

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

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



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

LEGISLATIVE RECORD

OF THE

*One Hundred and Third
Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

Volume II

May 10 to June 15, 1967

**KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE**

HOUSE

Tuesday, May 23, 1967

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Donald Kroah of Augusta,

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

**Papers from the Senate
Reports of Committees
Leave to Withdraw**

Covered by Other Legislation

Report of the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act to Authorize a Bond Issue in Amount of \$2,200,000 to Provide Funds for School Building Construction" (S. P. 155) (L. D. 326) reporting Leave to Withdraw, as covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Providing for a Coordinator of Apprenticeship in the Department of Education" (S. P. 259) (L. D. 639)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, Reports were read and accepted in concurrence.

Ought to Pass

Report of the Committee on State Government reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act Providing for a Coordinator of Apprenticeship in the Department of Education" (S. P. 199) (L. D. 430)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Providing for State Government Internship Program" (S. P. 200) (L. D. 431)

Report of the Committee on Towns and Counties reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to County Funds for Buildings for Education Programs for Retarded Children" (S. P. 201) (L. D. 432)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Expenditure of Assessment for Fire Protection Tax in Certain Townships" (S. P. 571) (L. D. 1441)

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

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

**Ought to Pass with
Committee Amendment**

Report of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act Prohibiting Hunting from or on Public Ways" (S. P. 262) (L. D. 643) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to Transportation and Possession of Liquor by Minors" (S. P. 407) (L. D. 1038) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report of the Committee on Towns and Counties on Bill "An Act relating to Review of and Issuing Bonds for Projects under Housing Authority Law" (S. P. 354) (L. D. 938) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

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

In the House, the Reports were read and accepted in concurrence and the Bills read twice. Committee Amendment "A" to each was read by the Clerk and adopted in concurrence, and tomorrow assigned for third reading of the Bill.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Towns and Counties reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act to Authorize Cumberland County to Raise Money for Court House Capital Improvements" (S. P. 251) (L. D. 611)

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. COUTURIER
of Androscoggin
Mrs. SPROUL of Lincoln
Mr. MILLS of Franklin
— of the Senate.
Messrs. CROMMETT
of Millinocket

FARRINGTON of China
 SNOWE of Auburn
 ROBERTSON of Brewer
 MEISNER
 of Dover-Foxcroft
 WIGHT of Presque Isle
 — of the House.

Minority Report of same
 Committee reporting "Ought not to
 pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the follow-
 ing member:

Mr. NADEAU of Sanford
 — of the House.

Came from the Senate with the
 Majority Report accepted and the
 Bill passed to be engrossed.

In the House: Reports were read.
 The Majority "Ought to pass"
 Report was accepted in concurren-
 ce, the Bill read twice and
 assigned for third reading
 tomorrow.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Preserve and
 Enhance Scenic Values in the State
 of Maine" (S. P. 500) (L. D. 1215)
 which was indefinitely postponed in
 non-concurrence in the House on
 May 19.

Came from the Senate with that
 body voting to insist on its former
 action whereby the Bill was passed
 to be engrossed, and asking for
 a Committee of Conference.

In the House: On motion of Mr.
 Littlefield of Hampden, the House
 voted to insist and join in the
 Committee of Conference.

Non-Concurrent Matter Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act relating to Right
 to Vote on Approval of Final Urban
 Renewal Plans" (H. P. 829) (L.
 D. 1237) on which the House ac-
 cepted Report "A" reporting
 "Ought to pass" of the Committee
 on Legal Affairs and passed the
 Bill to be engrossed on May 19.

Came from the Senate with
 Report "B" reporting "Ought not
 to pass" accepted in non-con-
 currence.

In the House: On motion of Mr.
 Harvey of Woolwich, tabled pend-
 ing further consideration and spe-
 cially assigned for Thursday, May
 25.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Enact-
 ment of Municipal Zoning" (H. P.
 853) (L. D. 1386) which was passed
 to be engrossed in the House on
 May 15.

Came from the Senate passed
 to be engrossed as amended by
 Senate Amendment "A" in non-
 concurrence.

In the House: The House voted
 to recede and concur with the Sen-
 ate.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Granting Compli-
 mentary Fishing Licenses for Cer-
 tain Maine Residents in Armed
 Forces" (H. P. 1120) (L. D. 1592)
 which was passed to be en-
 grossed as amended by House
 Amendment "A" in the House on
 May 12.

Came from the Senate with
 House Amendment "A" indefinitely
 postponed and the Bill passed to
 be engrossed without Amendment
 in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mr.
 Carrier of Westbrook, the House
 voted to insist and ask for a
 Committee on Conference.

Orders

The SPEAKER: The Chair recog-
 nizes the gentleman from Fairfield,
 Mr. Champagne.

