

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

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



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

LEGISLATIVE RECORD

OF THE

One-Hundredth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

VOLUME II

MAY 12 - JUNE 17, 1961

and

SPECIAL SESSION

NOV. 27 - DEC. 2, 1961

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL

AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Tuesday, June 13, 1961

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. A. Christopher Ives of Hallowell.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

Paper from the Senate

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the Joint Select Committee on Gubernatorial Votes be instructed and authorized to re-examine the returns of votes cast for Governor in the last gubernatorial election and report such changes, additions, revisions or corrections of the report already made by them as the facts justify (S. P. 589)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

In the House, the Order was read and passed in concurrence.

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act relating to Participation by the State of Maine in the 1964-65 New York World's Fair (H. P. 377) (L. D. 552)

Resolve Appropriating Money for In-School Educational Telecasting (S. P. 275) (L. D. 876)

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

Orders of the Day

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

Mr. BAXTER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we expect the sales tax bill on a supplement sometime after 9:30 when the Senate convenes, I now move that the House recess to the sound of the gong which should be between 9:30 and 10:00 o'clock.

Thereupon, the House voted to recess.

**After Recess
10:30 A. M.**

Called to order by the Speaker.

On motion of the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Hendricks, House Rule 25 was suspended for the remainder of today's session in order to permit smoking.

Mr. Whitman of Woodstock presented the following Order out of order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee be directed to study and report to the 101st Legislature such recommendations concerning revision of the Senate and House Rules and the Joint Rules as may accomplish efficiency and expediency of the legislative process in Maine. (H. P. 1189)

The Order received passage and was sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Bussiere of Lewiston presented the following Order out of order and moved its passage:

WHEREAS, the members of the House have learned of the death yesterday of Fernand S. Jalbert of Lewiston, brother of Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDERED, that the Clerk of the House be and hereby is directed to send to Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston a telegram expressing our deepest sympathy to him and the entire family on their loss.

The Order received passage.

Mrs. Shaw of Chelsea presented the following Order out of order and moved its passage:

WHEREAS, the lady legislators of the House, girls in the Clerk of the House office, Speaker's office and Majority Floor Leader's office have received orchid corsages,

BE IT ORDERED, that the recipients extend sincere thanks to the gentleman of the House responsible for this thoughtful gesture. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: The Chair will declare this Order unanimously passed. (Applause)

The following papers from the Senate, appearing on Supplement Number One, were taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

Conference Committee Report

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Resolve Providing for Survey to Determine New Projects for Recreational Areas (S. P. 286) (L. D. 887) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed)

BROOKS of Cumberland
NOYES of Franklin
MARDEN of Kennebec

— Committee on part of Senate

TURNER of Auburn
SMITH of Falmouth
WINCHENPAW

of Friendship

— Committee on part of House

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Report "A" of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Increasing Sales Tax" (H. P. 708) (L. D. 986) reporting same in new draft "A" (H. P. 1184) (L. D. 1631) under same title and that it "Ought to pass", and Report "B" on same Bill reporting "Ought not to pass", and Report "C" on same Bill reporting same in new draft "B" (H. P. 1185) (L. D. 1632) under title of "An Act Decreasing the Sales Tax and Eliminating Certain Exemptions" and that it "Ought to pass" which Reports and Bill were indefinitely postponed in the House on June 7.

Came from the Senate with Report "A" accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. BAXTER: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, that the House recede and concur with the Senate in accepting Report "A" "Ought to pass."

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. BAXTER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think that we have now arrived at a very crucial stage in our deliberations and I am sure you all realize that as well as I do. I would like to review just a few of the reasons why I think that the sales tax Committee Report "A" should be accepted at this time through the recede and concur motion which I have just made. These things I think we have discussed before, but I would like to mention them again just briefly so you can have them in mind when you vote.

We have reviewed the fact in the past that our sales tax is not high in comparison to the sales taxes in other states. Considering the fact that we have a food exemption, there are many states with higher sales taxes than Maine has and many at our level. I have also outlined to you the fact that we have a very unusual tax situation inasmuch as we do not choose to draw from the food base and we do not have any income sources such as corporate income taxes and personal income taxes. There are only two states that are in this position that we are when it comes to raising funds to carry out our state services, one being Florida and the other being Ohio.

Therefore it is not unusual for us to have to go frequently to the sales tax base for money and it is quite amazing that even after we increase the tax at this point, if we should, we still in spite of our restrictive tax base would not have a sales tax which was high in relation to other sales tax states. I have also mentioned to you of course that we are based on sales taxes in the State of Maine, our excise taxes, our gasoline taxes, and of course our sales tax, that we are basically a sales tax type state—not only in our general sales tax but in our other individual sales taxes.

We have also mentioned the fact that in Maine our effort in relation to the other states has been dropping, it has gone from eleven to sixteenth, to twentieth, and of course the question is where we will be when this session is over. I think a very good indication of

that may be the case of Connecticut, which has been mentioned here before. Connecticut is one of the states in New England which has a lower effort rate than we did, due primarily to their very high, personal income rate. But in spite of that, Connecticut in this session—you have been told, has increased its sales tax from three to three and one-half percent. In addition to that, they increased the liquor tax by forty percent; they increased cigarettes from three cents to five cents a pack, two cents a pack; telephone tax was up from four to six percent; motor vehicle registration fee, up from eight to ten dollars. So, they not only have increased their sales tax as we are discussing that increase, but they have added many other increases besides.

Now we have talked about alternatives here. We have talked about floating a bond issue for capital expenses in spending the surplus for the supplemental budget, which we have very thoroughly and resoundingly turned down. We have talked about patchwork taxes, cigarettes, beer, liquor, auto trade-in, and wildlands for instance which we can add up one way or another to do the job. You know that beer had a unanimous "Ought not to pass" report from the committee and we also know that the House quite decisively has turned down the auto trade-in tax. So the patchwork quilt leaves considerable to be desired, both I think in a soundness and in the fact that parts of it are just plain no longer available.

The budget has had a great deal of review. Of course it had a review when it was originally drawn up. We know that it was reduced substantially and severely from the requests of the department heads. We know that the budget then was reviewed by the Appropriations Committee, a sound and conservative Appropriations Committee, which made further cuts after a great deal of thought and after very intimate contact with the problems involved. We know that the budget then came to the floor of the House and to the Senate and amendments were made to adjust it up and down, and there were as many ups

as there were downs, and the two branches had different ideas of where the increases and the decreases should occur. We went around in a circle for a while, we had two conference committees, and finally we arrived at a point where a goodly majority of both branches accepted the committee report, the compromise report, which gave us the budget as we now have it.

The budget of course had a great many items in it. As far as adding and subtracting, we could go on almost forever and there are many in both branches who would like to increase items in here as well as there are those who would like to decrease them. We have the Adjutant General's Department, the Armories, the Department of Agriculture, the Apprenticeship Council, the Department of Economic Development, Education, as we know, is a large portion of all of our budget, and we go down through the state teachers colleges, Farmington, Gorham, Washington, Fort Kent, Aroostook State Teachers College, the Maine Vocational Technical Institute, all of our Vocational Rehabilitation, School Lunches, Driver Education, New England Higher Education Compact which I know a lot of you are interested in. We have the employees salaries, the Finance Department, the Forestry Department—the backbone of our state is our forestry, the Health and Welfare Department, our Child Welfare services, and our Medical care program — particularly of course the Hospital Program, the Municipal Sewerage Program, the Water Improvement Commission, the Industrial Accident Commission, the Legislative Research Committee—I am skipping over many of them here—the Maine Maritime Academy, a growing academy which needs help, Mental Health and Corrections Department, all through the various items in that department, Park Commission, Sea and Shore Fisheries, and the University of Maine.

