred to two or three times in this House, and that has never been in this House. That has never been presented to the House. It has been in the Senate. We have allegedly gone through the process of debating the educational pro-

gram but we haven't had any taxes for it, there must be somebody besides me. Now the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, and I have all respect for him—I think him a very competent and intelligent leader—complains that he has tried, this is the third time, to get a major tax bill through. Well, now I was one of the veterans of the war of 1947. I contributed my share to defeating his ambition, but I would like to read to you the result of the failure to pass that major tax bill in the 93rd legislative session, and I am referring now to the Governor's budget message under date of January 12th, 1949.

"General Fund Surplus. As a result of savings and receipt of income greater than estimated revenues there is a balance of \$6,145,930 in unappropriated surplus. Accepted business principles dictate that this fund be appropriated only for non-recurring capital improvements. We must safeguard this fund against depletion.

"We should first set aside \$2,000,000 earmarked for working capital of the Treasury Department . . .," and that was done. Now the result was that in 1950, at the Special Session they proceeded to liquidate that surplus, but it certainly was not in line with the recommendation of the Governor in his Budget Message of January 12th, 1949, because about \$2,000,000 of that went into Health and Welfare, mostly A. D. C., and \$1,000,000 went into the educational program which was expanded to a pretty remarkable extent.

I would like to call your attention to what has happened to this education program, and I certainly would be the last one to deny any education to any group. I think I am as much concerned about the educational opportunities of our youth as the leader of our House or anybody else, but we should have some concern as to whether or not that is getting back to where it belongs, and there is some question about that. That \$1,000,000 was poured into the education financial stream, but our buildings, our normal schools and all the other things, as was brought before us in the Appropriations Committee were in a deplorable state. Apparently

no money has been put into that project. There may be some teachers who got some extra salary but I have not heard of them. The towns got the money and they did what they pleased with it and I hope some went to education. It undoubtedly did, but I don't think anybody here is able to tell me because they don't know.

Now we are considering, in the bill before us, the repeal of the property tax. Well, that is a tender subject with me. It always has been, because of the hokum that has been associated with it. Now I would like to just briefly give you a little mapping or a sketch of what happens to the State property tax in the county of Penobscot; that is the county I am concerned with. Taken in alphabetical order, the town of Alton paid \$682.07. It received in school subsidies \$4,416. The town of Bradford paid \$2,031. It received \$8,249. The town of Bradley paid \$2,356 and received \$3,680. Burlington paid \$1,262 and they received \$6,000. You can go through the whole list and get these fantastic figures.

That little bit of sophistry has been aimed at the rural areas, that they are going to be greatly benefited if we repeal the property tax. Now if you will just do yourselves the kindness to take advantage of the documents which are on your desks, one is from the School Department and states what the aid has been in 1950, and the other is your tax assessor who is giving you the information as to what the property tax consists of, I think you will get a real enlightenment and one that you should not overlook.

Now the general fund money, in 1941, was \$17,000,000. In 1950 we are receiving in the general fund \$32,000,000, which has practically doubled. We have on the road now a fleet of cars administering State affairs. The mileage last year was 10,257,000 miles, costing \$648,000. If you pass this sales tax, and administer it, it requires another fleet, just how many I don't know, and what it would cost no living man can tell.

Now what we are expected to do is to repeal the property tax and place the burden on the smaller income groups, the result of which

would be according to the most recent breakdown of individual incomes in the State—you have a copy in the file, I am not going into detail about it except to state that there are 344,000 people, and 331,000 of them are in the \$5,000 and less bracket, and they pay \$41,000,000 or fifty-eight percent of the whole individual tax in the State.

Now what we are requested or suggested to do in the interests of a broad tax is to place on the backs of these people the burden, the low-income groups, that is where they are, and they are not all workmen; there are some people living on modest incomes, fixed incomes, gentlewomen and gentlemen who have to struggle to make both ends meet.

Now in addition to the burden of the benefits which we are talking about, these people are already contributing in your liquor tax, \$6,566,000 that is coming into your general revenue fund. They are contributing \$5,141,000 in the cigarette tax. They are paying their fair share of property tax. Now they are disenfranchised here. We have at least 140, 150, or 160 businesses or enterprises represented by legislative agents, but there is nobody here, so far as I know, who is speaking for them, and if we abandon them, they are abandoned, that is all. I refuse to go along with a sales tax that will put on those little people, the small income groups in this State, anything resembling this monstrosity of a sales tax or an income tax or any other form of tax. Why? There exists another way of balancing this budget, and it does exist. We don't have to stay here and put on a major tax. A couple of mills on the property tax would almost balance our budget. A cent on cigarettes would give us a million dollars, five per cent of the retail liquor tax would bring it up so that we would be way over and above what we need.

Now there is something we need in this State besides a sales tax and that is a little financial responsibility by people who have some continuity in the financial structure of the State. We haven't got it now. The Governor comes in and stays four years and he leaves, and another man comes in and picks it

up. So if we would just take advantage of our opportunities to increase these little already existing taxing measures which are on the books which require no special fleet of investigators, which require no adjustments except a mere passing it on under existing channels, you will have your problems solved and you can solve them any time you decide to face the facts.

Now as to this property tax, which was frozen in 1932, I am just going to refer to you that in 1932 the Education Program in this State was one million six in school subsidies. At this moment it is about \$6,000,000. The Welfare State, as I said recently, was not even heard of. It is now amounting to about \$19,000,000 a year. Your snow removal and your road costs amounted to \$2,000,227. In other words, there are \$27,000,000 in additional services which the State is receiving, in which the towns and communities are relieved, and it seems to me a little bit on the narrow side to refuse to submit to a two mill tax—I mean in addition; that is all we would need and I don't know as we would need that. Now maybe it is no use in me talking about it, but I will go along with the gentlewoman from Portland (Mrs. Fay), and I certainly, under the circumstances, would vote "No" on the sales tax.

The SPEAKER: The Chair notes that the hour is one o'clock, and might I inquire how many more would like to debate this issue?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase.

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, there are two important executive committee sessions called for this afternoon which ought to have some time, therefore I move that the House recess until 3:30 P. M.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, moves that the House now recess until 3:30 P.M. this afternoon. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the House so recessed.

AFTERNOON SESSION 3:30 P. M.

Called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the enactment of Bill "An Act Imposing a

Sales and Use Tax" (H. P. 1695) (L. D. 1273)

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Delahanty.

Mr. DELAHANTY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I had hoped that I would have this opportunity this morning during the flood and heat of oratory, because I would have liked to have kept up the tempo of the day. However, I will speak but briefly, for what I have to say in part has already been established as a matter of record. It is not my purpose to reiterate that which I feel I must say and that part which I must play with respect to this particular measure. I would be remiss in my duty, however, as the leader of the minority party in this House if I were not to take a deliberate and positive stand at this time as we approach the moment of final enactment of this measure, and I will take as a theme the words of the gentleman from Damariscotta, Mr. Gay, when he said that we here today should be "the Captain of our ship and the Master of our soul."

The eloquence of the lady from Portland, Mrs. Fay, her sincerity of purpose, the manner in which she reviewed the past, appraised the present and anticipated the future, leaves but little doubt in the mind of the thinking person that this sales tax is not the revenue-producing measure with which we should saddle the people of this State.

I was of a mind, when this measure first came into the House, to meet it head-on. I attempted to do just that when I voted against several amendments to the measure. It was said that this was the best tax possible. It was the best tax possible when it was initially taken before us. What is it now? It is loaded with other exemptions. The roses have been strewn in the path of those who would oppose it if those exemptions were not in it. It then now is not the best tax that we can pass.

I would like, just for a moment, to say that two years ago, on April 15, 1949, our distinguished Governor said of such a tax as that with which we are here concerned: "The general sales tax to me is

neither fair nor equitable. I cannot subscribe to a tax which would require unemployed workers to contribute from their benefit checks, a tax which would take away from the aged, the blind, the dependent children, general relief recipients or mothers who depend on state or local communities for their subsistence. Is it fair to give with one hand and take away with another? The answer to that is 'No.'"

Comment has been made that those who would sponsor any other revenue measures were here to increase appropriations. If you recollect the immediate past, you will know that my distinguished colleague from Lewiston presented many amendments to the appropriation bill as it was headed for passage. Those amendments would have dropped the appropriations considerably. It was my candid opinion and my advice to him, and it was with my permission and the permission of my party that those amendments which he produced here on the Floor of the House were given consideration.

I am pleased to say that in response to the responsibility that was placed on the majority party the other day for this tax measure, that my party has said to me that we do not want this awful responsibility of a sales tax, but we will take the impact of any other revenue measure that is consistent with fairness and equality.

My party has authorized me to say that it opposes the sales tax; it opposes it because in its party platform before the convention of hundreds of people it demonstrated its opposition to this measure and that opposition was approved. We have here, the members of the Democratic Party, in mind the people whom we all have to legislate for. This is not the tax that will assist them, because, as your Governor has said, it will take away with one hand what it has given them with another.

There is a question here involving the real estate tax. It is said that that tax has to be levied with equality. It does not have to be distributed on a basis of equality. What assurance then, members, have you who support this tax that your property tax will be returned to you equally?

Ladies and gentlemen: in all sincerity, I say that this is our finest hour, the finest hour we have in which to demonstrate a moral courage, a courage that will demonstrate to the people, to the wage-earner and that man who has to struggle for his family, that we do not want to impress upon him the burden that should be assumed by those who have the ability to pay. You will be the master of your soul if you continue in courage of the conviction that you have shown here previously. I want to vote against this tax because it will give me peace of mind with the knowledge that I am not burdening the people of this State who are not able to pay.

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

Mr. **McGLAUFFLIN**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Governor Payne has been repeatedly quoted as having favored an income tax two years ago and now as favoring a sales tax. I want to say in defense of Governor Payne that a big man changes his mind when he finds he is wrong, and Governor Payne found he was wrong and changed his mind. A little man never changes.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar.

Mr. **BUBAR**: Mr. Speaker, I think any man will change his mind if it is open to evidence. It is always evidence that produces belief, and anyone who is capable of weighing evidence, when that evidence is presented, they will believe. And I have never seen anything since 1912, I have never found any evidence since 1912, when the first sales tax was thought of and talked over in this House, I have never found any evidence yet to convince me that it was a right and a fair and a just tax. And I think, members, so far as I am able, I can weigh evidence.