Mr. CHAMPAGNE: Mr. Speaker,
 I would like to inquire if the House
 has in its possession Senate Paper
 604, L. D. 1587, Resolve Regulating
 Fishing on Part of Moose River,
 Somerset County.

The SPEAKER: The answer is
 in the affirmative.

Thereupon, on motion of the
 same gentleman, the House voted
 to reconsider its action of yester-
 day whereby it voted to recede and
 concur; and on further motion of
 the same gentleman the House
 voted to recede.

Senate Amendment "B" was then
 read by the Clerk and adopted in
 concurrence.

Mr. Champagne of Fairfield then
 offered House Amendment "A"
 and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to
 S. P. 604, L. D. 1587, Resolve,

Regulating Fishing on Part of Moose River, Somerset County.

Amend said resolve by inserting after the Title, the following:

'Emergency preamble. Whereas, Acts and resolves of the Legislature do not become effective until 90 days after adjournment of the Legislature unless enacted as emergencies; and

Whereas, the following legislation is vitally necessary for the conservation of fish for both the inhabitants of Maine and our tourists; and

Whereas, the following legislation is vital to the economy of the State; and

Whereas, in the judgment of the Legislature, these facts create an emergency within the meaning of the Constitution of Maine and require the following legislation as immediately necessary for the preservation of the public peace, health and safety; now, therefore, be it'

Further amend said resolve by adding at the end, the following:

'Emergency clause. In view of the emergency cited in the preamble, this resolve shall take effect when approved.'

House Amendment "A" was adopted and the Resolve was passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "B" and House Amendment "A" in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Nadeau of Sanford was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. NADEAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have here an editorial that's written by Publisher William Wright from Sanford; and as you know, this is a Republican paper and this can be checked out with all my fine Republican friends from York County. The editorial is on "Sales Tax Increase" and its byline "A Cruel Hoax Indeed."

"Governor Curtis has correctly labelled the politically-inspired Republican plans for a one-cent sales tax increase as "a cruel hoax" on the taxpayers of Maine. We agree wholeheartedly and vehemently oppose any such outrageous

raid on the pocketbooks of our citizens.

The Republican plan is like a mackerel — shiny and beautiful in the moonlight but stinking in the light of day.

It is cruel because it paints a mirage of relief to the property taxpayer, who should know better by now than to trust the promises of increased "state" aid. "State" aid, hell; that's OUR money they're using. OUR money, yes, sent to Augusta where the cream is removed by the bureaucracy and a small portion of skimmed milk returned to the towns as "state" aid.

A hoax indeed! If the property taxpayer wants to bother studying our recent history, he'll see what a hoax it is indeed!

Where has the money gone? For instance — a few years ago our state budget was in the \$60 million range (less than the total increase asked for!). Now the budget is \$191 million. Let us ask the taxpayer how much his taxes have gone down since they increased the budget by \$130 million — over 300 per cent! How much relief have we really had? In other words, just where in blue blazes has all the money gone?

We've got one answer — while our state's population has remained the same, "the number of state employees has doubled! Think of it! We now need double the amount of state employees to take care of the same amount of citizens and obviously to spend three times as much money as they needed before! Is any citizen living better, paying less taxes, or saving more money since this huge increase took place? We'll let each individual answer that for himself.

The Governor's "Modest" Program. The Republican plan is a hoax because they say that Governor Curtis' plan is not "rich" enough, that it doesn't meet the needs of the times! Hogwash! Here are a few examples of his "too-modest" program:

1. Curtis proposes a 50 per cent increase in aid to education!
2. Curtis proposes a 51 per cent increase in general subsidies!

3. Curtis proposes a 92 per cent increase in vocational education!

4. Curtis proposes a 30 per cent increase for the University of Maine!

5. Curtis proposes a 34 per cent increase for state colleges! Not progressive? Not enough money? Not "rich" enough for the blood of economically poor Maine? Who's trying to kid us? The facts are there. Governor Curtis' budget is the biggest in Maine's history, with the biggest increase in Maine's history (\$54 million) and now the formerly "frugal" Republicans say it isn't enough!

Saturday Rallies. Then last Saturday school subsidy "rallies" were ordered (oops, we mean held) all over the state to sell the \$26 million Republican mackerel in the form of L. D. 1642 to some 4,000 trained seals (exempting those who were there under duress.) This bill promises \$10 million extra, over and above Governor Curtis' 50 per cent increase in education IF the seals will swallow the mackerel cast in the form of a one-cent increase in the sales tax. Do it fast, don't contemplate, don't question — just swallow and flap your flippers in delight at the thought of \$10 million.

Questions that need answers. Don't question the fact that at least 140 towns won't get any money at all while others get a 100 per cent increase. Don't question the fact that Biddeford with 20,000 people will get less money than much smaller (and richer) Cape Elizabeth. Don't question the fact that the present formula is all fouled up and needs straightening out.