Now I submit to you that there are many items in there which one might wish to second guess the Appropriations Committee on and the Legislature's work to date, and the Executive Department. However, I can't believe that it is practical for

anybody to feel that a solution to our problem at the moment is to cut the supplemental budget but not give us cuts in items in which he might be interested. For instance, you might say the supplemental budget should be cut, but please don't cut the DED or don't cut the hospitals, or don't cut this or that, particularly I think the hospital program. Now if one seeks an adjustment in the supplemental budget as a solution, certainly he must go along with all cuts, not just the cut in which he is not interested in, and retaining the things that he is interested in. By the same token quite obviously there are two sides to every question and it is only fair that cuts would be balanced by increases.

To me I think that we are definitely now at the point where we must decide. Many have said that they feel that they could go with the sales tax at the enactment stage. However, at the moment in our recede and concur motion, we are to all intents and purposes at the enactment stage because we have dealt quite thoroughly with many of the alternatives and to me the final alternative is not practical. Therefore, I would certainly encourage the members to vote now as they would vote were we at the enactment stage on this particular bill. So therefore, I hope that my motion does prevail.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It certainly is a great turn about in the thinking regards expressed just now by our Floor Leader, Mr. Baxter, but let's review a few of the things he commented on.

Connecticut tax. By what they're doing in the State of Connecticut they're helping the State of Maine if we hold our line, because they're increasing inheritance tax and other taxes they have imposed are severe and extreme, but the economic means within the State of Connecticut are sufficient enough probably to bear out a program they might desire. We here in Maine will benefit by the action of that state by driving people into our state, of older people who have a

few paltry dollars that they might have reserved or set aside that they don't want the state to obtain through the new taxation; they'll come to Maine to live, there is a good potential for that.

Now this is just one more way of getting back at the sales tax in a different form. I will admit I was one of those who did oppose the bond issue. I believe in paying as we go and keeping the state on a sound level without additional cost and expenditures to obtain the result that we can afford and desire. As far as the patchwork taxes go, they have criticized our particular form of procedure to obtain needed revenue because of their desires to get the full 3½ percent tax. But the reason why they are opposed to patchwork taxes is not because the revenue derived from that way of source of revenue is because the protection of special interests, because if you have seen the lobbies at work these past couple of days, each and every one of them were formed and lobbying for their own particular interests against the taxation of individual bills, are now lined up and ganged up to support the sales tax to prevent they individually being taxed to bring revenue within the state. You have seen it; we have all seen it. You've got calls at your homes, you have had calls at your place of business, from political figures, you have had it from individuals who are so-called "brass" who would desire to have their way carried out against — which would be against the wishes of the Legislature as they have already expressed on the Floor of this House. You have heard another gentleman speak in regard to railroad tax relief. Sure, I am not opposed to the tax relief in the form which should be presented to you, but I am in the form that it is now presented to you for full relief. You don't see them willing to take a cut the same as we tried to do to the D.E.D. and other departments. They will take the tax dollars to use. How much consideration will be given that for some reduction? Now this 2½ percent bill that you now have before you, who does it hit? It hits the poor family which now the State of Maine has to support

to a certain degree to help keep alive and make them survive, you see those people buy a 25 cent piece of clothing to keep their children warm, the Morgan Memorial and different agencies which will have things given to them. Now you are going to turn around and tax those people to the extent that they can't even hardly afford that. I think it is ridiculous to even consider it.

So in other words, what it has been trying to reach here is a compromise, as I see it, but this is not the compromise acceptable I don't believe to a majority of this House. Because they are going to get the sales tax in some form, whether just partially to increase it on the present level or hit the poor family and working people with an increased tax, because when you buy a doctor's prescription you pay no tax; but the poor family that can't afford a doctor has to go and get patent medicines, he'll pay a tax. So who does it hit?

One thing that I think we should consider is to live within our means and ability to pay within the State of Maine, within the economic conditions now existing in the State, not within the means and ability of those who are in a position where they can afford to have the luxuries of life and neglect them to get the people who can't. In other words, we should consider how far and how fast we can go in Maine within our eligibility and ability to pay. The question in my mind arises, who wants all these services proclaimed? In my opinion I think it is more of the so-called "Brass" department heads to enlarge and grow and expand more than it is what they claim the people want because if you have the protests of the people in the area that I represent, the surrounding areas around me near the state line, they very emphatically stated that they are opposed to increase in sales tax to drive any further business across the border to the neighboring state, and I concur in those things and will stand here today to fight in their behalf. And when we get through with this bill, I hope you will vote on the merits and condition of the bill and give it full consideration and live with-

in the means and ability of the people of the State of Maine to pay under the economic conditions now existing, and to stop considering the lobbyists, tactics, discard them entirely, and vote on the merits of this bill, and I rise in opposition to the motion pending and do ask for a division when it is so taken.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Westerfield.

Mr. WESTERFIELD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I intend to be very brief. I have at numerous times outlined in caucuses and on the floor of this House what I feel is a more moderate, more economical, and a sound program for financing a major portion of the needs of the state at this time. I have strongly felt that we should not deplete our major tax resource, the sales tax at this time, and have opposed the sales tax on those grounds. Since I have on numerous occasions outlined my program, the program of many in this House before you, I shall not take time to go into that further at this time, and merely say that I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, to recede and concur does not prevail, and that we will then adhere to our action whereby we indefinitely postponed the sales tax measure. Thank you.

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

Mr. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Let me start this dissertation by saying that I have the greatest respect for his Excellency, Governor Reed. I think Governor Reed has tried to give the people of the state a good program, but in my opinion and in the opinion of the majority of the citizens of this state, I think he has been far too excessive in his budget demands. In my five months here as a freshman legislator, I have seen many instances of waste. I think these can be and should be corrected. It is my firm conviction that education, institutions and all departments could stand at least a five percent cut without in any way jeopardizing the proper

functioning of this state. I have been accused of jumping party lines. If trying to avert burdening the people of this state with an increase in sales tax, which in my humble opinion is not necessary, then I am guilty of that sin. My stand, and I repeat very firmly, I am against imposition of an increase in sales tax. Thank you.

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

Mr. BRADEEN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This as we all can see is a most beautiful morning, but I bring to you a sobering thought. According to the Fitzgerald translation of the Rubaiyat, Omar the Tent Maker wrote nine hundred years ago under the Persian sun these lines:

"The moving finger writes;
And having writ, moves on,
Nor all thy piety nor wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
Nor all thy tears wash out a word of it."

My friend, this is the hour of decision, as has been mentioned in this hall before. Last Wednesday, I believe, sixty-five Republicans joined hands with thirty-five Democrats on a roll call vote signifying that they were definitely opposed to any increase in the sales tax at this time. I find great difficulty in believing that any substantial number of the sixty-five Republicans, and I am primarily addressing my remarks to you at this time, have changed their minds in the last six days by any warmed-over argument that they may have heard. I definitely oppose the motion made by the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, and when the vote is taken, I request a roll call.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested.

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

Mr. DRAKE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As a freshman member of this Legislature, I have learned a great deal this session. I have learned the meaning of "political expediency" and about "shell games," and I have been impressed with the oratorical histrionics and devastating humor of some of our mem-

bers. In spite of all this, I must admit that I find it difficult, yes, I will say impossible, to accept the philosophy of this 100th Legislature that our state motto of "I Lead" applies only to legislation which carries no price tag.

The record of the 100th Legislature should be a milestone in the history of Maine. We have enacted some excellent legislation. We have a forward-looking program set forth in our supplemental budget. We have a schedule of very progressive L. D.'s. Shortly after World War II we received national recognition for the Maine Turnpike, one of the first limited access super highways in the country. Today, we have an equal opportunity for another dynamic forward step in educational TV.

I am confident that the people of our state will accept an increase in the sales tax in order to enjoy the benefits of these programs.

Let's stop playing games! Let's enact our programs! Let's pass an increase in the sales tax! Let's go home!

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Medford, Mr. Hichborn.

Mr. HICHBORN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We have considered a supplemental budget for a period of some six months. We have discussed and considered a great many L. D.'s, we have apparently accepted a program, we passed those presumably because we felt that they were important, worthwhile and necessary to the state. Now it is time to pay for them, and we are faced with certain alternatives. We can wrap some of them up and put them back on the shelf again, or we can face the responsibilities to our people and we can pay for them. I come from a rural area, and my people are just as tax conscious as the people in any other section of the State of Maine. I'm no more anxious to go on record as favoring new taxes than anybody else. I would very gladly support any patchwork tax program if it appeared that we would get anything except a patchwork result.