Now I wish I didn't have to say anything that would hurt anyone's feelings this afternoon. I know that a word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in pitchers of silver, and I know that a soft answer turns away wrath; but you know that the best we can do when we are on fire inside, the volcano is liable to

burst, and we will say things that we wish we didn't have to say.

But here is one thing I want to make plain. I do not want to talk any more about this, you ought to know my position, but when other people say my position has changed I want to make it plain this afternoon. I want to say one thing, and that is that from here on I do not believe I will ever be against women voters or women lawmakers after the lady from Portland spoke this morning. She gave such a wonderful argument. Her logic was clean and clear and convincing, and when she took her stand against the sales tax, as she did, I admired her. But I understood why she is taking the chance. I have met her time and again in the corridor in the last few days. I have met her on the street, and always she had two boy friends with her, one on each arm, escorting her around. And they were wonderful boys. They were her boys, beautiful boys. I could not help but stop on different occasions to look at them and admire them. And I could see this morning that that mother was voting for her boys and for their future, that she might give to her boys the right to live in a country where majority rules and where a little minority cannot rule like they do in Russia. That is what makes dictatorship, a minority rule. She was strong enough to say, "My boys are going to live in a country where the brass hats will not rule the vast majority."

Now I heard out in the corridor here five different people who told me this morning—they said, "I am glad you are going to change your vote on the sales tax." Well, I don't know how it came about. I asked them who told them but they wouldn't say. They said, "Well, we heard it."

Well, I have been against it since 1912 when that thing was born in this House and it has been creeping around here ever since. That is in the days when the old Bull Moose came out and I was a Bull Mooser. I am not ashamed of it. I was State committeeman from Washington County. I suppose that is where I got all of the few brains I have got, eating fish down there. That is why the fellows from

Washington County are so bright; they eat fish with a little blueberry packing.

Well, I made one hundred and ten speeches in that campaign under old Teddy Roosevelt, and the Republican Party was split stem to gudgeon, right in two, and a Democrat became governor—Governor Plaisted.

All right. We came down here and the Republicans were sick. I have always been a Republican, I was born a Republican, always voted Republican until I took on the Bull Moose. I have been shot at a good many times since that, members. Sometimes the hair flew and sometimes it got under the skin, but I have still got my horns, and I hope I keep them. (Laughter)

Well, we came down here and we had several conferences, and the Republicans said, "Now what are we going to do? We have got to do something to win back these Progressives; if we don't we are done. Now what can we do?" Well, someone suggested that we advocate some progressive measure, and one fellow said, "Let's advocate a sales tax and abolish the property tax," and another fellow said, "No, let's advocate an income tax and abolish the property tax." And they discussed it here and there. I was called in on the conference, if you please. I know what I am talking about. And finally they decided on a sales tax. Oh, it was the same old thing, only it was changed a little. It changes every year, but it is still the same old thing.

Well, Ira G. Hersey was the big shot then in the Republican Party. They knew his next move was for Congress. So they selected Ira G. Hersey to sponsor this tax and put it in, the sales tax, just a little different from this. Well, he agreed to do it. I don't know as he agreed, but he said he thought he would. And the Governor out in the other end, Governor Plaisted, the Democratic Governor, he got hold of it, and he served notice. He says, "That tax is an unfair and an unjust tax and it falls heavily upon the underpaid, the small-salaried man, and if they pass that tax I will veto it." Well, I will tell you the hair flew. It went on and they

didn't pass it. But he did say this, "If they want an income tax I will support it." Well, it went on and the tax didn't come in. Bye and bye Ira G. Hersey in a little caucus made this statement. He said, "Gentlemen, I cannot put my name to that tax. I cannot do it. It will fall too heavily on the poor man, and I just can't do it." And Ira G. Hersey didn't put it in. And I have been against that iniquitous thing from that day to this, because I know what it will do for the poor man and I know that three-quarters of the people in this State are against it and a small minority want to put it over. And then they say I changed my position and am going to vote for that sales tax! But I asked the last fellow—I said, "What do you think? Do you think you can be like old Joshua and turn the sun back on its dial? You might as well think of me turning back and changing my vote as to think that the sun can turn back. I know too much about it." Now that is clear. I haven't changed my vote.

Now we talk about throwing our vote away. I don't know as I ought to speak of this, but it was said here. I know you members don't believe it, because you have got more sense than I have, most of you. It was stated here on the floor of this House this morning that a man that votes for this sales tax is going to throw his vote away. You heard it. Such nonsense! If he wasn't a young man I would say he had gone nuts.

Members, you can't throw your vote away when you are right, you can't lose your vote when you are in the right. When you are voting for a just cause you cannot lose your vote and you cannot throw it away. You may be voted down, but if you are right you are not beaten, you are not licked, you will not throw your vote away. You may laugh at truth; you may ridicule it, you may kick it out through the windows here today, but, members, it will be rapping at your door in the morning. You can't get away from it. It will go to bed with you at night and sit on the foot of your bed all night and be there when you open your eyes in the morning. If you vote for principle and right and truth you are not going to lose.

I have been voted down a good many times, but, so far as I know, I have never been whipped. I have got to be whipped in my heart there first, members. I believe I am right.

Now another gentleman here—and I have a lot of respect for him too, he said — well, I won't quote what he said, but he talked about somebody crying here. I suppose he meant me. At least the fellows have been jabbing me about it as though he did mean me. Well, I may have dropped a few tears, but members, I am not ashamed of them. They are honest. When you go to your box out here and pull the mail out, every time you will get letters from old men and old women with a sob in every one of them, the sick and the needy. I tell you it would make an angel weep. I am not ashamed of it, not a bit. Maybe if the gentleman had a little more sympathy he would shed a few tears himself: he would not try to vote this thing over onto the people of the State of Maine. Anyway, I had rather cry a little here and be right and just than to cry for the rocks and the mountains to fall on me and hide my face from the just one and the holy one and the righteous one who is going to sit upon the throne some day and we are going to face him. That is my position anyway, members, if you please.

Now let me tell you what is going to happen. As I told you this morning, I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet. I have been called a son of a gun a lot of times, but I am not a son of a prophet. I was informed yesterday on what I call high authority that if this sales tax is passed by a two-thirds majority when there is a three-fourths majority outside that don't want it among the voters — do you want to tell me that when they will bring in a petition of forty-three thousand names from one little section of this country, do you mean to tell me that that doesn't mean anything? You had better sit up and take notice, members. They have said, "If they put on an emergency clause and deny the people of the State of Maine the right to pass on this tax, we are all set to organize every town and do it in a hurry, every town and

city in this State and we are going to do what they did in New Jersey, we are going to demand that a special session be called and that tax repealed." That is what he told me and I believe it. Members, there is going to be the roll call, and the town is going to know how we voted when that time comes.

Now we do not want that to happen, but, members, it is going to happen. I am just telling you. You do not have to believe that I am right, but that is what is going to happen. You had better take care.

Now just one thing more. There are so many things, but I will not take the time to say them. A gentleman over here went on and quoted a lot of poetry. That is nice. I like to meet a man that is born a poet, and I admire him. Well, I just want to tell you what George Washington said, in the trying days of the Revolution, when it seemed that we had been sold out. Why, of course we had Benedict Arnold who sold us out, and the darkest days had come when it looked as though maybe we might be tied to the chariot wheels of England forever. This is what George Washington said. He rode up and down the line and he gave his orders, and he said: "Put no one but Americans on guard tonight."

Members, this is the time. We are in the darkest hour the world has ever known. Congress arrayed against Parliament; nation against nation, kings against kings, statesmen against statesmen, generals against generals. Confusion everywhere. This is a trying hour and it all came about because a minority began to rule a majority. That is what dictatorship is.

Let us take care this afternoon and let's guard our heritage which is majority rule, and let's give the people the right to vote on this measure by referendum. When you destroy that, members, you have destroyed the only thing that stands between us and dictatorship, and there is not any member in this House that wants a dictatorship. Be careful, members, how you vote today for your children and mine. Thank you.

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

Mr. **JALBERT**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am fully appreciative of the fact that many of you, including myself, want to see an end to this debate. I feel that this is certainly not a laughing matter, I feel that this is the most crucial moment of any member, regardless of years, who served before in this body.

I will make this statement now: that if this tax becomes a law either by special session or by the curtailment of services, if we are to uphold the law, a special session will have to be held, because as we stand now financially this tax will not yield the monies necessary. I shall prove my point with facts and figures, and I challenge any member of this House to debate them with me.

Financially, as we stand now, after lengthy deliberation, the appropriations bill, the book, as you well know, is now \$8,988,432.

Before I go into further figures, I would like to remind the gentleman who spoke this morning and made several remarks as to why an attempt was not made to lop this bill off—I would like to remind that gentleman that I stood here for ten days when to my sorrow my good friend, the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, did not enjoy any more than I did a case of laryngitis, with a stack of amendments an inch thick, and saw that gentleman vote against me on every one of them, and the full total of those amendments was some two million dollars. Pertaining to one specific amount, growing out of the school census, I don't think there is a member of the Appropriations Committee who will not bear me out when I say that I spent hours in here stating that was an antiquated law and I for one felt it should be stricken off the books.

I will further state that first the striking off of monies comes and then we take care of the loss. And I shall be happy to debate that point with the gentleman.

Going from the nearly nine millions of dollars, I might remind you that in transit we now have, to

complete the services for the remainder of this fiscal year, we now have legislation that is in committee or on the table, or even in the Governor's office for his signature, to the tune of \$539,337 for each year, a total of \$1,178,674 for the biennium. We have besides that special resolves for the ensuing biennium in transit in the House and Senate on the table to the amount of \$2,400,430 for the biennium. We have in the committee room some two million dollars for the biennium. That figure now becomes—assuming that you, in my opinion unconstitutionally, want to go out of the property tax field—a figure of five and a half million dollars each year, making it eleven million dollars. That total therefore becomes \$27,567,436 for the biennium. According to the figures, this tax would yield eleven million dollars. Exemptions to it have been added to the tune of one million dollars, bringing down the revenue from the tax to ten million dollars each year, twenty million dollars. Simple arithmetic shows me that if you subtract twenty million from twenty-seven million that leaves you seven million dollars, and you will still be seven million dollars in red ink. How else can you get that seven million dollars if you pass this tax but to come back here and lop off these exemptions? Because when people will stand for days upon end, begging, pleading that you chop off this overgrown appropriations bill and nothing is done about it, the only other answer is that you need more money, you have to come back, because in the words of the Governor, we cannot operate under deficit spending, and under this we would be operating under a three and a half million dollar deficit spending.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Casco, Mr. Hancock.