Above all, don't question the fact that only \$10 million is going to come back out of the \$26 million increase in revenue from the hike in the sales tax!

If education is in such a mess that we need \$10 million, why not get the whole \$26 million to straighten out the situation? Where's the other \$16 million going to go except to be squandered and dissipated in the bottomless pit in Augusta? You know where it's going, but none dared ask. Trained seals indeed.

Another disaster is hidden in this whole fishy deal. The extra school subsidy of \$10 million is only for one year. That means that in two years the state will be committed to double that figure for the following two years, which will mean a budget of over \$300 million plus ANOTHER sales tax increase to 6 per cent! Just who on earth thinks that the State of Maine can stand this fiscal insanity?

Under caption of, Would hurt Industrial Development. No one has thought what this one-cent increase will do to industrial development and expansion! We now penalize new and existing industries bringing in new equipment with the 4 per cent tax. Are we going to try to sell industry on coming to Maine and then tell them we'll soak them 5 per cent on new equipment? We have seen what happened in the past to many Maine industries that failed to keep up with the times by going along with old machinery. How foolish can we be?

We suggest — What would we do if we were in control? Here are our answers:

1. Enact Governor Curtis' program. It will more than meet the needs of the State in the next two years. Certainly a \$54 million increase is about all we can stand.

2. If the legislature rejects his tax program, we suggest that Governor Curtis slash EVERY department request to bring the budget in line with modest increases in revenue. Governor Muskie did it during his term and nobody suffered. The Republicans used to call him a spendthrift! What a joke! Their program makes him look like Scrooge!

3. Take the next 18 months to straighten out the subsidy mess and the administration mess in the Department of Education. A good research committee could bring order out of chaos and make subsidies fair to every community.

4. To finance these future recognized needs, we suggest passing emergency legislation to bring the millions and millions of dollars of dedicated funds of the State Highway Department into the general fund of the state under state control. It is high time that

this separate monarchy under its own ruler, with its own funds, become a part of our state's democracy and share our fiscal responsibility.

If the state is in financial distress, it is ridiculous to allow this one department to go on spending millions of dollars every year when part of the money could be put to better advantage at that given moment. In other words, build new roads yes, but build them in tune with the state's economy.

Again, Governor Curtis has called for a somewhat similar plan. But, alas, the Republicans can't go along with anything he suggests.

Hasty Political Power Play. What does all of this add up to?

Simply this — the Republican plan is a hasty, politically - motivated power play to embarrass Governor Curtis. It is fiscally irresponsible, and against every tenet of a true Republican. It calls for more money, more state employees, more giveaways — just what the Republicans have stood against for years. It is an unbelievable performance by supposedly mature men. If they want to destroy their party forever, this year's legislative performance will mark the beginning of the end.

We urge every Republican to reject their leader's ill - a d v i s e d political scheme. We urge them to place their responsibility to their tax-paying constituents above gross party politics. We urge them to remember their Republican beliefs of the past and to stand for fiscal sanity.

We urge every Democrat to stand behind Governor Curtis. If they hold fast and true, they can prevent this bill from being railroaded through with a two-thirds majority.

If it does pass, we urge Governor Curtis to veto it, fight it with every possible means. Perhaps a long, hot, unpaid summer in Augusta will bring some people to their senses." And I would like to request at this time that especially the people from Oxford County and York County, as you all know we are all bordered by New Hampshire towns, to at least support the young family man and the people on the fixed income and defeat any

increase in the sales tax. Thank you.

Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that Mr. Couture of Lewiston be excused from attendance because of the death of his mother; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Members of the House of Representatives of the 103rd Legislature extend to Mr. Couture and family its condolences and expression of sorrow; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Clerk of the House of Representatives be directed to send a certified copy of this Order to Mr. Couture in token of our sympathy.

The Order received passage.

Mrs. Hanson of Lebanon was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mrs. HANSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to make only one reference to this quoted article by the Representative from Sanford, Mr. Nadeau. I do take offense to the criticism of Education received either directly or indirectly through this article. I feel that our Committee acted — they said that it was with excessive haste and we acted without consideration, for the merits of the bill. And I don't agree with that.

We spent hours and days on 636 and L. D. 1642 and we felt that we came out with a good bill which was for the best interests of education. That's my only comment.

Mr. Sullivan of Portland was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In my opinion Mr. Nadeau in what he said covered the ground very thoroughly, and after listening to him it is my considered opinion that the proposal by the seeming leaders of the Republican Party I would say it verges on bribery.