The people in my area are no more anxious for new taxes than the people in any other area, but

neither are they anxious to have the programs that we've been talking about, that we have voted upon, that we have said were good programs, turned down. They are not anxious for a cut in services, they have been named again and again during the past few weeks—we don't need to name them now, we don't know which ones would be cut anyway. Even though we don't want new taxes, if it's necessary to have a tax in order to have the program, I think that the people in my area are in favor of paying for them, and I shall support the motion of the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Paten, Mrs. Harrington.

Mrs. HARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to address my remarks to the Republicans in this House. You have a Republican Governor in the corner office. As you recall, there were some years we didn't have one. I think that you owe him the courtesy of supporting his program; and to the Democrats in this House, I would like to remind you that when Governor Muskie was in office, several of the Republicans in this House supported some of his program. Now it's time for you to help us out.

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

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words, ladies and gentlemen of the House, as you know I'm very much opposed to the sales tax, and I would like to say a few words about loyalty. Some people have questioned loyalty around here, now for the benefit of those who haven't kept track of all the records, this is my seventh consecutive term and I have been in one seat or another when there was no Republican in the front office; I have been here in one seat or another when we couldn't send a Republican to the United States Senate; I have been here in one seat or another when we couldn't send a Republican Representative to Congress. Now I think it was the year that the late Governor Clauson won the front office, I lost Thomaston to the Dem-

ocrats by eight votes. That year a young Thomaston business man ran against me, and naturally Thomaston would go for a home town boy; but the outlying area saw fit to send me back. Now this time in the primaries the Republicans had no choice, I was the only candidate and there was no choice, they had to take me or nothing.

Now do I represent those people down to Thomaston? I believe that when the election is over in November, I represent all the people in my district, and I won't belabor you with figures. I have a lot of them here, but I would just like to call your attention to this big sheet that was put out by the leaders I assume, and that says every penny that the 99th Legislature spent, it adds up to some one hundred nineteen and one half million dollars. It says at the bottom all appropriations. We have already passed a current services budget of 119.2 million dollars, we have already passed a four and one-half million dollar crash program, we already have five and one half million dollars left in one account and six hundred thousand in another and some odd change in another, and we have already agreed that we could up the estimate a little bit. I know that I can stand here and safely tell you that probably eighty or ninety percent of the people that I represent, Democrats and Republicans alike, do not want this sales tax.

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

Mr. WOOD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to have you folks consider for a minute what group of people in the State of Maine are hurt the most when we decide to raise taxes, either sales tax or any other tax? Is it the railroad executives, that get from thirty-five to seventy-five thousand dollars a year? Is it the state employees that get a raise every year? Surely they want taxes raised, if they raise their salaries \$300 and they pay \$150 more sales tax, they are helped \$150. Is it the school teacher? Surely they want sales taxes, they want their raises. If we raise them from \$300 up, which some of

them have gone way over that, they don't pay any taxes. The burden falls upon the little people, the little people that we consider of little consequence until we go back and ask their support in the next election.

It's the little people that are out of work. It's for all people that are living on state pensions. Over the weekend I went out into six of the nine towns that I represent, put in a lot of time. I asked the people how they felt about more sales tax, how they felt about the supplemental budget; no one asked me to change my mind and vote for the sales tax. Hardly a one said they'd rather see the services cut a little than have taxes at this time. Up in my county, a business has closed their doors in the last two weeks, fifty to one hundred people this week are signing up for unemployment that have been working. They will get a very small amount of money each week to live on and they'll pay sales taxes out of that. When that is used up, what happens? Some of them to save their washing machine and television will go to these finance companies, borrow money and pay thirty-three percent interest and with the sales tax, ladies and gentlemen, that's pretty high interest. Now these are the people and the only people that will be hurt by this tax, and they are the majority of the people in the State of Maine. I hope that when this vote is taken, you folks will consider that and stick by it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Bearce.

Mr. BEARCE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I always enjoy our talk from my friend from Friendship, it's always exhilarating. I think he's left, but I was going to offer to him our other proposition that I would go down this afternoon or any time with him and go down the streets of the town that he lives in or any other town within his area, and say to the residents of that town, now we have a lot of problems in Maine, education, old age pension, other things that are covered by the supplemental budget that amounts to \$7,500,000. Would you

be willing to contribute ten or fifteen cents per week per person to take care of those items, that's all it is, per person, ten to fifteen cents per week. I think we would get some reasonably good answers. The way most of the people I think have been going at this is like about thirty years ago when I was operating a mill up in Canada, we had a young native come around that sold potatoes. He came around with this pitch, you don't want no potatoes, do you? Well, the answer is obvious, we don't want no potatoes. But that's the way this pitch has been going with the sales tax, we don't want the sales tax. Now when you put it down to a dollars and cents basis and how much it is going to cost per individual, it's very small.

Now turning to Omar Khayyam, my recollection back in college of Omar Khayyam is this little statement: a loaf of bread, a jug of wine and thou beside me in the wilderness — well, by God, I guess we're in the wilderness now. I think I know my way out, and I am voting as you all know for the sales tax at three and one half percent and backing the Governor and backing the Republican Party; and I am going to back it to the end. I'll compromise the rate, cut it ten percent, cut any item out you want to, but lets push this sales tax or push a tax through and get out of here. We don't want to be labeled as the do-nothing lousy bunch—excuse me—I'll take that back, legislature. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Milbridge, Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. KENNEDY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would feel remiss in my duties as a legislator if I did not vote against the motion of the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter. Not only vote against it, but be very vocal in opposition to this tax measure. There has been some question among the members as to our progress in the State of Maine, and I think if you have reviewed the history of the State of Maine in the last five bienniums we have doubled our budget, doubled our spending in the State of

Maine. It has cost money to do it. My firm conviction is that there is a time when one must stop doing it. This is a good time, ladies and gentlemen, this session to at least draw in our belts and hold the line. We will still be getting an increase of about nineteen million over the last biennium if we do pass some of the piecemeal taxation before us.

I am disturbed as I know many of you are, I have mentioned that the services have doubled in amounts of money, and we all know that the gross per capita income has not doubled in the last ten years, far from it. These same people, ladies and gentlemen, are going to pay the tax. These same people are burdened with other taxes; they have the real property tax, they have excise taxes, they have taxes on gasoline, cigarettes, and I could go on and on. But you all know about this, I don't need to review it. In the State of Maine we have a great number of people who are living on a fixed income. We encourage those people to come to Maine and retire. We should take them into consideration before we take steps like we are considering here today.

It has been mentioned on the floor of the House even this morning, that if we pass this tax it will be a milestone in the history of Maine; but I say to you ladies and gentlemen, it is going to be another millstone around the necks of the taxpayers in the State of Maine. I recommend that we defeat this measure here before us this morning, ask the leaders to send the supplementary budget back to the Governor, we have full trust in him to allow him to adjust it for what he thinks are the dire needs of the people of the State of Maine and we buy it when it comes back with the money that we give him by taxation.

Some have expressed concern over their legislative documents in the other branch. I have no fear for legislative documents in the other branch and neither should you, ladies and gentlemen, because there's going to be money by this piecemeal taxation to pay for all of them, if the Governor will pare his supplementary budget back to the

figure that we give him, and allow us to take home our legislative documents that bear an appropriation. He is an honorable man, he is not going to be vindictive, he's not going to hold these documents over your head in the last hours of the session, of course not. I wonder how many of us, ladies and gentlemen, over the weekend have been weakened by the siren cry of the proponents of this measure to the point of irresponsible spending, and I believe it is irresponsible spending if we buy the whole package. Or have we been strengthened by the desperate wail of the electorate to stand firm in opposition to the demands of the unsympathetic and ever increasing bureaucracy that we have here in Maine? Our population has not increased in the last ten years, we have the same number of people, the same number of people will be paying the bills, and I am strongly in opposition, firmly opposed to the motion pending before this House.