Mr. **HANCOCK**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Before I give my few comments on this tax situation I would like to explain that they are the result of my own considered opinion and do not necessarily reflect the thoughts of any group here in the House.

I am not, and never have been, particularly opposed to a sales tax.

I believe that any tax, sales, income or otherwise, can be written and administered so that it is just and equitable for all concerned. However, I am sorry to say that I cannot go along with this particular tax that we are now considering. I do not believe that it is either just or equitable.

Concerning this particular tax bill under consideration, Legislative Document Number 1273, entitled "An Act Imposing a Sales and Use Tax." Now I have no particular objection to a legislative number, and I think that the title is all right. I particularly like that word "imposing" in the title, but that is about as far as I can go along with that particular tax bill. The objections that I have to the tax are these: In the first place, the first one reflects back to my maiden speech in this House, when I said that the Appropriations Bill that we were then working on was fantastic, and I believed that it demanded more money than was necessary for the expenditures of proper State government. I think that this tax measure will bring in the money for that fantastic budget, but it is still absurd because it is more money than we need, and even if we should cut our budget a little later, when it gets back to us, if we have the money in the form of the tax, somewhere along the line it is going to be spent and spent for such purposes as we here will have no control over.

The second objection that I have to the tax is this: It favors the big business over the small business man, the farmer and the laborer. I do not believe it would be possible to devise any tax that will be so favorable to industry as this particular tax is. Now in a small way I am an industrialist, but I still hold to that opinion.

Big business had its hand in helping to write this tax. Certainly through the effects of our lobbyists, and it is a good lobby here, it had its hand in amending the tax. We voted down amendments here in the House that favored big business. They were introduced and approved in the other body, and when they came back here, there was hardly a word said against them, and they are now incorpo-

rated in the tax bill. Big business has had its way.

Now this matter of a property tax: I could not quite make up my mind as to whether it is right or not, that the State eliminate the property tax from its books, but now we are confronted with a little different situation. It doesn't seem that any of us know whether we are going to be able to eliminate the tax or not. It has been said here that one way to get around the decision handed down to us would be that the State would collect the property tax from the different towns and then pay back to those same towns the same amount in the forms of aid to education or any other legal method of transferring the funds back to the towns.

Now members, I say to you: can you think of any more heavy sword hanging over the head of any legislator when he is down here than that situation? If you come down here and stand opposed to some measure which the authorities, the powers that be, favor, they can merely come to you and say: "Look, young Hancock, Casco should get back its \$4,000 each year, but unless you can see eye to eye with us on this measure, it would be a little doubtful whether it gets the full amount or not."

Now I don't believe that anyone now in authority in the Legislature and in the administration would do that, but we have absolutely no guarantee that it would not be done at some future time.

The third objection that I have to the tax is this: That it will cost the average man a lot more than has been stated here on the floor of the House. Just a short time ago—a couple of weeks ago, I believe it was—it was said that the tax would cost \$5.56 for the man who earned a thousand dollars in a year's time, and then they gave us the scale for each salary bracket up to and including \$5,000. Now at the time I heard those figures and talked them over, I was very much tempted to lean toward the sales tax bill, but after further consideration I came to the conclusion that these figures would not hold up, that it would, in effect, cost the average man a lot more money. These figures are based entirely on

his salary, and if you consider salary only, they might possibly hold up substantially the same as has been given to us.

But there are other things, apparently, that need to be taken into consideration. If you read your tax bill carefully, you will find that this situation which I am about to describe would hold true: I am going to use a description of a man trading for a car, but it holds true for many other deals of a similar nature. Now for example: The \$3,000 bracket—the figures given to us, the man earning \$3,000 a year, he will pay \$16.16 a year for a sales tax. All well and good. However, the man who earns \$3,000 and has to travel to his work has to have an automobile; it is a necessity of life, transportation. He will step out and buy an automobile. He probably has a car of his own now. I know in my own particular business, we have quite a group of boys and men working for us who earn around \$2,500 to \$3,000 a year. They have a car the value of which would be somewhere around \$500 to \$1,000. And you all know that a \$500 car today is not too much of an automobile, and I do know actually, in some instances, where some of these people who work for us, have traded cars at least three times in a year. All right. They take their automobile, trade it in for another second hand car that would cost \$500; forgetting the cash difference, the sales tax paid is \$10. To do that three times in a year, as some of these people that I know about have done this, the sales tax for that one item alone for that man is \$30, which is almost twice as much as what they say will be for everything for that man in that salary bracket. Now if one holds true, the other is false. You take your choice.

Now the same thing is true of a man possibly a little bit better off. He buys a \$2,000 car and pays cash for it and his sales tax is \$40. All right. He keeps the car three years and turns it in for another car valued at \$2,000; if he is allowed \$1,600 for his old car and pays a \$400 cash balance, he still pays a \$40 sales tax.

Now I have been assured by some of the proponents of this tax bill that the Tax Administrator has

said that he will operate the sales tax on the cash difference. If that is so, one of the main objections that I have is ruled out. However, I have also been informed by members of the tax committee that the way this tax bill now reads the situation that I have described is accurate and true. In other words, unless the tax bill is amended, we have no guarantee that this situation of trade-ins would not hold true. I used automobiles as an example. It would also hold true for every electrical appliance that you trade in; every time a farmer trades a cow, every time—and Maine is a State of dickerers—that you trade for anything.

Now I suppose as I stand here obstructing the passage of the sales tax, that I would be termed an "obstructionist." I don't think that holds true in its entirety. I cannot believe that it would be possible to call a man who holds an honest difference of opinion from yourself an obstructionist. He believes differently. He is sincere in his opinions. He is not trying to obstruct your measure; he merely thinks that you are wrong, and that is what I think about this tax bill.

Now I have been consistently here a member of the so-called "economy bloc." Is that "obstructionist?" I don't think so. I have tried to help keep State expenses down. I haven't succeeded, but anyway I tried to help along those lines.

Yesterday the so-called Burgess Income Tax was presented on the floor of the House. We couldn't even get enough support here to get that report accepted. We couldn't even get it accepted. We had no opportunities to amend it or to discuss the bill fully. Is that being an obstructionist? Who was the obstructionist that time? I don't think we were.

Therefore, Ladies and Gentlemen, and I am sorry that I have taken up more time than I meant to, I am against the sales tax. I believe that it is unfair and inequitable. I believe that it places the burden in the wrong place. I don't ask you people to vote as I do for the Good Lord knows that many of you hold a different opinion from my own, and it certainly

is an honest opinion. All I do ask is that you consider the matter, consider the consequences, and vote as you, yourselves, honestly feel best. Thank you.

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

Mr. ALBEE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have heard many pro and con arguments on this thing, a lot of statements made about the property tax. We can't get it returned, as the gentleman from Casco, Mr. Hancock, just said. I have gone over that subject and have talked with attorneys and there is a bill now in committee, that will be on the floor of the House for an assessment of a seven and one-quarter mill property tax. An amendment can be added to that bill and specify that the amount received from that respective city or town can be turned back at the rate of seven and a quarter mills and specified for schools or construction. They can receive every cent collected by the State.

Also the gentleman from Lewiston said that the sales tax would bring in \$10,000,000, and he made somewhat of a challenge. I would be very happy to accept his challenge for public debate anywhere he states regarding taxation, Federal, State or Town, and I will defy any man or woman in this room to tell me the exact amount that this sales tax would bring in. They have forgotten one thing. On this tax there is a "use" tax. I haven't heard it mentioned here by the opposition or by those in favor of this tax. No one knows exactly what that will bring in, and they are estimating \$10,000,000. We just don't know whether it will bring in \$10,000,000, \$11,000,000 or \$12,000,000; it is just a bare estimate.

Now I believe that we can get away from the debate on taxes and especially on the sales tax, and let's talk about one thing now, the dollar. No one talks about that. They are just getting some money in. We all know that pay-as-you-go is the proper way. There is no war that can be fought with future men, future weapons or future supplies, nor can a war for military defense be paid for with future money. Before it can be spent, the

money must be extracted from the American people by taking their savings, by taxing them, or both. The government may take our savings either by selling us savings bonds or by inflation. By selling savings bonds the Treasurer takes over now the savings of the thrifty. Later both bondholders and other Americans will be taxed to repay these bonds.

When the Government obtains funds by printing paper money, by selling bonds to commercial banks, or by selling negotiable bonds which can be used as collateral for bank loans, the invariable result is inflation and shrinkage in the value of the dollar. That is one thing I want to mention, the shrinkage of the dollar, which I will show. Such devices confiscate those personal or corporate savings which are in the form of cash, bank deposits, notes, bonds, life insurance policies or annuities. Inflation is therefore a forced capital levy. We do not need to refer to inflation's disastrous effects in Germany, France, Italy, Hungary, Japan and China. Consider what has already happened, here and to you, during and since World War II.

Our World War II deficits were largely met by the sale of Government bonds to commercial banks. The banks paid for the bonds by giving to the Government "deposits" created out of nothingness. The Government then used these "deposits" as money to meet its expenses. Although this method kept the tax burden lighter than it would have been otherwise, what did it do to your savings?

Between 1941 and 1946, largely because of Government borrowing, some fifty-eight billion of new demand bank deposits were created, thus doubling the supply of money and money substitutes. This increased supply of dollars cut the purchasing power of each dollar — and of your savings approximately in half. Suppose you had in 1941 \$1,000 in deposits; \$1,000 in bonds; \$1,000 in preferred stocks; \$3,000 equity in social security and other old age insurance, and \$8,000 in life insurance. That totaled \$14,000. But since 1941 the inflation caused by the Government's sale of bonds to the banks has cost you \$7,000 in terms of the 1941 dollars. In terms

of 1951 dollars, this cost would equal \$14,000. Do you then feel that you really benefited by the Government's reluctance during World War II to levy taxes enough to pay for its war costs?

Now, we are threatened with a repetition of what happened in World War II. If the Government again resorts to selling bonds to banks instead of levying taxes sufficient to balance its budget, inflation may bring even greater shrinkage to the dollar value of your savings. At one time or another, in most nations of the world, runaway inflation has almost completely wiped out the monetary unit. Faced with such a prospect, are you going to sit quietly and watch your accumulations of years gradually shrivel away? Or are you willing to pay your share of the cost as it arises? If so, insist upon a pay-as-you-go policy year in and year out, in peacetime and in war.

Now let us take up-to-date figures. Between January and November of 1950, according to Government figures, the average of wholesale prices rose 13 per cent. Retail food prices climbed 7 per cent, and stock prices moved up 18 per cent. These advances caused widespread belief that inflation is in full swing.