I have received over the past three weeks over twenty letters and the gist of those letters are practically all the same. And they say — this is a wonderful thing

for education, the teachers et cetera et cetera; and then they say — we go along and if the sales tax is necessary we are for it. They don't have the decency, the ethics, the aboveboardness, to say a sales tax or an income tax; and I am frankly amazed at the Republican Party who have been control of this State for the last sixty years, and partially in control even in the 102nd Legislature. And the Republican Party who were in control of this State over the last fifty years, they should have appropriated at least a hundred million dollars for education or an average of two million dollars a year. They didn't. That's why the 102nd had to advance so much for education because in effect they were over a hundred million dollars in the red.

Now you have the Republican Party wanting to use as a gimmick the sales tax. In effect what they want to do is load an additional tax on the small income people. Why don't they consider an income tax about as follows: Five thousand exemption for a couple, a thousand for each dependent. That would mean the average family of five with a couple or two children would have an exemption to start with of \$8,000. Why shouldn't they? They're already overtaxed. And when they come up with this gimmick that people with money they buy more. Let me give you just one illustration of how that works.

People with big incomes they usually control a business or they're one of the main officers. So they go out and they buy a nice Cadillac or a Lincoln or some high priced car, which they charge off in their business as a cost of doing business. The car, the sales tax is charged off. On top of that every quart of oil that goes in there, every gallon of gas, the upkeep of it — and if they should happen to have minor repairs possibly the third year, that's charged off. The average citizen with the small income trying to raise a family needs a car to go to business. They go out and they probably buy a used car, possibly for six hundred to a thousand dollars. In the first place they would pay high finance charges in buying

the car. In the next place every quart of oil, every gallon of gas, every minor repair, they have to pay and they usually pay through the nose. Now that's just one illustration of this camouflage when they say that the people with large incomes pay their just share of the taxation under a sales tax.

Further, people with wealth and control of business, with their paid legal lobbyists, they are all ready and over the years they have been saving in many ways. They usually get practically everything they want and so they make money that way. Now I have tried to be as brief as I could and yet give you the facts. I consider that proposal of that sales tax — and I myself consider that I'm frankly myself and it's my opinion that this is a form of bribery. Thank you.

House Reports of Committees Leave to Withdraw Covered by Other Legislation

Mr. Hanson from the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act relating to Property Tax Exemption for Persons Reaching Sixty-five Years of Age" (H. P. 727) (L. D. 1051) reported Leave to Withdraw, as covered by other legislation.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Age of Persons Liable for Poll Taxes" (H. P. 1039) (L. D. 1511)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Robinson from the Committee on Taxation reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Providing for a Credit Against Sales and Use Tax on Industrial Machinery and Equipment" (H. P. 769) (L. D. 1116)

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Ross from the Committee on Taxation reported same on Bill "An Act Providing for a Luxury Tax on Luggage, Jewelry, Furs and Toilet Preparations" (H. P. 426) (L. D. 590)

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Hanson of Gardiner, tabled pending ac-

ceptance of the Report and specially assigned for Thursday, May 25.)

**Ought to Pass with
Committee Amendment**

Mr. Crockett from the Committee on Highways on Bill "An Act relating to State Aid for Construction of Highways" (H. P. 604) (L. D. 848) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and on motion of Mr. Crockett of Freeport was accepted and the Bill read twice.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT
"A" to H. P. 604, L. D. 848, Bill,
"An Act Relating to State Aid for
Construction of Highways."

Amend said Bill by inserting at the beginning of the first line (same in L. D. 848) the underlined abbreviation and figure 'Sec. 1.'

Further amend said Bill by adding at the end, before the Statement of Facts, the following:

'Sec. 2. Effective date. This Act will become effective when the State Highway Commission determines that funds are available from the General Highway Fund to finance this Act.'

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I was going to request as to whether or not we could have some explanation with regards to Committee Amendment "A" to this bill. It would appear to me that this does add substantially to the Highway bill. Is such information available to the House?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, poses a question through the Chair to any member of the Highway Committee who may answer if they choose.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Crockett.

Mr. CROCKETT: I would like to ask Mr. Bragdon if he is referring to State Police that ask for twenty-eight men. And the Committee said no, we will give you fifteen men; that saved approximately \$116,000. Is that the question?

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, consider his question answered?

The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. BRAGDON: No, I had reference to filing number H-337.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, poses a question through the Chair to any member of the Highway Committee who may answer if they choose.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt Committee Amendment "A"?

The motion prevailed, and the Bill was assigned for third reading tomorrow.

Mr. Nadeau from the Committee on Highways on Bill "An Act Providing for Area Directional Signs for Route 6 and Maritime Provinces" (H. P. 831) (L. D. 1239) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Bill read twice.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT
"A" to H. P. 831, L. D. 1239, Bill,
"An Act Providing for Area Directional Signs for Route 6 and Maritime Provinces."

Amend said Bill by striking out all of the last underlined paragraph and inserting in place thereof the following:

'16-A. Route 6 and Maritime Provinces: Such sign shall be constructed and maintained on Interstate 95 near the northbound Howland exit.'