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

Mr. BERRY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would address my remarks to all the members of the House regardless of party affiliations, to all those members who are here because they have been elected by people in the small towns and the big cities and were sent here with the full knowledge of the people who elected them that there was a responsible job to do.

There is a word used in the military of the country, the word posture, and I would ask you to reflect in your own mind what you think the posture of the State of Maine is at the present time. What image does it create? It has, I think, been portrayed here as perhaps a little ailing, perhaps in need of a little bulwarking. A man who has a job to do needs sustenance, he needs strength. We have a job to do here in the State of Maine, we have come up with a program modest in my opinion, yet a step forward. Certainly the people who sent us here, everyone of us, expect the program, hope the program to be implemented and certainly feel that they sent respon-

sible people here who have the courage to implement it. I certainly hope that this measure prevails.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, that the House recede and concur with the Senate in accepting Report "A" "Ought to pass." A roll call has been requested by the gentleman from Waterboro, Mr. Bradeen.

For the Chair to order a roll call, it must have an expression of a desire for a roll call by at least one fifth the members present. Will all those who desire a roll call, please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned their count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than one-fifth having arisen, a roll call is ordered.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Smithfield, Mr. Johnson.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House to be excused from voting inasmuch as Mr. Jalbert has asked that his vote be paired with mine. He would vote against, and I would vote for.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Smithfield, Mr. Johnson, states that he wishes to pair his vote with the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, stating that he has talked with the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, and that if he, Mr. Jalbert, were here and were to vote, he would vote "yes"; and that if the gentleman from Smithfield, Mr. Johnson, were to vote, he would vote "no." Is it the pleasure of the House that the gentleman from Smithfield, Mr. Johnson, be excused from voting?

(Cries of "No")

The SPEAKER: All those in favor of excusing the gentleman from voting, say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

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

Mr. BRADEEN: Mr. Speaker, I am a little confused, do I understand that if Mr. Jalbert were

present he would vote for this motion to recede and concur?

The SPEAKER: That's what the gentleman from Smithfield, Mr. Johnson, stated.

The gentleman from Smithfield, Mr. Johnson, now wishes to correct his statement and state that he has talked with the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, and that if he, the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, were here he would vote "no"; and that if he, the gentleman from Smithfield, Mr. Johnson, were to vote, he would vote "yes." Is it the pleasure of the House that the gentleman from Smithfield, Mr. Johnson, be excused from voting?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will restate the question. The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, that the House recede and concur with the Senate in accepting Report "A" "Ought to pass" in new draft, on Bill "An Act Increasing Sales Tax," House Paper 1184, Legislative Document 1631. If you are in favor of receding and concurring, you will answer "yes" when your name is called; if you are opposed to the motion, you will vote "no" when your name is called.

The Clerk will call the roll.

ROLL CALL

YEA—Albair, Anderson, Greenville; Baker, Baxter, Bearce, Berman, Auburn; Berry, Cape Elizabeth; Boothby, Bragdon, Brewer, Brown, Vassalboro; Chapman, Gardiner; Chapman, Norway; Cyr, Davis, Dostie, Winslow; Drake, Edgerly, Estey, Gardner, Hague, Harrington, Hichborn, Hopkinson, Hutchins, Lane, Lincoln, Littlefield, Matheson, Morse, Perry, Pike, Prince, Schulten, Smith, Falmouth; Stevens, Stewart, Storm, Thornton, Walker, Wellman, Wheaton, Whiteman, Whitney, Speaker.

NAY — Anderson, Ellsworth; Beane, Augusta; Beane, Moscow; Bedard, Berman, Houlton; Bernard, Berry, Portland; Binnette, Boissonneau, Bradeen, Briggs, Brown, Fairfield; Brown, South Portland; Buckley, Burns, Bussiere, Carter, Choate, Cooper, Coulthard, Crockett,

Curtis, Danes, Dennison, Dodge, Dostie, Lewiston; Dunn, Durgin, Edwards, Finley, Fogg, Gallant, Gill, Ham, Hancock, Hanson, Bradford; Hanson, Lebanon; Hardy, Hartshorn, Haughn, Hendricks, Hinds, Hughes, Humphrey, Jameson, Jobin, Johnson, Stockholm; Jones, Karkos, Kellam, Kennedy, Kilroy, Kimball, Knapp, Knight, Lacharite, Lantagne, Letourneau, Linnekin, Lowery, Maddox, Mathews, Maxwell, Merrill, Minsky, Moore, Morrill, Nadeau, Biddeford; Nadeau, Lewiston; Philbrick, Augusta; Philbrick, Bangor; Plante, Poirier, Prue, Roberts, Rust, Sevigny, Shaw, Shepard, Sirois, Smith, Strong; Sproul, Sweet, Tardiff, Thaanum, Turner, Tweedie, Tyndale, Vaughn, Wade, Walls, Waltz, Waterman, Westerfield, Williams, Winchenpaw, Wood, Young.

ABSENT — Dennett, Jalbert, Levesque, MacGregor, Malenfant, Noel, Smith, Bar Harbor.

EXCUSED — Johnson, Smithfield. Yes 45; No 98; Absent 7; Excused 1.

The SPEAKER: Forty-five having voted in the affirmative, ninety-eight in the negative, seven absent and one excused, the motion to recede and concur does not prevail.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Milbridge, Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. KENNEDY: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adhere to its former action.

The SPEAKER: Is it now the pleasure of the House to adhere?

The motion prevailed.

Thereupon, the Bill was sent forthwith to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair wishes to make an announcement, and to recognize the presence in the gallery of twenty-four students of the sixth grade of Union Central Grade School, accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Maxine Heath and Chaperones Mrs. Doris Miller, Mrs. Christine Savage, Mrs. Veda Scott, Mrs. Charlene Leach, Mrs. Thelma Taylor, Mrs. Bernice Nute, and Mr. Earl Hannan.

On behalf of the House, the Chair extends to you a most hearty and cordial welcome and we hope that you will enjoy and profit by your visit with us here today. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: Reference is

made to Senate Paper 588, dated June 9, which reads as follows:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that there be created an interim joint committee to consist of 3 Senators and 5 Representatives appointed respectively by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, to study and report to the 101st Legislature such recommendations concerning the functioning of the Department of Economic Development as may best promote greater benefits in meeting the increasing industrial and recreational needs of the State; and be it further

ORDERED, that the members of the Committee shall serve without compensation but shall be reimbursed for their expenses incurred in the performance of their duties under this order; and be it further

ORDERED, that there be appropriated to the Committee from the Legislative Appropriation the sum of \$1,000 to carry out the purpose of this order (S. P. 588)

In reference to this Order, the Chair appoints the following members of that Committee on the part of the House:

GARDNER of Orono,
Chairman

TYNDALE of Kennebunkport

SCHULTEN of Woolwich

KIMBALL of Mount Desert

BURNS of Westbrook

Ought to Pass in New Draft

Report of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act to Correct Errors and Inconsistencies in the Public Laws" (S. P. 253) (L. D. 770) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 590) (L. D. 1638) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the New Draft passed to be engrossed.

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence and the New Draft read twice.

Under suspension of the rules, the Bill was read the third time and passed to be engrossed in concurrence and sent forthwith to the Senate.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Whitman of Woodstock,

Recessed until one-thirty o'clock in the afternoon.

After Recess
1:30 P.M.

Called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Guilford, Mr. Dodge.

Mr. DODGE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to present an Order out of order and have unanimous consent to briefly speak on the Order.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Guilford, Mr. Dodge, requests unanimous consent to present an Order out of order. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the Order.

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that H. P. 1030, L. D. 1431, Bill, "An Act Imposing a Tax on Gross Receipts of Trading Stamp Companies" and accompanying papers be recalled to the House from the legislative files for reconsideration.

Mr. Dodge of Guilford was granted unanimous consent to address the House briefly.