What is inflation? The Committee on Economic Accord, a group of some 150 leading economists, — and I do want to say that I have books here and letters from corners of the country which deny that the sales tax is regressive, which I can read to you — defines inflation as "A change in the volume of the circulating medium tending to reduce the value of the monetary unit." The "circulating medium" is the combined supply of pocketbook money and demand deposits in banks. Other things being equal, when circulating medium increases at a faster rate than does the physical volume of trade, inflation results, and the value of the dollar shrinks and prices go up.

Did inflation make prices go up in 1950? No. Circulating medium did not grow as fast as production. There was slightly less pocketbook money in circulation in December of 1950 than in December of 1949. During the same interval demand deposits increased only 7 per cent.

But, between December 1949 and October 1950, the physical volume of industrial output rose 23 per cent; and it is still climbing.

Why did prices rise? Rising prices are not caused solely by inflation. They can also be materially affected by the velocity with which money and money substitutes circulate. Between October 1949, and October 1950, the rate of the turn-over of the average demand-deposit dollar increased by about 13 per cent. This exceeded the average advance during the same twelve months in prices of material goods. So, the real cause of the recent price rise was not inflation, but the increased speed at which deposits moved in and out of the banks. Does this mean that we need not worry about inflation?

Because of war, wars are fearfully expensive. Neither here nor abroad have politicians ever dared, now get this, neither here nor abroad have politicians ever dared to levy taxes enough to balance wartime budgets or State budgets. They have voted enormous appropriations, but the problem of finding the money to pay the bills has been left largely to Treasury officials. They have either printed more money or borrowed from the banks. Both methods inflate the supply of circulating medium and reduce the value of the money unit. When carried to extremes, as in Germany and China, inflation brings collapse of the government responsible.

How does wartime inflation affect business and stockholders?

1. Bureaucratic attempts to keep down prices of manufactured products and goods at retail.
2. Rising wage rates and other expenses. These would eat into profits.
3. Penalizing of much needed efficiency by "renegotiation" of profits of firms having lucrative war orders and by price reduction imposed on the products of firms which had widened their profit margins by more efficient production methods.

4. Reduced sales volumes and reduced profits caused by Governmental interference with free markets.

5. A marked rise of the price level. This, despite bureaucratic efforts. This would tend to generate fictitious "excess profits" which would be heavily taxed.

6. Halving of the purchasing power of every dollar of dividends; and stockholders' dividends have no cost of living adjustment attached to them, which is very interesting.

7. Destruction of the working capital of corporations—an item which has increased from thirty-two billion, at the end of 1941, to seventy-five billion, at the close of 1950, largely by earnings plowed back by corporations during the nine years. This seventy-five billion of working capital, so far as it represents cash and dollar securities or receivables, will now buy little more of labor, materials, plant, and equipment than did the thirty-two billion dollars possessed at the end of 1941. In other words, inflation has largely wiped out the nine years' effort of corporations to build up working capital, so far as such increase was represented by cash in banks, dollar securities and receivables. A similar inflation in World War III would likewise wipe out corporate savings by cutting the dollars purchasing power again in half.

Perhaps this will answer some of the questions from the minority party, and just show where we are headed for. I am going to give you a good example of exactly what a \$2,000, \$3,000, or \$4,000 income means, because that is why I read first the inflation of the dollar so you will know what a dollar stood for.

And now to demonstrate it, during World War II when the inflated circulating mediums caused the price level to double despite all efforts that they chose to keep prices down. Since the successfully controlled articles were comparatively cheap and also scarce, the surplus consumer spending power was concentrated on uncontrolled items or on those on which black markets developed, and the rise in price level was just about as great as when prices were entirely unregulated. As inflation boosts income rates the normal increase in income tax rate by no means account for the real advance in rates caused by inflation.

To illustrate: Now let us consider the case of a man, wife and two children. Suppose inflation has doubled his income, then prices have also doubled, he can buy no more than formerly, but because his income tax is figured in normal dollars, his tax rate will rise as shown in the following table.

Now I wish to state about the normal dollar. I don't believe many have considered that here, but the dollars of the Federal government have been devaluated to fifty-nine cents, and when you pay your income tax, you do not pay on that dollar; the government still figures on the normal dollar. They do not say you are making \$4,000, and then reduce it down to a fifty-nine cent dollar; and you pay your taxes on a fifty-nine cent dollar, and the 1951 income tax is doubled.

Let me illustrate the effect of this income tax on typical families. If your present net income after deductions and detailed exemptions was \$2,000, then your net income after inflation would be \$4,000. On the present \$2,000 there is no tax, but with inflation your tax is \$320. These figures are from the Federal government index of 1951, of January. \$3,000 is inflated to \$6,000, and his tax would be \$720. That is taking into consideration a man, wife and two children. It goes on up to an income of \$128,000. This is very interesting: "Inflation stems mainly from business ignorance of debit finance. They fail to realize that, whether the money comes from taxes or from diluting the dollar, and thus stealing the savings of the thrifty. A war must be entirely paid for while it is being fought. Most legislators and administrators know that, and because of that inflation original estimates are over-run.

Now that is what has happened in the State of Maine: We have over-run our original estimates. But they forget that inflation lessens production and brings disaster to the thrifty. A balanced budget—history has no exception to this rule. When optimistic people and business over borrow from banks and thus increase demand deposits, intelligent credit limitations by the Federal Reserve Board can check such expansion. Also, long before the induced inflation becomes disas-

trous a turn in the business cycle usually occurs and overborrowing yields to underborrowing. Wiser legislatures avert inflation, because they fear that their constituents, resentful of higher taxes, will vote them out of office. Few of those whose savings are taken away by inflation know what happens to them. If they did and a majority of voters understood the disastrous effects of inflation, they would insist upon a balanced budget every year.

Pay-as-you-go taxation is the only method of state finances which leaves no unpleasant after effects. So the logical question is: What taxes shall we choose to bring in the needed cash?

It has been said here that industry is not paying their share. I am in sympathy with industry for one reason. In this ad that you all saw in the paper—I can pick it all apart word for word. It is misrepresentation; it is misleading, it clouds the issue. They do make one statement to which I want to call your attention: "No one is exempt except the wealthy man, many of whom spend a good part of their income outside of the State and have money to invest in stocks and bonds." I wonder what would happen to the good old State of Maine, or the country, if people did not invest in stocks or bonds? Every working man of the low income group in this country is a stockholder in some organization, and he should feel that part. Taxes upon upper-bracket individual incomes are already so high as to dry up sources of capital which formerly financed new enterprises. They have sadly weakened incentives to produce and work hard. Taxes on corporate incomes lay the heaviest burdens on the best run organizations. They penalize efficiency and reduce our potential. Worst of all are heavy taxes on so-called "Excess" profits. They encourage waste. In my opinion a low sales tax is the only answer.

I do want to go a little farther and perhaps answer a few questions. My good friend, the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar, on April the 19th, on a bill to license chiropractors in the State,

stood on the floor and pounded—I thought he was going to break his knuckles there—and stated that thirty-three states have passed this law, thirty-three states can't be wrong. Thirty-three states have the sales tax at the present time, and I am wondering if they are wrong.

I just want to close by saying, in answer to the gentleman from Casco, Mr. Hancock, that the figures given him by a member of the tax committee the day this bill was brought onto the floor constitute a misleading statement. I think this will answer his question. Let me analyze it. Assume that a family consisting of a man and wife and two children have an income of \$2,080 per year, which is \$40 a week. I am going to make a statement which I received from the labor men in this lobby, and I have received it from several others and from the retail association. At \$40 per week, which is \$2,080 per year, they have told me, the labor groups, the Retail Grocers' Association, that one-half of that money was spent for food. Well, that surely is a necessity which is exempted from this bill. Rent is exempted, which is another ten dollars, because I do not know where you can live much under forty dollars per month. That leaves a balance of \$500—or, we will put it on a weekly basis—that leaves a balance of ten dollars. Let's assume that that man in the bracket system is able to purchase—which they do: they run to the store and get this and get that, small articles which all come under twenty-five cents—let us assume that he spends two dollars and a half a week. That leaves a balance of \$7.50. A two per cent sales tax on that balance is fifteen cents.

Now is there any man or woman in this House within the range of my voice that knows of anyone in the State of Maine that has children in school that would not contribute fifteen cents a week to educate their children? I know in my own city it costs in the neighborhood of \$200 to educate one pupil. I know of families with four, five and six children. I am contributing towards educating those children

and I am very happy to do it. But I am sure that if they understood it themselves they would be only too glad to say, "I wish to be a part of educating my own children."

Now I will be very happy at any time to stand up here and answer any questions regarding taxation that you would like to know. I have all the figures from the federal government, state financing, town financing, city financing. I carry a complete file of them, and I would be very happy to answer your questions at any time. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Cole.

Mr. COLE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It seems to be in order for the members of the Appropriations Committee to give their version of the bill. My good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Finnegan, has given you his version. I would like to give you mine.

Over the past week end I have gotten together a brief set of facts pertaining to this Appropriations Bill and why I think we need a tax, which may be very helpful to you in bringing into focus the problem which we are facing here today and the basic reasons for it.

This Appropriations Bill provides the State monies to finance most of the operations of the State of Maine with the principal exceptions of those financed by the Highway Fund and the Special Revenue Funds. The money which this bill appropriates comes from six principal sources: (1) the State Property Tax, (2) Inheritance and Estate Taxes, (3) Cigarette and Tobacco Taxes, (4) Taxes on Public Utilities, (5) Taxes on Insurance Companies, and (6) Liquor and Beer.

For the past three years these sources have produced the greater part of the following: In 1948 \$24,300,000; in 1949, \$24,000,000 even; in 1950, \$24,200,000; and the estimate for the current year, which at the end of nine months appears to be reasonably accurate, is \$24,100,000. In other words, the revenues to support the appropriations about which we are concerned here

now, have remained at practically the same level for four consecutive years, whereas the cost of most everything, the money which we are dealing with must buy, has increased rapidly in the past four years as we all know from our own personal experiences.

The situation became so acute in the latter part of 1949 that the Special Session came in, in February, 1950, and financed the cost of the increasing prices and deficiencies, in appropriations by appropriating \$3,140,800 from Unappropriated Surplus to care for the two current fiscal years, ending last June and this coming June 30th. We now find ourselves in a position of either cutting back the services which heretofore have been provided by the General Fund money by the amount of this inflation, which now is roughly three million dollars a year, or admitting that increased revenues must be provided to maintain State Government only at approximately the level at which it is now and has been operating. The fundamental difficulty here, of course, is that our tax base is not responsive to the inflationary trend of our current price level. We seem to drink, smoke, chew, own taxable property, use the public utilities, buy insurance, and die with taxable estates in about the same way from year to year now as we did four or five years ago when prices were, on the average, much lower.