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill assigned for third reading tomorrow.

Mr. Wood from the Committee on Highways on Bill "An Act to Authorize the Reconstruction and Elimination of Hazardous Locations on Portions of State Route 6" (H. P. 404) (L. D. 570) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Bill read twice.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT
"A" to H. P. 404, L. D. 570, Bill,
"An Act to Authorize the Recon-
struction and Elimination of
Hazardous Locations on Portions of
State Route 6."

Amend said Bill by striking out
in the 6th line (5th line of L. D.
570) the figure "\$850,000" and in-
serting in place thereof the figure
'\$3,000,000'

Further amend said Bill in sec-
tion 2 by inserting after the word
'bonds' in the 3rd line (same in
L. D. 570) the words 'redeemable
before maturity'; and by striking
out in the 4th line (3rd line of
L. D. 570) the figure "\$850,000"
and inserting in place thereof the
figure '\$3,000,000'; and by inserting
at the end of said section 2 the
following sentence: 'Said bonds
when paid at maturity or otherwise
retired shall not be reissued, but
may be refunded on terms more
favorable to the State than those
in the original issue.'

Further amend said Bill in sec-
tion 6 by striking out the words
'at maturity' in the 3rd line (2nd
and 3rd lines in L. D. 570)

Further amend said Bill by strik-
ing out in the 2nd line of the 2nd
paragraph of the referendum (1st
line of the 2nd paragraph of L.
D. 570) the figure "\$850,000" and
inserting in place thereof the figure
'\$3,000,000'

Committee Amendment "A" was
adopted and the Bill assigned for
third reading tomorrow.

Mr. Hanson from the Committee
on Taxation on Bill "An Act relat-
ing to Tax Exemption for Benevo-
lent and Charitable Institutions
Conducted for Benefit of Non-
residents" (H. P. 949) (L. D. 1380)
reported "Ought to pass," a s
amended by Committee Amend-
ment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted
and the Bill read twice.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT
"A" to H. P. 949, L. D. 1380, Bill,
"An Act Relating to Tax Exemp-
tion for Benevolent and Charitable
Institutions Conducted for Benefit
of Nonresidents."

Amend said Bill in the last line
(same in L. D. 1380) by striking
out the underlined figure "\$35" and
inserting in place thereof the
underlined figure "\$20"

Committee Amendment "A" was
adopted and the Bill assigned for
third reading tomorrow.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Com-
mittee on Highways on Bill "An
Act to Make Allocations from the
General Highway Fund for the Fis-
cal Years Ending June 30, 1968 and
June 30, 1969" (H. P. 99) (L. D.
126) reporting same in a new draft
(H. P. 1173) (L. D. 1672) under
same title and that it "Ought to
pass"

Report was signed by the follow-
ing members:

Messrs. FERGUSON of Oxford
ROSS of Piscataquis
GREELEY of Waldo
— of the Senate.

Messrs. CROCKETT of Freeport
NADEAU of Biddeford
BURNHAM of Naples
MCNALLY of Ellsworth
WOOD of Brooks
DUDLEY of Enfield
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Com-
mittee reporting "Ought not to
pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the follow-
ing member:

Mr. WALTZ of Waldoboro
— of the House.

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recog-
nizes the gentleman from Freeport,
Mr. Crockett.

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker
and Members of the House: I rise
to move acceptance of the Majority
Report which was nine to one.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman
from Freeport, Mr. Crockett, now
moves the House accept the
Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

The Chair recognizes the gentle-
man from Waldoboro, Mr. Waltz.

Mr. WALTZ: Mr. Speaker and
Members of the House: I rise in
opposition to the motion just made
by my good friend, Mr. Crockett
from Freeport

You will note that I am in a
very small minority in signing this
report, but I feel most strongly

about reserving the rights and privileges of the Maine voter and to sustain the judgment that they made at the polls.

The 102nd Legislature passed the so-called Sunday Liquor Bill. All of you are familiar with the steps that were taken and the end results, yet within a year a bill of a similar nature was presented to this House. This bill that we are discussing today to me is a parallel situation.

The original bill that was presented in the very early days of this Legislature made no reference to one item of which I am extremely critical, and that is this: a million dollars for building construction. Now, many of you may recall that at the special session of the 102nd Legislature held a year ago, a bond issue in the amount of \$2,500,000 was submitted to the public on a referendum, the purpose of which was to build a highway office building. At the election the voters turned this thing down, that is the referendum, by approximately a three to two margin.

Now I maintain that this particular item here is pretty much a subterfuge on the part of those who are particularly anxious to see this building constructed. They have this item of a million dollars to be taken from current revenue, and in addition appropriating a million and a half from highway surplus, which is the amount which our people turned down at an election less than a year ago. Missionaries have been working upon me to convert me to their way of thinking. One of the statements that they made was that the leadership in both the Republican and Democratic Parties were in favor of this bill.