Mr. DODGE: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I wish to briefly explain why I am trying to bring this bill back and why. This is a tax on the stamp companies. Now I have been investigating and going around talking to retailers about this and what they would have to pay for the number of stamps that fill a stamp book. A book holds 1200 stamps. The retailers pay different prices according to how many books they take at the same time. By the way, the stamps always stay in the name of the stamp company, otherwise they could be taxed, and it is somewhere between \$10.00 and \$15.00 according to the — the retailers pay for enough stamps to fill a book according to what I have had from the retailers. The more stamps you buy, the less price you pay. Now supposing we take the price between the two that the small retailer pays is \$12.50 for enough stamps to fill that book. Now when that book is redeemed, I have here the book where you have the different things that you can redeem it for. You can redeem that book for an article that will retail somewhere between \$2.50 and \$3.00, that's the retail price, not the

wholesale price. They buy it of course wholesale. Now the spread between those and the price they get for the stamps they give the retailer comes to somewhere between \$9.00 and \$10.00. Now out of that, if we taxed them 2 percent, we would get 25 cents. Now we aren't asking, or at least I'm not, to kill the goose that laid the egg, but what we would like to do is get part of that egg, and it has been brought out in the House here that would be at least \$50,000 a year and how much more we do not know.

One thing I am interested to know is that under this bill, you would find how much money the stamp companies are taking out of the state. Now to my mind, this money that we are getting, we are treating it fair and the stamp companies have got the money and they are taking it out, and they aren't going out of business because we charge them 2 percent on it, that money is going out, lots of it is going out of the state, not all of it, we have some stamp companies in the state, but all we have got to do is reach out and take it, and I can see why — that is a tax that apparently isn't going to affect anyone. Thank you.

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

Mr. BAXTER: Mr. Speaker, this order seeks to recall from the files a gross receipts tax on the stamp companies which was decisively defeated in both branches of the legislature after a majority ought not to pass report on the part of the Taxation Committee. We have pointed out that this is a gross receipts tax which is basically an unfair and improper type of tax. It was also pointed out that it is discriminatory because the use to which stamps are put are basically for advertising and we all realize that when we know that because one store has stamps and another store doesn't, people will go to that store. It is a promotional item, the same as T.V. advertising, radio advertising, and many other things, except rather than go on T.V. somebody may choose to have stamps to persuade people or encourage people to trade with him.

There is one other thing to consider, and that is that in addition to that the stamp companies are basically merchandisers, such as we will say Montgomery-Ward, they sell merchandise. The merchandise is paid for by stamps rather than by cash, the cash is paid to the retailer who gives the person the stamps and you take the stamps then and purchase your goods with the stamps rather than with money. Again I would say that a gross receipts tax would be discriminatory if the same thing is not applied to Montgomery-Ward and all other forms of merchants who are selling goods for cash and in this case it is a company who is selling goods for stamps. It seems to me that we do not want this kind of tax in Maine. It yields a very small amount of money as has been mentioned, \$50,000 per year, which as compared to the problem that we are facing at this moment, seems negligible. I hope for this reason — I move that this order be indefinitely postponed. I would request a division.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, that this Order be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of the indefinite postponement of this order please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned their count.

A division of the House was had.

Fifty-seven having voted in the affirmative and fifty-three having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

Upon request of Mr. Bragdon of Perham, the following matter was called up for consideration on the Special Appropriations Calendar:

Bill "An Act Making Supplemental Appropriations for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1962 and June 30, 1963." (H. P. 1165) (L. D. 1606)

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

Mr. BAXTER: Mr. Speaker, the bill which has been taken off the Appropriations table at this time is of course the supplemental budget

with which we are all concerned, as you know, and has received the approval of the Appropriations Committee and two Conference Committees and both branches of the legislature. It has been sent to engrossment and this time in order to amend it, either upwards or downwards, would require a two-thirds vote.

However, many have expressed a desire to change the budget further, both up and down, and I think that if it should be considered, that quite obviously additions as well as cuts will have to be entertained, and of course entertained in both branches, and we will have to go back into the process of conference committees and so forth and so on. Those who agreed previously to the budget as it stands now of course both sides made certain sacrifices. If the budget is reconsidered, so that it opens it up for amendments, then obviously all bets should be off and those who wish to put back things that they gave up because of the Conference Committee Report will certainly want to put them back, and those who wish to cut and did not because of the Conference Committee Report, will introduce amendments accordingly. I will make the motion when the time comes, I will assure you that I am making it only so as to place it before you as you have indicated that you want done. I believe that in its present form as far as cuts are concerned, that it should not be cut further and I will not vote for any further cuts. However, for the reason and to get it before you, I will move at this time that the House suspend the rules for the purpose of reconsidering the action whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, that the rules be suspended for the purpose of reconsidering the action of the House on June 5, whereby it passed this bill to be engrossed, for the purpose of entertaining amendments.

A motion to suspend the rules is not debatable.

Mr. Bragdon of Perham asked for a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested.

All those in favor of suspending the rules for this purpose, please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned their count.

A division of the House was had.

Ninety-five having voted in the affirmative and nine having voted in the negative, and ninety-five being more than two-thirds of the members present, the rules were suspended.

Thereupon, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby on June 5 it passed the bill to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The House will be at ease. Will the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, approach the rostrum please.

(Conference at rostrum)

The SPEAKER: The House will be in order. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. BAXTER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think there are two things that I would like to say, one is that shortly I will move to recess for one hour for the purpose of allowing anybody to make any amendments that they may wish to make. It is my understanding that amendments — I would ask a question through the Chair, of the status of the amendments that were originally introduced to the bill.

The SPEAKER: Those amendments have either been adopted or indefinitely postponed.

Mr. BAXTER: Well, I assume that the amendments which were indefinitely postponed by the acceptance of the Committee of Conference Report — can they be reintroduced under the same filing number and under the same name?

The SPEAKER: The rules would have to be suspended for those indefinitely postponed, for the purpose of reconsidering the action whereby they were indefinitely postponed.

Mr. BAXTER: Can further amendments be put in covering the same subject? For instance, I would state an example for the Clerk, the—

The SPEAKER: If there was a change made in the amendment, why then they could be offered,

if they were indefinitely postponed. However, putting in the same amendment would require the suspension of the rules where they have been indefinitely postponed, in order to reconsider the action whereby they indefinitely postponed them, like any other bill.

Mr. BAXTER: That was the first question I had. The second point I wish to make is that we have discussed the matter of the supplemental budget with the Governor and asked his outlook on it. It is his feeling that he has compromised to the point that the budget has now reached — there have been numerous cuts in his original proposals. He feels that both branches of the legislature accepted it and at the point that it was originally after the Appropriations Committee brought it out and that therefore he would not be able to acquiesce in further adjustments. In other words, whatever adjustments are made from here on in it is strictly a matter of the legislature making the adjustments and taking the credit or what have you, or discredit, for whatever adjustments they make.

For that reason, or with that information, and for the purpose of preparing amendments, I now move that the House recess for one hour.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, moves that the House recess for one hour for the purpose of preparing amendments.

Thereupon, the House recessed until three o'clock.

After Recess 3:00 P.M.

Called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Is it now the pleasure of the House that the rules be suspended in order that we may effectuate our actions by a simple majority vote, for the purpose of reconsidering our action whereby we have adopted certain amendments and indefinitely postponed certain amendments?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair awaits the presentation of amendments.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Westerfield.

Mr. WESTERFIELD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to present House Amendment "O" and move its adoption and would like to speak briefly to the amendment.

Thereupon, House Amendment "O" was read by the Clerk as follows:

HOUSE AMENDMENT "O" to H. P. 1165, L. D. 1606, Bill, "An Act Making Supplemental Appropriations for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1962 and June 30, 1963."

Amend said Bill under the caption "ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF" by striking out the line:

"All Other	216,890	218,170"
------------	---------	----------

and inserting in place thereof the line:

'All Other	166,890	168,170'
------------	---------	----------

Further amend said Bill under the caption "ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF" by striking out all of the last sentence and inserting in place thereof the following sentence:

'Also provides travel of \$27,500, industrial advertising of \$100,000, recreational advertising of \$155,560, and related office expenses and equipment.'