In view of the statements which we hear from time to time about the rapid growth of State government, I submit that the above provides food for thought. Please do not misunderstand me. I am not saying that the State has not increased its services in some directions. It doubtless has. On the other hand, it may have decreased in other directions. What I am saying is that the overall total of the tax dollars the State takes from you and me today buys no more than the tax dollars back in 1940. The expenditures have doubled but so have the prices. This does not seem too surprising when we consider our own personal experience, when we go to the grocer or clothing store, for example. Therefore, the \$32,750,053 which was spent for

the operation of the general fund in 1950 buys no more in the wholesale market today than the \$15,-526,173 would purchase in 1940. The increase in appropriations during the last ten years has just about kept pace with the decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar, or putting it the other way around, the price increases in the past ten years. You may well say to yourselves there must be something wrong here for we all know that the State of Maine is providing more services today than it did ten years ago. There were probably things which we are doing with the general fund money ten years ago which we are not doing today, but I was particularly interested to find out that in case of one of the larger items of expenditures in the general fund, the weekly pay rates of our State employees which run about thirty per cent of the total has increased only some eighty odd per cent as against price level increases of over one hundred per cent. So there is some gain here. The real gain, we find, is in our Health and Welfare Department. The State today is doing almost exactly the same thing that you said a moment ago had been done in the general fund, and that is the appropriation for that department in 1950 was only approximately double the amount which was provided in 1940. In other words, it provides for no more shoes, clothes, or board and care bills, for the cost of these items has approximately doubled. Here again, we all know that the expenditures of the Health and Welfare Department have increased substantially in the past ten years and a reference to a breakdown between state and federal money to the Department shows quite clearly that beyond the amounts necessary to cover the increase in the cost of shoes, stockings, board and care and so forth, and the money to pay for the other items which they provide has come from the Federal Government. It has increased substantially the amount of money it is making available to the Department. In short, practically all of the increases in the Public Assistance Programs in the last 10 years have come from the Federal Treasury.

These figures which I have quoted are subject to check in the official reports of the State of Maine, the Price Index figures may be found in the publications of the Department of Commerce and the Council of Economic Advisers. The breakdown between the federal and state money to the Health and Welfare Department is available in the official records of that Department.

Now, the expenditures for Public Assistance, which is Old Age Assistance, Aid to Dependent Children and Aid to the Blind, from the State's general relief account, which is the pauper account, accounts for about seventy per cent of the total State appropriation for the Department of Health and Welfare. The expenditures adjusted to the 1941 cost of living index of the State funds for public assistance, A. D. C., Aid to the Blind, increased \$361,000 from the fiscal year 1940 to the fiscal year 1950. It is interesting to note that the increased cost from Federal funds was four and one-half times that of the State fund increase.

Adjusted total expenditures for public assistance increased approximately \$2,000,000 from the fiscal year 1940 to the fiscal year 1950, \$361,000 from the State funds and \$1,650,000 from Federal funds. The second reason for the increase is our aging population. In the period from 1940 to 1950, there has been an increase of over 10,000 people, 65 years and over.

Now, I have heard a lot about the amount of money that is in the Treasury, as of today. At the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1951, you have \$300,000. Now, as I said before, in the special session, we allotted the State three and a half million of recurring money. Now, what happens if we don't get a tax? We will go back to 1949, without one cent of extended services. And that means 38 cents a meal for our State Hospitals. It means no increase for our State employees, which means also that a union will come in and disrupt our labor. It means also that Old Age Assistance will be cut back to 1949, which was \$39 per month. It would also mean that there would

be no repairs on any institutions in the State of Maine. It will also mean if we do not have a tax that we will cut back in ADC to the 1949 level. And also our pauper account.

Now, it seems to me very clear that there is need of new money and personally I think we have the tax to bring it, it is a fair tax and I hope that we will pass it, Thank you.

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

Mr. FENN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am sorry I can't stand here before you and deliver a witty, humorous speech to entertain you but I will be brief; that will save you something.

I just want to make my position clear. It has become perfectly apparent that this 95th Legislature intends to appropriate many millions of dollars more than the current revenue will produce. The Appropriations Committee report calls for something more than two million dollars per year, the House and Senate amendments brought it to the five million mark, the Ways and Means Committee brought it back to approximately four million and now, if the State gets out of the property tax field, this figure skyrockets back between about ten million dollars. We, therefore, cannot escape a major new tax in one form or another. I have consistently voted against the sales tax because I believe that this tax is more offensive to my constituents than any other available tax measure. Accordingly, yesterday, I voted to try to keep another tax measure alive. Nevertheless, so long as the majority have voted to appropriate more money than we have, I shall vote for any tax measure that can get by or be passed by both branches of this Legislature because I will not vote for deficit financing in the State of Maine. We have seen the disastrous results of deficit financing within our own Federal government.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eustis, Mr. Carville.

Mr. CARVILLE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I never have declared myself here or gone

on record as to where I stood on this tax matter. I was not in favor of this tax as it was written. It was not what I promised I would do to myself and others when I came down here. But I have consistently gone along with it. I am in favor of a sales tax. I think it is the fairest tax that we can impose and I am going to stay with it and I am going along with it and I hope that many others here will do the same. I feel that we have got to have this money. I have been bored with these figures we have been getting here and I think everybody else is. I don't think it is a question of figures. I don't believe there is a soul here who doesn't realize that we have to have this money. The question is: How to get it? Reiterating, going over these figures, I don't think it gets us anywhere. The minority party, I noticed as I imagine many of you did, the two leaders got up, I think they are trying to confuse us, one of them tells us that we are going to raise too much money on it; another one gets up, one of the leaders, and says we are not going to get enough, we will have to come back here for a special session. I certainly have discounted everything that they have said to me after hearing those two gentlemen.

I thank you and I hope we can put this over here today and go home.

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

Mr. DUNHAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I like the words of my friend, the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Fenn, and I compliment him on them.

I have been talking sales tax the last three or four years. I am getting a little bit tired of it. You have made us marked men by issuing us yellow number plates. I go down street and everybody stops me and says: "You are a member of the Legislature, aren't you?" "Yes." "Well, how about this tax business." And I have to stop and talk with them. The Speaker, who comes from the same place, he has an office, he can retreat to his office but I can't. I have to answer them. So I have to talk about the thing.

But the only thing they say to me is: "Why in the devil don't you settle this thing and go home?" They don't care particularly. They are interested of course, but they wonder why you and I don't get together and settle this thing. It has been said here that this is a good Legislature. It is. It is fair and broadminded. Just to put in a few words about what they do in other states, let me read you a little article that was in Collier's magazine this last week about other states and I quote: "State Legislatures have almost all adjourned and the members have gone home to do whatever it is they do for a living while not legislating. A sigh of relief has escaped constituencies and the consensus is that the damage was relatively slight. Here and there were sighs that Governors as well as Legislators are not always crystal clear in their determination to see that we, the people, do not suffer more than necessary. For example, Governor John Davis Lodge of Connecticut did his very best to wrench from the Legislature \$3,000 for a State Board which hasn't existed for quite a long time. And the California Legislature got itself into a steaming lather about several bills. There was one that decreed that a simple two-man fist fight would legally be a riot provided one of the participants got killed and had an insurance policy which didn't pay off should he be killed in a riot. And one legislator, George J. Hatfield, decided that all the foregoing was entirely too uncomplicated and he therefore introduced this measure." This is a gem. It says: "The failure of the Legislature to enact any bill or other measure shall not be considered as any indication whatsoever of any legislative intent whatsoever." And then they adjourned.

Now, folks, let's look at this thing realistically. Where does our money go that we pay taxes for in this State? 83 per cent of the money in our general fund goes for three things: It goes for education, it goes for Health and Welfare and it goes for institutions. Did I see any desire on the part of you people to cut down any of those things? Oh, a little here and there but not too much. All right, where does the

money come from? Where does the money come from? It comes from these sources: \$6,000,000 is raised from the sale of liquor. Does anybody want to raise the price of liquor when it is marked up sixty-one per cent? We get \$5,500,000 out of property. Do you want to raise the property tax? God forbid! No! We get \$5,000,000 out of the sale of tobacco. Do we want to put an extra tax on tobacco? Why, of course you don't. They are bearing their burden; they don't want to pay any more.

You are putting all the burden on those three sources that you should put on them. Therefore, what are you going to do? If you don't want to cut on one hand and if you don't want to raise those things on the other hand, then what are you going to do? You are going to have an extra tax. Now, what are those other taxes? There is an income tax on the one hand. Are you going to get any help paying an income tax? No! The Ides of March are going to face you. How about the property tax? Are we going to get any help paying a property tax? Of course, you're not. It is coming right out of your pocket and the only tax left that you will get some help in paying is the sales tax.

Now, my dear friend, the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Rollins, this morning, said he wanted to broadcast—he wanted to broadcast to the people out of the State that there wasn't a sales tax in Maine. I say to him, and I say to all of you people, I want to broadcast to them that there is a sales tax in Maine and I want them to help pay it. What a small price, what a small price to pay to enjoy what they enjoy in the State of Maine.

My friends, you cannot sell this State, and I repeat this, I have travelled over thirty-eight of them and there isn't a state in this country that has what we have to sell, not a state and we can't sell this State short and I am going to say to you that this is a small price, a small price, for out-of-state people, coming in here, to just pay a sales tax. I have known several instances where people go into our stores, they pay the price for the merchandise and they say, "What!

No sales tax." No sales tax. They are used to it, they are paying it in thirty-three other states, they are used to it, they want to pay it.

I am just going to make one last statement and I am all done talking about a sales tax. This is my last statement. I think we are unmitigated, unadulterated suckers that we don't tax the source of revenue from the people who come into the State of Maine. That's my last statement, ladies and gentlemen. I am not talking about a sales tax any more. That is my last statement. You are unmitigated, unadulterated suckers that you don't tax the source of revenue coming into the State of Maine.