This I am reluctant to believe because in my thinking the leadership in both parties are rather astute politicians and are keenly conscious of what the people back home are thinking.

Here's another approach. I've always understood that the Highway income, so to speak, was dedicated revenue to be used for the construction, maintenance of highways and certain allied activities. How can we justify taking two and one

half million dollars from this dedicated fund to build a building costing two and a half million dollars?

I may be looking at this from an entirely wrong approach, but ladies and gentlemen, believe me, I have no desire to go back home to the people in my district and explain to them after they had turned this proposition down by approximately three to two, to tell them why I disregarded their wishes in this matter.

I propose to take little or no further action on this particular item. How you vote is entirely in your hands. I am going to continue to vote against this bill both now and on subsequent occasions, as it comes before the House. I feel quite consciously that this is the right thing and I certainly wish to reflect the thinking of the voters of the State.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Waldoboro with regard to this feature built into the highway construction bill. I became aware that this was going to be done some two weeks ago, and I had very grave misgivings. I'm not saying that the people are going to turn down the highway issue — of course they're not, but it seems to me that we're throwing something back at them which they definitely turned down only in the last election. I don't think this is going to leave a good taste with the people back home, to think that they were completely disregarded by the Highway Committee in this Legislature in coming up with this proposal to build this building.

We of the Appropriations Committee were somewhat assured a week or so back that because this construction of this building was something which was going to alleviate an overcrowded situation in the offices of other departments, that the Appropriations Committee was going to have an opportunity to sit down with Highways and discuss this proposal with them. For some reason, of which I have no knowledge, this meeting did not

come about. If I had been privileged to sit in on such a meeting, I think I would have taken the same position that the gentleman from Waldoboro has just now taken—that I think that the Highway Department would be smart at least to wait another two years, they probably can manage, before they insist upon building this building which the people so emphatically refused to give them in the last referendum.

I think that he has a very strong point—I think it's unwise legislation — we shall probably all vote for the Highway bill and we'll pass it, but I don't like it.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I also have sympathy with the gentleman from Waldoboro, Mr. Waltz. I had intended to table this bill for a couple of days, but if we give it its first two readings this morning, he still will have a chance to offer an amendment tomorrow and at that time we could vote on the specific merits of that amendment.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a member of the Highway Committee, and a member that's served before, this didn't meet with exactly my pleasure. However, I couldn't see—I couldn't offer an alternative that would be better, so I went along with the Majority Report.

Now let me say that the people were told that this was for a highway building and nobody got out and sold a bill of goods to them that we needed the building and went into any great detail like they did the Archives building. We needed the Archives Building as far as I'm concerned like I need a hole in the head. Nevertheless, there was no salesmanship done on it, and they weren't told that other people were going to benefit. For instance, the office space problem will be relieved for at least four years by additional space for several departments. Let me tell you what a few of them are:

Including the Governor's staff, the Legislature, Public Utilities Commission; you see the Public Utilities Commission will be moved from the State House Office Building and that will make available space for the Legislature and the Executive Department, Education, Mental Health and Corrections, Agriculture, Forestry, and the Retirement personnel, Parks and Recreation and Taxation, and this will be accomplished by moving the State Highway Department into a new building to be financed by transferring \$1,500,000 from the highway surplus account and allotting \$1,000,000 from current revenue—general highway revenue. So as you can see if I go on, this is page 2 of the report that was given to the Committee. Let me say that I don't have a better alternative and there is space problems in several of these departments—probably this would be the only way that we should take care of it in this term.

I would further like to say that this was done without too much knowledge of this Committee, this was done by the leadership of both Parties meeting with the Governor, meeting with the different department heads and the shape of the General Fund revenue and the conditions as they are, this seemed to be the only way that they could solve the problem and relieve the space shortage, and at this time I'm willing to go along with the Majority Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hollis, Mr. Harriman.

Mr. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I stand in support of Representative Waltz from Waldoboro. The majority of the constituents of each one of us represented in this House voted against an office building. I do not think that we have any right as legislators to circumvent their desires, neither do I believe that we should if we had the right. I am against more office space anyway for state employees, if you make more they'll fill it up with more employees. I suggest that we defeat this bill, and that the two and a half million dollars they're

going to use here can cut down the bond issue, and I move that we accept the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the House that the pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Crockett, to accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

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

Mr. SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have to say "Amen" to what Mr. Harriman, Representative Harriman, just said.