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of the paragraph which reads as follows:

"EMPLOYEES SALARY ADJUSTMENT PLAN

Personal Services	580,000	580,000
Provides for installation of new pay plan"		

Further amend said Bill under the caption "HEALTH AND WELFARE, DEPARTMENT OF" by striking out the following lines:

"Medical Care Program		
All Other	1,000,000	1,000,000"

and inserting in place thereof the following:

'Medical Care Program		
All Other	677,000	675,000
Welfare Administration		
Personal Services (15)	55,107 (15)	57,684
All Other	14,893	15,316
Capital Expenditures	3,000	2,000
	73,000	75,000'

Further amend said Bill under the caption "UNIVERSITY OF MAINE" by striking out the line:

"All Other	625,000	625,000"
------------	---------	----------

and inserting in place thereof the line:

'All Other	425,000	425,000'
------------	---------	----------

Further amend said Bill by correcting the totals therein affected by the adoption of this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante.

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Because of the importance of this amendment and because not all parties concerned have finalized their opinions pro and con, I move that this L. D. and House Amendment "O" lie upon the Appropriations Table, pending acceptance of House Amendment "O."

(Conference at rostrum)

The SPEAKER: The House will be in order. The gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, in reference to L. D. 1606, "An Act Making Supplemental Appropriations for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1962 and June 30, 1963," has requested that it be placed upon the House Appropriations Table pending the adoption of House Amendment "O", said motion having been made by the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Westerfield.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I would move a division when this vote is so taken.

The SPEAKER: This is not debatable, it is under a House order that any member of the Appropriations Committee has the right to place a matter upon the House Appropriations Table.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: May I ask a question through the Chair? Did we not just suspend by simple vote the rules?

The SPEAKER: We suspended the rules for the purpose of considering amendments and not for tabling matters on the House Appropriations Table.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. BAXTER: Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of caucusing by both parties, I move that the House recess until four o'clock, and there will be a Republican caucus here immediately.

Thereupon, the House voted to recess until four o'clock.

After Recess
4:45 P.M.

Called to order by the Speaker.

On motion of Mr. Whitman of Woodstock, the House voted to recess until 7:30 P.M. this evening.

After Recess
7:30 P.M.

Called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now calls up for consideration L. D. 1606, from the House Appropriations Calendar, An Act Making Supplemental Appropriations for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1962 and June 30, 1963, which was placed on the table pending the motion of the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Westerfield, that the House adopt House Amendment "O".

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Westerfield.

Mr. WESTERFIELD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Because of certain procedural changes that are necessary which I would first explain in order to introduce House Amendment "O" it is necessary first that we indefinitely postpone House Amendments "E" and "J," because of the fact that those two amendments took care of certain clerical changes in the bill and those same clerical changes are provided for under House Amendment "O," and for that reason, I would at this time withdraw my motion to introduce House Amendment "O" and move that we recede from our action whereby we adopted House Amendments "E" and "J."

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Westerfield, withdraws his motion for the adoption of House Amendment "O."

Is it now the pleasure of the

House that the House reconsider its action whereby it adopted House Amendment "E"?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: Is it now the pleasure of the House that House Amendment "E" shall be indefinitely postponed?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now understands that the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Westerfield, moves that the House reconsider its action whereby it adopted House Amendment "J." Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: Is it now the pleasure of the House that House Amendment "J" be indefinitely postponed?

The motion prevailed.

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

Mr. WESTERFIELD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I now offer House Amendment "O" and move its adoption, and would speak briefly to the motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Westerfield, now offers House Amendment "O" and moves its adoption.

House Amendment "O" was then read again by the Clerk.

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

Mr. WESTERFIELD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: House Amendment "O" provides for a reduction in the supplemental budget of \$2,195,268, it provides for a \$100,000 reduction in Economic Development, the total elimination of the employees salary adjustment plan which totals \$1,160,000, it provides for a reduction of \$250,000 in each year of the biennium with reference to the hospital aid program, a total reduction of \$500,000, and further provides for a reduction in the University of Maine of \$200,000 each biennium, a total of \$400,000.

I would call your attention to the fact that every dollar which we provide through the supplemental budget, every dollar of that is new money. Every dollar of it will reappear before us two years from

now as current services. Through the adoption of this amendment, we will reduce that total amount by approximately 2.2 million, and will provide a supplemental budget of approximately 5.3 million dollars which I feel is a strong sturdy step in the right direction and a program which we can finance. Therefore, I hope that each of you will consider the measure carefully, and will adopt House Amendment "O," and when the vote is taken, I will ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Fogg.

Mr. FOGG: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: When this supplemental budget was drawn up, the original one here, we Democrats went along with it, because we felt that it could be financed otherwise than by a sales tax. We came out with a plan and advanced it to the House here, to the papers and other ways for financing this supplemental budget, we felt that it was a sound plan. However, it was not received with much degree of grace. It was called a shell game and irresponsible financial thinking, and showed no indications of ever getting anywhere. Now we still feel that our plan is sound; in fact, some Republicans felt that it was a sound plan and so, we're progressive, the Democratic party, and we do feel that we'd like to make progress, but we don't want to make it at the expense of a three and a half percent sales tax because in my own town, the people do not want it. Last Sunday, after the Governor spoke, I waited around home for three hours with the expectation I would receive some telephone calls for it. I didn't receive any. The only comment I received after I got out of the house was by one of the prominent Republicans saying he still did not want to see a three and a half percent sales tax. However, we do feel that we Democrats, that we have proposed a way of financing this plan and we would like to adhere to this way of financing without cutting the budget.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante.

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As my seatmate and the Minority Floor Leader has indicated, we have been accused in the past of being irresponsible, of being shell-game operators and much earlier of being leopards. Such childish accusations have never disturbed us. We are going to be as sincere, as frank, and as honest as we possibly can be in stating our position on this amendment and the entire supplemental budget.

As spokesman for the Minority Party, I have on several occasions stated clearly that we feel that the supplemental budget at 7.5 million was sound, providing that it could be financed without an unnecessary sales tax increase at this time. We haven't any intention of changing our position on the supplemental budget this evening or in the future until the dawn meets the moon, this will happen when Governor Reed himself informs us and the general public that all alternative financial proposals are unacceptable to him; namely and chiefly, the bond issue. Therefore, we the minority party, make one final plea, in the interest of the State of Maine, for all parties concerned, to give and take a little and come up with 10.8 million in new revenue; and by so doing without doing it with an increase in the sales tax. It is therefore at this time that we are making this final plea and will have to oppose Amendment "O."

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I was very much amazed to hear from my colleague from Old Orchard make the statements he has just made because previous talks with him indicated that we were within the range of some compromise within reason and within the ability of the state to pay this finance without going into sales tax. I think this program as presented to you tonight is one of construction, it was one of advancement, it is brought out by the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Westerfield, it's all new money, it's progress within the state to the extent of the ability of the state to pay without going into deficit

financing as I would call it with a bond issue or also without going into a sales tax. I think everyone has their mind pretty well made up, and without any further debate I move a division when the vote is so taken.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Pike.

Mr. PIKE: I'm sorry, but I can't let this go by without expressing my complete disapproval of this amendment and the approach to it. It seems to me a meat axe approach cutting out some of the heart of some of our most important programs in the state, hospitals, the university, education. I don't like the idea of a bond issue paying for current things, I don't mind which tax or which particular group of taxes we take, but it does seem to me that we are getting in here at the last days of the session and throwing away the careful examination, the careful hearings, the votes of both bodies to pass these things, throwing them right out the window in order to get home. Now I want to get home as much as anybody does, but I just think that it's very very bad and the cleaver or the meat axe approach is never, it seems to me, a very good approach to any complicated financial problem. I'm sorry to have to say it because I was in caucus this afternoon, I suppose I'm bound, I'll have to be bound to the results of the caucus; I still don't like it.