Now, my friend, the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar, (Laughter) I can't match his oratory. He spoke about petitions. Why, bless his soul, I could get a petition with a thousand names on it to hang him to the dome of this State House! (Laughter) I could. Look, I went down to the grange the other night to speak in the Town of Whitefield. I went into a drug store to buy a cigar. The proprietor shoved this petition and he says: "Here, sign this." Sign this! Without even reading it. He says: "Here, sign this." I didn't say what I thought to him and I didn't sign it either. But that is the way petitions are gotten. Here, sign this! That's all there is to it. Why we could hang any one of you from the dome of this Capitol, as I said before, with a petition. Ladies and gentlemen, please, I beg of you, if I didn't want to destroy my dignity, I would get down on my knees and I would pray for you! (Laughter) Get together, for the Lord's sake, and let's pass a tax and get out of here!

I am going to tell you something, when twenty weeks are up, you are going to see a vacant chair right here,—two he says (Mr. Lessard)—(Laughter) I have listened as long as I want to listen to this stuff. Let's get together, all of us, and pass this tax, the people want us to do it, they want us to settle this thing and they don't want anything to do with it themselves back home. They want us to do it. I am going to do it myself and I want everyone of you to help me. Thank you. (Applause).

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

Mr. CENTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I know that I cannot say anything that has not been said before but I do wish to put my position on the record.

In the campaign last September, I was asked by several of my townspeople how I stood on the matter of taxation. In every case I replied that if elected I would make my decision after I had heard the evidence on the various proposed tax measures. I can truthfully say that I came here without any commitments and with an open mind. I studied the bills, I listened to the arguments and quite some time ago it became apparent to me that first, more money was needed if the essential services are to be carried on at any where near the present level and demand.

Secondly, that the only way to tax that had any way of passage was a sales tax in some form. The reason I believe that a sales tax is the only tax that has a chance of passage is because it is the only tax that has withstood the arguments of the opposition without being shot completely full of holes and, it emerged from the verbal battle with more followers than all tax bills combined. It has withstood the attacks of its opponents because it is a sound tax and equitably spreads the tax burden. That is, as equitably as any tax can and works hardship on practically no one.

We have heard many times that the sales tax works an undue hardship upon the lower income man and the man with the big family. I do not believe that this is true. The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Albee, a few moments ago, spoke of the man with the \$2000 income and four in the family. It is true that he got about \$40 a week and he mentioned that about half of that or a thousand dollars would be spent for food, which is exempt. He mentioned the fact that about twenty-five or thirty dollars would go for rent, another \$300. He did not mention the fact that a couple of hundred dollars more would go for wood, coal or oil used for his

domestic cooking and heating purposes. All in all, he is going to be back down, as he said, to somewhere around \$400 left that he can possibly spend for tax items under this bill, which would be a tax of two per cent or about \$8.00, and I thoroughly agree with him when he says that is not too much to expect for this man to pay this small amount for all the services he is getting from the State of Maine.

Now, the man with the big family. I have every respect for a large family but, as a matter of pure logic, members of this House, is it not a fact that the big families cost the State more money than small ones? It costs more for education, it costs more for protection, it costs more for welfare and, if the head of the house happens to be unfortunate to lose his life or become permanently disabled, then it certainly costs the State a lot more for Aid to Dependent Children.

Now, I firmly believe that in return for these services, protection and security, that this man should pay a little something to help his State supply these services when needed.

I said a while ago that this tax was as equitable as any tax could be. There is always a small percentage of people who get hurt under any tax. In fact, they get hurt by any piece of legislation but we should not pass bills for the small percentage; we should not pass legislation to suit a small section of the State, we should do what is best for the most.

When I think of the effort, the energy, the oratory which has been released in this building these last three months about this matter, and when I think of the small number of people who are really going to be hurt by this tax, I am reminded of Shakespeare's "Much ado about nothing".

I, personally, do not want to go back home and feel that I have had any part in obstructing progress in the State of Maine or standing in the way of providing the means by which the State can render the services which the people want and deserve and are willing to pay for.

I have made my decision, ladies and gentlemen, and that decision is for the sales tax.

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

Mr. HARDING: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Fortunately for you and unfortunately for myself, I haven't prepared a speech. I think I might remark facetiously that after listening to the gentleman in the back row tell how little money is going to be spent on tangible personal property, it might be foolish to pass a sales tax anyway; we are not going to get any sales tax. We are not going to have to spend any money on tangible personal property but I assume the purpose of this bill is to raise revenue; I say I assume that, it might be for other purposes from the provisions of it.

In standing up here I haven't any idea that I am going to change anybody's mind, but as I stand here I want to pay tribute to the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Fay, for her excellent exposition of the philosophy of government in which I firmly believe. I wish I might have said myself what she said this morning.

I say to you that I am not unalterably opposed to a sales tax but I am most horribly opposed to this bill, in the first place, because we have an Appropriations Bill which is bloated beyond all recognition and while I can't give you facts and figures of a financial nature I believe that I can recognize strategy when I see it and I must pay tribute to that strategy which gave us an Appropriations Bill and the amendments to it which have lifted it all out of proportion so that a demand for new taxes might appear reasonable. That Appropriations Bill has not gone beyond recall. We can get it back, puncture it, deplete it and have something that we can live with. I say we can; I don't know whether that is the pleasure of the House. I doubt it from what is going on here but it can be done.

The other reasons I have—and I won't give you all of them because it would take me three days probably to give you the whole of them—the objections that I have to this bill which is Legislative

Document 1273. One objection that I have to it is that it imposes a "Use Tax," as well as a "Sales Tax." That is imposed under Section 4 and I hope you have read it. I suppose the purpose of that Use Tax is to prevent people from going out of the State or sending out of the State to buy property and thus escape taxation. You will see by that Section 4 that every person who stores, uses or consumes tangible personal property is liable for the tax until he has paid the same. That is one of the provisions of the law and I will speak about that later.

Another reason is that your State Tax Assessor is given entirely too much authority under this bill. This is a typical bureaucratic set-up. If you will refer to Section 20, you will see that the assessor is given authority "to make and enforce rules and regulations consistent with this chapter as he may deem necessary." That is some more of these bureaucratic rules and regulations which have the force and effect of law. They call it an administrative law. I don't agree with that; I can't vote for it.

The next section, Section 21, gives him the right "to employ such assistants, . . . as may be necessary," and places no limitation on it. Carried to its ultimate degree, he could spend for assistants and enforcement of law all of the money that could be collected under it. I don't say that he would; I say that he could. I can't agree with that.

Section 22 gives him the right to examine all premises. It starts out: "The assessor, whenever he shall deem it expedient,"—I like that language, "whenever he shall deem it expedient"—"may make or cause to be made by any employee of the assessor . . . an examination or investigation of the place of business, the tangible personal property, and the books, records, papers, vouchers, accounts and documents of any retailer." Then, if you will skip down to the last line of this section, it says: "The provisions of this section shall also apply to any person who, the assessor has reason to believe, is liable to the payment of a tax under this chapter." That is, anybody who is subject to the pay-

ment of the Use Tax. That section purports to give the State Tax Assessor the right to come in and search your homes any time he may deem it expedient. I am not speaking to you about the constitutionality of the provision, but what does that provision say? I assume that it says what is printed right here that "at any time he deems it expedient he may cause an examination and investigation of the place of business, the tangible personal property," and those other things to be made.

Section 24 gives him the right to summon witnesses. I assume by that that he may summon witnesses to Augusta at any time he sees fit. There is nothing there to prevent that. You would have to leave your home or your place of business and come to Augusta upon his summoning you, and that summons may be given by registered mail without the protection that is afforded in other legal process, where it must be served personally. It provides that it may be served personally but it doesn't require it; it states that it may be served by mail.

I think that the things that I object to most are Sections 32 and 33. I object to those in connection with Section 4, which imposes a Use Tax. Section 32 and Section 33 make this a criminal statute. I do not believe, and nobody is going to convince me, that the matter of taxation is a criminal matter. I appreciate the fact that on the federal level we have those things; if you make a false statement you are subject to a \$10,000 fine and the Lord only knows how many years in prison. But I am not going to vote to inflict anything like that on the people of the State of Maine.

Section 32 applies primarily to retailers under the law. It is taken care of by another section which requires that the statements made to the State Tax Assessor shall be made under pain and penalty of perjury and then goes on here and provides a specific penalty for frauds and fraudulent returns.

Section 33 provides that "Any violation of any provision of this chapter for which a penalty is neither prescribed above nor pro-

vided by any other applicable statute, shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$20, nor more than \$50, or by imprisonment for not more than 11 months." The effect of that provision under Section 4, imposing a Use Tax, will make criminals out of perfectly honest, law-abiding citizens. Some farm wife who sits down and makes out a mail order refuses or neglects—say neglects, she probably won't know anything about the provisions of this law and it wouldn't be reasonable to expect her to—if she doesn't make a return to the State Tax Assessor, saying that she owes a Use Tax and pays the Use Tax, she is immediately a criminal and subject to imprisonment for eleven months in jail. I can't vote for that and I won't vote for it. If you people want to; go ahead. As I say, I can't and I won't.

Now, I don't know whether somebody is going to stand up and say: "Well, we don't mean these things; they won't be enforced." If they do and if that is the case, then you don't need the law anyway. If they are going to be enforced, then it is a bad law, it is bad legislation. I say to you that the test of any legislation is not what somebody says may be done under that law, what they say they intend to do under it, but what can be done under the provisions. If they can do something under the provisions of that law that should not be done, then it is not a good law.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar.

Mr. BUBAR: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: It is very evident that there is going to be a hanging bee and I wish my brother would set the date and send out a general invitation. The Sales Tax boys have been trying to hang me ever since 1912 and I am still a-going but I would like to go to my own hanging whenever he sets the date.

Now, I don't want to say anything more about this sales tax but it has developed here how we can settle this whole question. There has been a challenge thrown out here in this House.

Now, of course, that is fighting

talk and I never challenge anyone because I can't run as fast as I used to run. But there has been a challenge thrown out. Now, I am going to make this suggestion in all seriousness: That the gentleman from Lewiston accept the challenge of the gentleman from Portland to debate the Sales Tax versus the Income Tax and that the question shall read: "Resolved, that the Income Tax is more just, equitable and democratic than the Sales Tax," and that we have two judges from the House and one from the Senate and that it be held in this House next Tuesday night.

That is all I have to say. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Bath, Mrs. Moffatt.

Mrs. MOFFATT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: When I first came here in January, the Governor came before us and gave his budget address. Previous to becoming Governor, he had been, I believe, Director of Finance for a period of years. He had a picture of the financial position, the financial state of the State of Maine. The Appropriations Committee sat hour after hour and listened to people applying for appropriations. They gave us an Appropriations Bill. Apparently the two branches, feeling that they knew a little more in that short time blew the Budget Address and the Appropriations Bill sky-high.