I've gone up into some of these departments, including the Highway Department, and if they showed a little judgment—I'd like to run that Highway Department and I'd eliminate just to start with about twenty-five percent of the help! And, if they kept their records in a modern way instead of needing more space they could cut down and use probably from a half to two-thirds, they could eliminate at least one third of the space they've now got; and if they would have some of the help up there work, then I'll bet you that with half of them I could have one person, and not work very hard, do the work that at least half of them let's say two of them do, and I believe in some instances one could do the work that three of them do. Thank you.

Mr. Evans of Freedom then asked for a division.

The SPEAKER: A vote has been requested.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It's very obvious, as the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, stated, that the real point of discussion here, in the major part at least, is wherein it concerns the building itself, and certainly I hope that hastily we will not defeat this measure. I think as has been stated that the thing to do would be to accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report and that tomorrow when the bill is up for a third reader if you have an amendment to put in, or amendments to put in, against the

bill then would be the time to do it, but certainly the defeat of this bill should not be entertained and I certainly hope for that reason that the motion to accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report will prevail and I ask for a division.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I move this item lie upon the table until Thursday, May 25.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, now moves that item 9, L. D. 126, be tabled and specially assigned for Thursday, May 25, pending the motion of the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Crockett, that the House accept the "Ought to pass" Report.

Mr. Birt of East Millinocket then requested a division on the tabling motion.

The SPEAKER: A vote has been requested on the tabling motion. As many as are in favor of tabling will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

54 having voted in the affirmative and 63 having voted in the negative, the tabling motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Limerick, Mr. Carroll.

Mr. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: At this time I would like to point out to the House, the fact that having been a member of the Museum Study Committee at your last session of Legislature, it was pointed out to us that there was a great need for space, that departments are hiring space all over Augusta and to operate efficiently we should have additional space here, and whether we like it or not we realize that state government is certainly growing and we have a great necessity right in the Education Department alone. These people are so crowded that the officials here recently to evaluate the State Department of Education were shocked and surprised to see people working so close, their desks are so close that their voices are carrying from one desk to another; it's impossible for

these people to work efficiently. Therefore, I would urge you that where we have an opportunity to have the State Highway Department use their revenues to build an office building, and I really feel that we should go along with them on this and that will make additional space available for the departments that are presently crowded, and I hope that you will give this an "ought to pass" report.

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

Mr. SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The reason that they have those desks so close together is the fact in my opinion, considered opinion, that most of these heads of departments — they get in there, and they immediately start to build themselves a nice little empire, like the old-time kings, and they have used these departments for patronage! And they have also used very able people in their parties with, in my opinion, understandings — they have rewarded those people in many ways, either with promises of jobs for them or their friends. In other words, they have influenced them, which in my opinion and under my code of ethics is a form of bribery! And I am frankly so fed up in looking into these various departments — and when I say looking in, it means that I've spent a lot of time — and when I find that in one department the gentleman directly and indirectly is paid, not by State money as they say, but by the taxpayers' money of this State — and that gentleman, the head of this department, to the best of my knowledge and belief directly and indirectly draws somewhere between thirty-five and forty thousand dollars from the State, and in the investigation of what he is doing he spends about ten percent and not over fifteen percent of his time in earning that money, and he spends, we'll say — let's say give him another five percent, so we'll say then he is spending about eighty percent of his time in a private practice. That's one.

A little later I may give you the facts on another gentleman who directly and indirectly, he is

the head of a certain department in this State, and that gentleman directly and indirectly is drawing about thirty-five thousand dollars, and from people who work under him — they're on the level — he doesn't spend more than ten to fifteen percent of his time on the job! He's off, shall I say — enjoying himself, fishing, hunting et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. Now — that's the condition you have, and don't be fooled — don't be fooled by certain gentlemen who will stand up here, and I am frankly amazed at one of them. I respect his ability, but from what he says, I have no respect for his judgment. Thank you.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird.

Mr. STARBIRD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As I sit here this morning and listen to the debate, while I have no personal quarrel with the method of building a building used here, I believe the Constitution of this State does.

In Article IX, Section 19, it mentions that "All revenues derived from fees, excises and license taxes relating to registration, operation and use of vehicles on public highways, and the fuels used for the propulsion of such vehicles shall be expended solely for cost of administration, statutory refunds and adjustments, payment of debts and liabilities incurred in construction and reconstruction of highways and bridges, the cost of construction, reconstruction, maintenance and repair of public highways and bridges under the direction and supervision of a state department having jurisdiction over such highways and bridges and expense for state enforcement of traffic laws and shall not be diverted for any purpose, provided that these limitations shall not apply to revenue from an excise tax on motor vehicles imposed in lieu of personal property tax."

I believe, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that I would like to ask someone to try again a tabling motion so that this question could be cleared up, because I believe there is a valid argument against the constitution-

ality of the putting of these funds from highway funds, diverting them to building an office building.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move this item lie on the table until tomorrow.