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

Mr. BERRY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I was very happy to see the ranks close behind this issue as set forth by the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante. This is a situation which we have seen come, this is a situation which we can now at this stage of the game rally behind wholeheartedly each as individual representatives of the people. The proposition which is before us cannot be by any amount of camouflage or whitewash be called a program of construction and progress. We all know in our hearts it's a program of destruction and retrogression. Certainly this is something that we are very fortunate now to find un-

ity behind. Let's get behind it, and support. In order that our positions may be clearly indicated, I would request a roll call.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested.

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

Mr. TYNDALE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I can't but help but being heartily in accord with the statements made by the esteemed colleague, Richard Berry of Cape Elizabeth. I believe now is the time for unity, it has been clearly drawn before us without our help. When I left this House this afternoon, I returned to my room and I tried to meditate a while on this problem, and I couldn't help but glance out of the window and watch the fertility of the trees outside and it recalled to my mind something that happened to me during the week end. I was walking about the farm, and I noticed the seedlings struggling to grow. There was growth everywhere, everything was reaching out grasping hold of itself to grow. I made a statement this afternoon about conservatism, and I wonder whether we are on a journey to nowhere. I feel that the State of Maine is trying to reach out and grow, certainly we all want to grow with it. There's nothing in my mind more determined at this moment that we have conquered in unity within our party and we move forward to a constructive program.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Milbridge, Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. KENNEDY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: These are of course the crucial hours of the 100th Legislature. Even though we may have some defectors in the ranks of the majority here this morning, I still think we might have enough here to indefinitely postpone the entire supplemental budget. I'm sure that there aren't many of you people that would want that to happen. I hope that we go forward and support Amendment "O," so that we may try to accomplish something with the money at hand. A vote of 98-45 against the sales tax increase would seem to me an overwhelm-

ing majority opposed to such a measure, but please let's do have some unity by saving some of the supplemental budget. I don't think that we want to destroy it all, and I don't think that we are going to be able to muster enough votes to pass a sales tax — we have tried that, and I am not in favor of bonding current services. We demonstrated that last week in the House of Representatives. Now we might make a step forward if we do adopt House Amendment "O." If we do not adopt it, I'm afraid that's the end of the supplemental budget for this session. Let's show some unity, even though we might have some defectors, let's show some unity and try and move forward with this amendment.

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

Mr. BRADEEN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Sometime when you have an opportunity plus the inclination, I suggest that you turn to the final pages of Gibbons Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. You will find there one sentence, which I now pass to you, this, "In the boundless annals of time, man's life and his labors are but a fleeting moment." This is a fleeting moment; use it well. Use it in a way so that you can go back to the people who sent you here and say there is the record, under pressure I stood fast. I thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Yarmouth, Mrs. Knapp.

Mrs. KNAPP: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As you all know I have worked and tried to get the pay for those in the lower bracket, but I can be on the losing side as well as on the winning side, and if I can't have it, I shall vote for amendment "O" just the same.

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

Mr. ESTEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This may be a fleeting moment in the annals of time, but to my knowledge this is the first time that any consideration for the supplemental item for the University of Maine has been considered openly

on the floor of the House. I would take just a moment to remind you that the total requests of the University were cut by more than a million dollars by the Appropriations Committee and the supplemental budget. Those cuts meant that half of the proposed number of new students could not be accommodated. It also meant that the new services for nursing and for industrial research and for ETV and forestry research and agricultural and engineering courses could not be carried out in this biennium. It also meant that the we could not supply the needed increase in operation and maintenance of the plant that the University has so badly needed. It would not provide for certain equipment and alterations in administration that were needed to meet the expanded enrollments.

You will recall that the million two hundred and fifty thousand dollar item in the supplemental budget would have provided for an additional three hundred students at the University who may be denied an education if we add another four hundred thousand dollar cut to that. This seems to be the only area that this four hundred thousand dollars could be applied. The university only appropriated to ask for enough in this appropriation to half way close the gap in salaries, in an institution where they already have thirty-six vacancies in their staff. And some of this four hundred thousand would make that gap even wider. I don't see how we can consider anything other than to keep the supplemental budget intact in order to provide the services so badly needed for the increasing number of students who are approaching college age and will be the citizens and the people of our state in the next few years.

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

Mr. WESTERFIELD: Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time only to make one point. Tonight we are voting on House Amendment "O." We have reached a crossroads. Tonight we can, if it is your mind, adopt House Amendment "O"; if not, tomorrow the sun will rise and you will again be faced with

the sales tax. Each of you must consider this carefully as you vote tonight whether we should reduce the supplemental budget to moderate proportions, or whether we should adopt a half-cent increase in the sales tax. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Bearce.

Mr. BEARCE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The meat axe apparently is a one-sided meat axe and it was all engineered as you know by the minority party without doubt. And the other boys have played ball with them, and they instead of taking it right down and cutting five, ten fifteen or twenty percent, right off the whole list, they pick out several various items, and one of the items is the University of Maine, that our honorable Mr. Estey spoke of. Is is certainly cutting the guts out of that university. Here's the man down below us here, he sends his sons to Cornell, and he'll vote against any education for the University of Maine, I think it is a doggone shame.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I resent the accusation that was just made on the floor of this House in regards to fellows following the minority party as Republican members. This is not a party issue, this is an issue for the people of the State of Maine, not the University of Maine or individual sanctions or efforts on behalf of any individuals, but for the interests of the whole state, an issue; and I resent those type remarks to the extent that we are being accused here as Republican members of falling under the hatchet of the minority party which is not true, not so, and I certainly want to emphasize that fact. We are here for an issue and an issue only in behalf of the people, the interest of the State of Maine, and that's what I am concerned with.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Two years

ago before the 99th Legislature the hospitals of our state came before us and presented to us that they were becoming desperate for a correction in the amount of state aid that they were being given on state cases. When I came to this session I looked upon some relief to the hospitals as one of the main priority items which faced this session. I think the program that we now have before us is a good one and represents perhaps the minimum of what we should do. If we cut out the \$500,000 as proposed in this amendment, I want you all to remember that you are cutting out with that undoubtedly a million dollars in federal funds. By so doing, you are making it so that the citizens of this state who have to go to a hospital are going to have to take up the tab, the hospitals certainly cannot continue to operate at a loss because they do not receive proper remuneration for these welfare cases. For that reason, I certainly oppose this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis.

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I will have to disagree with my good friend from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, that this is going to wreck the whole hospital plan, because I am very much interested in this hospital plan. I was so much interested in it that I went down and talked to the Commissioner and he tells me or he did tell me that if we adopted this cut, that it would take care of, in his opinion, practically everything that would need to be taken care of. It might be a little mite either one way or the other, it might be a little more than would be needed or it might be a little mite less than was needed, but from his talk I took it that he was perfectly satisfied. I disagree with the gentleman also that we will lose these matching funds. We will only lose matching funds insofar as the pool—as these people coming out of the pool, which is set up by the federal government, whereby the people who are receiving old age assistance and getting care from the state. If they go to the hospitals why the

federal government helps out, but we have a great many cases of the people going to the hospitals who do not receive old age assistance who just are sent there by the towns, who are found indigent and cannot pay their way and the towns have to pay it and they are not receiving and so the federal government does not match that by any means. They only match funds from the welfare department, and I did not ask him exactly what that would mean, but I know from my work in the welfare department and in working with these people who are receiving old age assistance, that it won't make no such difference in matching funds as has been stated, and I feel quite sure after the investigation that I have made, and mind you I am very, very much interested in these people, and I am very much interested in the hospitals, and I think that this is doing a good job for the hospitals, much, much greater than has ever been done and remember that after all that our people and a great many are out of work, have to pay these bills no matter how much you ask.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sherman, Mr. Storm.

Mr. STORM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would simply again like to remind you that if we don't provide these funds for hospital care at the state level, we will be providing them at the local level and out of our own pockets if we are unfortunate enough to have to go to the hospital during the next couple of years; what the hospitals are not able to make up to the program, they will have to make up by overcharging their paying patients. I am certainly going to oppose House Amendment "O," and I hope you will consider it carefully when you vote.

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

Mr. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I was very much disappointed in the stand the minority leaders have taken and I urge every Republican to get behind

Amendment "O." This is the show-down.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Guilford, Mr. Dodge.