That is not what the people in the State of Maine want. The people of the State of Maine have confidence in our Governor. I believe they have confidence in the Appropriations Bill and when we see fit to show that we have confidence in what they have brought out as somewhere fair in the financial picture, I am ready to stand by the position I took when I first came here on the very day of the Governor's Budget Address. I said then what I would do.

Now, you can swear at me or pray for me, and I probably need the latter, but I feel perfectly justified in standing by my previous decision. When you come down to one or the other of these pictures, I will go along with a tax, but I do

not feel that it is fair to the people in the State of Maine nor do I think that they want it because when they have called me over the weekend and asked me to justify my position, I have stated it and they have agreed with me that that is what they want. Not something imaginary or blown way up in the air.

There is one thing that will make me change my mind and that I am not stating at this time but I do hope you will settle down and give the people of the State of Maine something fair and something that they can really say is what they wanted. Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. March.

Mr. MARCH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am not winded good enough to talk as long as some of these other ladies and gentlemen but I have just a few words that I would like to say and that will be my last statement.

This tax bill is not exactly what I had in mind when I came down here. You have heard a lot of pros and cons since morning. They have spoken of the Appropriations Bill, that we should have more, that we should have less. That will, no doubt, come back and we can and maybe will make some slight changes. I feel that while this sales tax bill isn't exactly what I had in mind, we all have to concede a little bit, compromise a little bit, if we are ever going to accomplish anything.

When I came down here, I wasn't committed so far as my constituents were concerned except to do what I thought best when I had heard both sides of all of the arguments on all of the tax bills and that is exactly why I am not afraid to face my constituents. Maybe more of them don't want a sales tax than do but that doesn't matter. I would rather have friends than enemies but I am going to do what I think is right. I think the sales tax is right and if we find that the various flaws that have been pointed out in this sales tax make for inequity, we can amend them in the next regular session when we find out what needs to be amended.

I think it is about time that we did something about this tax.

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I will be very brief. This thing has been discussed plenty, I believe.

I do think that the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Harding, has given you some food for thought. I think you should consider his remarks. But, I would be remiss if I didn't get in on the hanging bee. I said quite a while ago that you were putting a rope around the people's necks. That is what you fellows are doing who are voting for this tax. Many have said that I had changed my mind. I am still voting against the tax. I have said it from the start and I want you all to know it.

My good friend, the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Dunham, said he would like to broadcast across this Nation that Maine has a sales tax! Well, my good friend, I will assure him that if that is the will of this House when this thing is over, I can give him that privilege. I would be very opposed to doing it but it could be done. As I said this morning, and I now reiterate, I hope that I can change the script on "Stop the Music," next Sunday night, I still hope I can, and say to 14,000,000 listeners: "Vacation in Maine; no Sales Tax in Maine."

But, my good friend, the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Albee, is the man that knows all the answers. It is nice to be highly educated and an orator. He said the trouble was the ignorance of the voters. Well, now, ladies and gentlemen of this House, I have stood here before in other sessions and I have said that I was just the uncouth, uneducated woodsman from the north. The gentleman says: "The ignorant voters." I am the ignorant voter, perhaps, but I am voting for what I think is the best for the most and I am voting against this tax.

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

Mr. ALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have opposed this sales tax from the very beginning. It is clear in my mind, today, that this is the only tax that

has a chance of passage. Yesterday, I voted for an income tax to keep it alive and to try to get something of a compromise. It is very obvious that all of us have to give a little and take a little now and then. Today, I am willing to face the issues squarely and I am willing to back up my stand. I am going to compromise.

I am going along with this Sales Tax. (Prolonged Applause)

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

Mr. ALBEE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would just like to answer the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Rollins, and I wish he would get a set of ear phones so he could understand, or perhaps he didn't read right. But if he will look up the records, I said the voters were ignorant of the facts of a tax. If he will look the record up, he will find that that is exactly what I said.

I do want to just correct one or two other things. I went out a few minutes ago, right after I had talked, and I called up a motor car company in Portland, Swearingen Motors. I wanted to do this in answer to my good friend from Casco. He is also a proprietor of a garage in Washington, D. C., where they have the tax. And I called him and asked him how they handled that tax there. He said: "It is very simple. If a man has a \$2500 automobile and he comes to me with an automobile to trade in for \$1500, if I allow him \$1500," he says, "I buy that car from him because he is not a registered retailer. Therefore, I sell him the new car for \$1,000 and he pays his tax on \$1,000." I hope that answers the question of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Hancock.

I do want to say again to my friend, the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar, here, that after I had deposited in the hopper the sales tax, he stopped me in the lobby and he said: "You know the other taxes are in. You know the only two good taxes in there are yours and mine." But today he sort of criticized that.

There is one other statement which was made the other day, it just came up here. It was made

in the Senate. I would just like to correct that Senator from York because if he had taken time to come in to the tax hearing, he could have heard it. Mr. Carroll of Bates College was here at a tax hearing, and I questioned him in rebuttal about the sales tax. He said it was a regressive tax, on which I disagreed with him. I asked the Professor of Economics at Bates if this was not a buyer's tax and he agreed that it was a buyer's tax and not a sales tax. I said: "Then it is evidently a progressive tax, a buyer's tax is progressive." He started to explain at length and I said that I would just like an answer. He said: "Well, I must agree that it is a progressive tax" and he said: "especially when it is in combination with a federal government income tax."

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

Mrs. FAY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I will not take much time either and I do hope that you members will not move the previous question on this issue.

We have been here the greater part of a winter and a spring and we have devoted as much time to porcupines as they would have us spend on the sales tax.

I am glad that we are now down to discussing the measure, L. D. 1273. This morning I was given the opportunity of expressing a philosophy. In 1273, we have a sales and use tax, adding a new section called 14-A. On page 13, we go back to Section 14 of Chapter 14 of the Revised Statutes and we take a quarter per cent off the railroads. Now, to refute some of the things that have been said here this afternoon.

The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Albee, said that this money would be returned to the cities and towns. The mechanics, I haven't been told whether it is to be done. But he says no one would object to paying fifteen cents per family to educate their children. That amount is based on the revenue they expect from this tax measure. We already have an estimated revenue for the current biennium of \$63,000,000. Part of that is going to the cost of schools.

Now, we have heard a great deal about representing people. I too have a conscience and I too hope to represent the people. I do not say that I represent them when I vote for something that has an emergency clause on it. But the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, has often mentioned that he represents 9,000 people. Granted that perhaps some of the people who vote for him may have voted for me, I led the ticket in the City of Portland and in last night's paper, on the front page, they had the poll of the average man on a bus, and four to one, they were against the sales tax.

Now, as to inflation and its reasons for added money at the government level. I believe that inflation is the best reason why the people paying those taxes can no more afford new taxes. For the same reason that the cost of government has increased, the cost of everything the average citizen buys has increased in the same proportion. We are told that thirty-three states have passed this tax. Have they solved their financial problems? They will not until they see the light that they can not fathom as long as they are sharing in federal aid programs. Whether they have a sales tax or any other kind of a tax, it is not going to solve their problem. We could increase this tax, as I said this morning, every two years by two per cent and we wouldn't keep up with the increase.

The gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Dunham, wants to pass a tax and go home. I don't want to pass the tax and I want to go home. The fact that people want to pass the tax is so as to be constructive. Ask the average man if he thinks that is constructive.

The gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. March, rightly says he represents his constituents and he was not bound to any commitments, nor was I.

The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Albert, says that he is willing for compromise sake to agree to a sales tax; he changed his mind this morning, as did the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Fenn.

Now, I say, when it comes to compromise, let's compromise this

expenditure of \$68,000,000 down to \$63,000,000, which is what we expect to have come in and that will be compromise that will be constructive. Thank you.

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

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Now that everybody wants to get the record straight, I want the record straight where I stand. I stand where I stood for the last two sessions of this Legislature: against the sales tax. If I ever come back here and it isn't passed, I will be against it again.

How much easier it would be for me to stand up here with a smile on my face like a lot of them have had today and say: "Yes, I will go along." But I am doing what my conscience dictates today and I believe my conscience is telling me to do what the people in my area want. I have received very few cards or anything pertaining to the sales tax because I think my people understand where I do stand on this measure.

The part that I am concerned with is just where is this thing going to stop? When we see what is going on, not only in our Federal government but in our other states, it makes us stop and wonder. In those states where we have got a Democrat majority today, what is our Republican party standing for? They are standing for sound government and trying to cut down on this expense that is mounting and mounting and mounting.

We talk about the devalued dollar. We are going to devalue it right here some more today. This giant octopus that is continually reaching out and reaching out and reaching out until it engulfs everything in this country.

I am surprised at the Republican Party of the State of Maine who have stood for years for sound government, today, going out and launching this State House on what is nothing more than a spending spree. We have continually criticized the Federal government for just such a thing as this and now we are following in their footsteps. My stand is against the sales tax,

today, and that is just the way I am going to vote.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Woodworth.

Mr. WOODWORTH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wish, at the outset of my remarks to express to the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Fay, my sincere admiration for her address of this morning. I do not think we have heard anything finer this year. It follows that I am not in agreement with the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin. He says she does not understand the problem. I think she understands the problem very well. I am also in disagreement with that gentleman when he says we are not going to pass any new laws by voting against this tax. I think the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, effectively answered that question when he said that if we do not pass this tax bill then it will be necessary to make some changes.

I am not in agreement with those who say that the small income group must be further taxed. I think it should be remembered that it is the consumer who pays the tax. These taxes are all passed along to the consumer and there are very many more in the small income group which follows that it is the small income group that now pays the bulk of the taxes. The fact is that they pay those taxes indirectly by increased rent and higher prices. The change made by the sales tax is that the sales tax is a direct tax on the consumer. That brings up the matter of inflation and it will be conceded, I think, that all taxes are inflationary. The reason they are inflationary is that they leave less of the consumer's dollar with which to buy other things after he has paid the tax.

This bill is as inflationary as any sales tax can be. Assuming that meat costs a dollar a pound, we put on a sales tax and the immediate effect is that the purchasing power of the dollar so far as the meat is concerned becomes 98 cents. So the man with the dollar only gets 98 cents worth of meat at a dollar a pound. The purchasing value of his dollar has gone down 2 cents. But, under this bill that

we have that tax is added to the cost of the meat so that the cost of the meat is now \$1.02. He therefore pays more than a two per cent tax because you are now getting 98 cents worth of meat at \$1.02 per pound where before you got 98 cents worth of meat at \$1.00 per pound.