Mr. DODGE: Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House: This amendment is a package deal. There's going to be things in it that we won't like, and there's things we will; but by and large, I agree that it is the best thing we have and I think we're coming out of this session without too bad a reputation. And I'm very much in favor of this amendment, and as I said before, I think this is the best thing we could do, and I think it's going to give us a pretty good reputation here.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is related to L. D. 1606, House Paper 1165, An Act Making Supplemental Appropriations for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1962 and June 30, 1963. The immediate question is the motion of the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Westerfield, that the House adopt House Amendment "O." A roll call has been requested.

For the Chair to order a roll call it must have an expression of a desire for a roll call by at least one-fifth the members present. Will those who desire a roll call please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned their count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than one-fifth having arisen, a roll call is ordered. The Speaker will restate the question. The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Westerfield, that the House adopt House Amendment "O." If you are in favor of adopting House Amendment "O," you will answer "yes" when your name is called; if you are opposed to the adoption of this amendment, you will answer "no" when your name is called.

The Clerk will call the roll.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Anderson, Ellsworth; Berman, Houlton; Bernard, Bradeen, Brown, Fairfield; Buckley,

Carter, Chapman, Norway; Choate, Cooper, Coulthard, Crockett, Curtis, Dennison, Dodge, Dunn, Durgin, Edwards, Finley, Gill, Ham, Hancock, Hanson, Bradford; Hanson, Lebanon; Hartshorn, Hinds, Hughes, Humphrey, Jones, Kennedy, Kimball, Letourneau, Lincoln, Linnekin, Maddox, Mathews, Merrill, Minsky, Moore, Morrill, Perry, Philbrick, Augusta; Philbrick, Bangor; Poirier, Roberts, Rust, Shaw, Smith, Strong; Sproul, Swett, Thaanum, Thornton, Turner, Tweedie, Tyndale, Vaughn, Wade, Waterman, Westerfield, Whitman, Winchenpaw, Wood, Young.

NAY — Albair, Anderson, Greenville; Baker, Baxter, Beane, Augusta; Beane, Moscow; Bearce, Bedard, Berry, Cape Elizabeth; Berry, Portland; Binnette, Boissonneau, Boothby, Bragdon, Brewer, Briggs, Brown, Vassalboro; Burns, Bussiere, Chapman, Gardiner; Davis, Dostie, Lewiston; Dostie, Winslow; Drake, Edgerly, Estey, Fogg, Gallant, Gardner, Hague, Hardy, Harrington, Haughn, Hendricks, Hichborn, Hopkinson, Hutchins, Jalbert, Jobin, Johnson, Smithfield; Johnson, Stockholm; Karkos, Kellam, Kilroy, Knapp, Knight, Lane, Lantagne, Littlefield, Maxwell, Nadeau, Biddeford; Pike, Plante, Prince, Prue, Schulten, Sevigny, Shepard, Smith, Bar Harbor; Smith, Falmouth; Stewart, Storm, Tardiff, Walker, Walls, Wellman, Wheaton, Whitney.

ABSENT — Berman, Auburn; Brown, South Portland; Cyr, Danes, Dennett, Jameson, Lacharite, Levesque, Lowery, MacGregor, Malenfant, Matheson, Morse, Nadeau, Lewiston; Noel, Sirois, Stevens, Waltz, Williams.

Yes 63; No 68; Absent 19.

The **SPEAKER**: Sixty-three having voted in the affirmative and sixty-eight in the negative, with nineteen absent, the motion to adopt House Amendment "O" does not prevail.

The **SPEAKER**: Will the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, approach the rostrum please.

(Conference at rostrum)

On motion of Mr. Baxter of Pittsfield, the House voted to reconsid-

er its action whereby it indefinitely postponed House Amendment "E."

On further motion of the same gentleman, House Amendment "E" was adopted.

On motion of Mr. Baxter of Pittsfield, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby it indefinitely postponed House Amendment "J."

On further motion of the same gentleman, House Amendment "J" was adopted.

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

Mr. **BAXTER**: Mr. Speaker, I now move that this bill be passed to be engrossed.

The **SPEAKER**: The gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, moves that this Bill be passed to be engrossed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

Mr. **HAUGHN**: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the expediency with the hammer, but I still think that consideration of this Bill is still due. We reversed ourselves once, you've got us back in the position again where you require two-thirds vote for this House to reconsider once again.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair would like to inform the gentleman that it does not take a two-thirds vote to reconsider an action if it is done the same or the next legislative day.

Mr. **HAUGHN**: May I say I am opposed to the motion that is pending now to be adopted by this House, due to the fact that I think there is other consideration to be given here and I think the members should be heard and express their views and the loud "no's" I heard it certainly is determined that way, and with the fastness of the hammer without somebody being on the ball following this fast procedure, why they get lost in the shuffle. And I hope and I know there will be more opposed and I demand a division when the vote is so taken.

The **SPEAKER**: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, that the bill be passed to be engrossed. The Chair will order

a division. All those in favor of passage to be engrossed of this legislative document as amended, please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned their count.

A division of the House was had.

Forty-four having voted in the affirmative and eighty-one having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

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

Mr. BAXTER: Mr. Speaker, I request a roll call.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I request this bill lie on the Special Appropriations Calendar.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, has requested that this legislative document be placed upon the House Appropriations Calendar pending the request of the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, for a roll call.

The House will be at ease.

House at Ease

Called to order by the Speaker.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill 1606 has been before us for some time. It has been thoroughly discussed, it has been to two committees of conference. I am sure most of you will agree with me that it is getting slightly late in the session. Again I place before you for your consideration L. D. 1606.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, has called up for consideration L. D. 1606, pending the motion of the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, for a roll call on the motion to engross.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I request this L. D. be placed on the Special Appropriations Calendar.

The SPEAKER: The House will be at ease.

House at Ease

Called to order by the Speaker.

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

Mr. BAXTER: Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent briefly to address the House.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, requests unanimous consent to briefly address the House. Is there objection?

(Cries of "Yes")

The Chair hears objection. The House will be at ease.

House at Ease

Called to order by the Speaker.

On motion of Mr. Baxter of Pittsfield,

Recessed for fifteen minutes.

After Recess

8:50 P.M.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Will the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, approach the rostrum please?

(Conference at rostrum)

Mr. Baxter of Pittsfield presented the following Order out of order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that the House Order setting up a Special Calendar on which there may be placed, at the request of a member of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs, Bills and Resolves carrying or requiring an appropriation, be and hereby is repealed and annulled;

AND BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that any Bill or Resolve on such Special Calendar at the time this Order becomes effective shall stand Tabled and Unassigned.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, may I ask on the introduction of this order whether or not it will not require a two-thirds vote?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will inform the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, that if this order were to be passed today it would re-

quire a two-thirds vote, but if it is tabled and lays over until tomorrow it only requires a majority vote.

Mr. HAUGHN: The motion before now stands as what, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: There is no motion before the House.

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, knowing the purpose and intent of this order, I move indefinite postponement of this order and ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: Since this amendment—or since this order is an amendment to the rules, and under the rules must lay on the table for one day, it cannot be acted upon today. Therefore, the Chair rules that the motion to indefinitely postpone the order is out of order.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I move suspension of the rules in order to be able to present this.

The SPEAKER: Will the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, approach the rostrum please?

(Conference at rostrum)

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, under the condition of it being 9:00 o'clock and knowing that we are able to handle this situation tomorrow without suspending the rules any

further, I will withdraw my motion and now move we adjourn for the evening.

The SPEAKER: Will the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, approach the rostrum please?

(Conference at rostrum)

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, out of courtesy to our kind Speaker why I now withdraw my motion in order to allow the gentleman to put it on the table and then after that I would make the motion to adjourn.

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

Mr. BAXTER: What do you want me to do?

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, moves that the House lay on the table until tomorrow — that the Order lay on the table until tomorrow. (laughter)

I'm sure everyone misunderstood me, because I said the Order lay on the House table until tomorrow. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

On motion of Mr. Baxter of Pittsfield,

Adjourned until 9:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.