I do not agree with the statement that has been made that a new tax makes the State more prosperous. I think Herbert Hoover once said that you can't tax yourself into prosperity, and I think most people will agree. I do not agree with those who say that the people sent us to the Legislature because they thought we were superior men; that we know more about what they want than they know themselves. I think we live in a country which has representative government, a Republic. We take pride in the fact that we have a government of the people, by the people and for the people. A man may say what he likes but he can leave the thoughts of his constituents out of his actions, but he does what he thinks best whether they like it or not. If you follow that principle you may have government for the people but government of the people and by the people has ceased.

I would particularly like to call attention to the recent decision of the State Supreme Court regarding the property tax. The Court has ruled that you cannot exempt municipal property and at the same time tax property in unincorporated places. It has been suggested that we can accomplish the result by refunding to the municipalities the amount of the tax. I do not believe that our Constitution will permit such a refund. I think our courts will hold that you cannot do indirectly what the Constitution forbids you to do directly.

I am aware that some people seem to think that we want this sales tax so badly that we will vote to exempt all property in the State from the State tax just to enable us to have a sales tax. The result of such action would be that we would exempt thousands of acres of wild land owned principally by large corporations from the payment of any tax. I understand that some of our legislative agents are in-

clined to that view, and have turned overnight into supporters of the sales tax. I do not believe that this or any other Legislature is going to exempt this corporate-owned property from any tax and I think that most of you would refuse to vote for any such proposition.

If my premises are sound, it follows that there is no likelihood that the property tax upon municipalities by the State will be exempted this year. Where does that leave us? It leaves us here. We are faced with the question of enacting a sales tax which is estimated by some, and perhaps not by others, to yield \$10,000,000. The purpose of enacting that bill is to defray expenditures of the State government which amounts to considerably less than half that amount. I can see no reason for anyone voting for a sales tax which will produce more than twice as much as the demonstrated needs of the State. I do not believe that this tax bill which we now have before us will be enacted by the Legislature. I do not believe that it will become law and I hope you will vote against it.

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

MR. FARLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have heard great talks here today, pro and con, with reference to the family. I think I can speak truthfully for the family when I can count ten. The gentleman from Standish (Mr. Center), I believe he is truthfully speaking when he says that at the time of birth he has been released, but the mother and father have not been released. You say that we have food exemptions. Children have to have something else.

One of my experiences was only here a year ago in June. Fortunately, I find myself today in a position that I have probably \$4.00. But from an accident to one of my sons whom I took to the professional doctors in the City of Biddeford, to the hospital, it cost me over \$700. Now, I ask you where can the ordinary man come along and pay the doctor six or seven hundred dollars for appendicitis or this or that? I noticed in the paper yesterday that we were called

the hatchetmen from York County. When the gentleman was spoken about, I imagine they meant us also. Well, that may be true. We probably come from the City of Biddeford, Saco and those places where there are very large families.

I would like to say this: I have been asked a great many times why I never went into the Republican party. I have been to a Republican Convention and the men just smiled when I said: "I have always been one who likes to be with the minority party because my vote and my conscience are clear." Two years ago I came here. I heard your Governor and my Governor, Frederick G. Payne, say that the budget was balanced. I have had experience with the gentleman—I am speaking now as a Democrat—in his first and in his second and I think I was of valuable service to him and I would never see him thrown down for anybody in his own party but it is only lately that his name has been mentioned only a very little.

I was one of those who followed the Governor in his budget; we were defeated. I was one of those who followed the Governor in his income tax and I was almost crucified in Biddeford because they didn't interpret it right that I was out on a raft, it was on a referendum, that I had to take it.

I came here this time willing to do anything I could do in the minority party to aid that Governor, your Governor and my Governor, so that he could have money enough to go along with. But we have got away completely from his budget; we have got away completely from the sales tax he advocated. His was with no exemptions and I stand that way and I am going to vote against the sales tax.

THE SPEAKER: The chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Letourneau.

MR. LETOURNEAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I know we have been on this matter overlong and I shall be very brief. I also realize that whatever I have to say shall not change any votes for my powers of persuasion are very limited.

I voted against the sales tax in 1946 at the special session when it

was tied with the bonus. I voted against it two years ago. I am going to vote against it this afternoon and I will continue to vote against it until someone can change my mind. I do not like this tax; I have never liked it for a lot of reasons. One of them is that it is very unfair. It has also been said here that this is the only thing that is left that has a chance of passage. I am beginning to realize that; everything else has been kicked overboard, there is nothing left to go on but that. However, I don't find too much fault with that; that may be good political strategy.

Now, I represent a town of 17,000 population, the largest town in the State of Maine. When I ran in September, I pronounced myself as being against a sales tax. I was elected against strong and very capable opposition, as a matter of fact, much more capable than I am. We were also fortunate in electing a senator from my own town, who—I have no authority to say this in his behalf—but I believe he is also strongly against the sales tax.

As the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Farley, said, I shall also perhaps be presented with an axe. Well and good. It was said a little while ago here that everybody should be willing to pay a sales tax. The large families, we have to help support them, educate them, and it costs us more money, which is true. I believe in large families. I think they are the bulwark of this Nation. After we have educated them and given them a little relief, in the last twenty-five years we have called upon them to give something that is much more precious than money, which is blood. And believe you me, members if we didn't have them, we probably wouldn't be able to discuss the sales tax here.

Now, I promised the people of Sanford that I would vote against the sales tax. They kept faith with me in electing me and I shall keep faith with them by voting against it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess.

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think my

position with respect to expenditures has been very clearly defined by me for some time. However, I do not pretend to be an authority upon finances of the State but because of several years of experience down here I do perhaps know something about the needs of the State and I am convinced, now, as I have been for the entire session that a new and added amount of revenue is necessary to continue the statutory requirements of the State of Maine.

I was the proponent of an income tax and if you wish to check the records for the two preceding sessions, you will find that my inclinations were the same then as now, that the income tax was the tax of my choice. I have done what I could to sell this group the idea that an income tax was a better tax to impose upon the public than a sales tax and I certainly failed.

Two years ago, I had the honor and the pleasure of serving this House as its floor leader. I do not even pretend that I was a good one but upon many occasions I found it necessary, thought it necessary, in the interest of harmony to take a position which I wilfully did. Today, I find myself in that same position, unofficially but as an individual. I would like to make this statement very clear to everyone within sound of my voice that if there is any thought that someone has reached me, let me allay that suspicion now because there is no living person that could reach me.

The conclusion which I have arrived at is one of my own. So, I am going to vote for your sales tax. I do not like it; I never have liked it for the reasons which I have stated but believing, as I do, that finances are necessary to continue the statutory requirements of the State and fill its known needs, I am going to support the tax and hope that the next Legislature will make the remedies which I believe should be made and I think you believe should be made.

I want to further state a position which I will take for the duration of this session of the Legislature. I will continue to do my best and use every bit of influence that I have in this House to reduce the amount of our ap-

propriations. I am firmly convinced they are too high. I shall continue to take that position and I hope that you will assist me in doing that as I am trying to assist you and the State of Maine this afternoon in providing the money that is needed for the next biennium. (Prolonged Applause)

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Falmouth, Mr. Dow.

Mr. DOW: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have recently heard this is a tax on the consumer. If any tax measure can be devised under which some of us will escape taxation, if any measure can be devised that doesn't bear on all of us either directly or indirectly, such a measure has not yet been presented to this Legislature.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is on the passage to be enacted of An Act Imposing a Sales and Use Tax, H. P. 1695, L. D. 1273. The yeas and nays vote has been ordered. Has everyone a blank?

All those in favor of An Act Imposing a Sales and Use Tax, H. P. 1695, L. D. 1273, being enacted will say yes when their name is called and those opposed to its enactment will say no.

I repeat, all those in favor of the bill being enacted will say yes; all those opposed will say no.

The Clerk will call the Roll.

ROLL CALL

YEA—Albee, Albert, Archer, Bailey, Bates, Bearce, Caribou; Bearce, Hebron; Berry, Boothby, Bradeen, Brown, Robbinston; Brown, Wayne; Bucknam, Burgess, Burkett, Campbell, Carter, Carville, Caswell, Cetner, Stan-

dish; Chase, Cape Elizabeth; Chase, Whitefield; Clements, Cobb, Cole, Crabtree, Daggett, Davis, DeBeck, Dennison, Dickey, Dow, Falmouth; Dunham, Emerson, Fenn, Fuller, Bangor; Fuller, So. Portland; Gay, Gilman, Gosline, Hall, Hand, Hanson, Machiasport; Hayes, House, Hussey, Ingraham, Jacoby, Jamieson, Jennings, Jones, Keene, Knapp, Lacharite, Lackee, Larrabee, Leavitt, Lord, Lovely, Low, Ludwig, Macomber, March, Martin, Augusta; Martin, Frenchville; Maxwell, McGlauffin, Morneault, Moulton, Nowell, Parker, Patterson, Perry, Peterson, Philbrook, Phillips, Pierce, Plummer, Potter, Ricker, Robbins, Roberts, Roundy, Sanborn, Sinclair, Spear, Stevens, Stewart, Story, Taylor, Lyman; Taylor, Norridgewock; Thomas, Jr., Totman, Travis, Vaughan, Wallace, Watson, West, Winchenpaw, Woodcock, Silsby.

NAY—Barton, Brown, Baileyville; Bubar, Castonguay, Chaples, Chase, Belgrade; Cote, Couture, Delahanty, Dostie, Duquette, Edwards, Farley, Fay, Finnegan, Frechette, Gowell, Hamilton, Hancock, Hanson, Lebanon; Harding, Hawkes, Jacobs, Jalbert, Kelly, Latno, Lessard, Letourneau, Littlefield, Madore, Maguire, Martin, Eagle Lake; Moffatt, Nadeau, O'Dell, Parent, Rollins, Senter, Brunswick; St. Pierre, Turner, Walls, Williams, Wood, Woodworth.

ABSENT — Clapp, Dorsey, Dow, Eliot; Fogg, Gerrish.

Yea 101, Nay 44, Absent 5.

The SPEAKER: One hundred and one having voted in the affirmative, forty-four in the negative, five being absent, An Act Imposing a Sales and Use Tax, H. P. 1695, L. D. 1273, is passed to be enacted and will be signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

On motion of the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase,

Adjourned until 9:30 A. M. tomorrow morning.