Thereupon, tabled pending the motion of Mr. Crockett of Freeport to accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report and specially assigned for tomorrow.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Highways reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act Removing Tolls from Augusta Memorial Bridge" (H. P. 349) (L. D. 497), which was recomitted.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. FERGUSON of Oxford
ROSS of Piscataquis
GREELEY of Waldo
—of the Senate.
Messrs. CROCKETT of Freeport
NADEAU of Biddeford
BURNHAM of Naples
WOOD of Brooks
—of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought not to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. McNALLY of Ellsworth
DUDLEY of Enfield
WALTZ of Waldoboro
—of the House.

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waldoboro, Mr. Waltz.

Mr. WALTZ: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I'm afraid that I'm going to wear out my welcome here this morning by being up here and talking as much as I have, but I oppose this bill for this reason or reasons. There is at the present time approximately \$175,000 indebtedness on this building. It is taking care of itself on the tolls of about two cents and a half a trip. It's estimated that in another five

years the indebtedness will be liquidated. In addition to that there are about sixteen men that receive employment taking tolls on this bridge. I suspect that the people that use this bridge constantly are somewhat annoyed by being held up and expected to pay tolls.

The situation to me comes down to this—does this House wish to spend, shall I say, \$175,000 on this particular item when in another five years it can be completely liquidated, and during that period of time sixteen men would have employment?

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Brown of Augusta, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted, the Bill given its two several readings and assigned for third reading tomorrow.

Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Highways on Bill "An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Ten Million Dollars on Behalf of the State of Maine to Build State Highways" (H. P. 691) (L. D. 972) reporting same in a new draft (H. P. 1174) (L. D. 1673) under title of "An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Sixteen Million Eight Hundred Thousand Dollars on Behalf of the State of Maine to Build State Highways" and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. FERGUSON of Oxford
ROSS of Piscataquis
GREELEY of Waldo
—of the Senate.

Messrs. CROCKETT of Freeport
WOOD of Brooks
McNALLY of Ellsworth
DUDLEY of Enfield
NADEAU of Biddeford
BURNHAM of Naples
—of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought not to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. WALTZ of Waldoboro
—of the House.

Reports were read.

(On motion of Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor, tabled pending acceptance of either Report and specially assigned for Thursday, May 25.)

**Passed to Be Engrossed
Third Reader**

Amended in Non-Concurrence

Bill "An Act to Authorize Lincoln County to Raise Money for Court House Capital Improvements" (S. P. 485) (L. D. 1206)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading and read the third time.

Mr. Waltz of Waldoboro offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 485, L. D. 1206, Bill, "An Act to Authorize Lincoln County to Raise Money for Court House Capital Improvements."

Amend said Bill in section 1 by striking out in the 3rd line (same in L. D. 1206) the figure "\$200,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure '\$150,000'; and by inserting in the 6th line (5th line in L. D. 1206) after the word "advisable" the following punctuation and words:

, 'but no funds shall be expended for a separate building'

Further amend said Bill in section 2 by striking out in the 5th line (4th line in L. D. 1206) the figure "\$200,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure '\$150,000'; and by adding before the last sentence a new sentence to read as follows: 'Such bonds shall be valid without first obtaining the consent of said county as provided in the Revised Statutes of 1964, Title 30, sections 302 and 404.'

House Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended in non-concurrence and sent to the Senate.

**Third Reader
Amended**

Bill "An Act Providing Funds for Relocating of Maine Central Railroad Tracks in Livermore Falls" (H. P. 822) (L. D. 1230)

Was reported by the Committee

on Bills in the Third Reading and read the third time.

Mr. Darey of Livermore Falls then offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 822, L. D. 1230, Bill, "An Act Providing Funds for Relocating of Maine Central Railroad Tracks in Livermore Falls."

Amend said Bill by striking out everything after the enacting clause and inserting in place thereof the following:

'**Appropriation.** There is appropriated to the Town of Livermore Falls from the Unappropriated Surplus of the General Fund the sum of \$15,000 to help defray the cost of relocating the Maine Central Railroad tracks in order to eliminate 2 grade crossings on Main and Depot Streets in said Livermore Falls. Such appropriation shall be a continuing carrying account until June 30, 1969. This appropriation is contingent upon the Town of Livermore Falls paying a comparable amount of \$15,000 and the availability of federal funds for the completion of this project. The federal funds thus furnished shall not affect the amount of federal funds that are presently allocated or will be allocated to the State of Maine for highway construction.'

House Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended and sent up for concurrence.

Bill "An Act to Provide for the Issuance of Weapons Permits to Certain Nonresident Employees" (H. P. 1172) (L. D. 1670)

Resolve Reimbursing Certain Municipalities for the Control of Dutch Elm Disease (S. P. 627) (L. D. 1629)

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

Amended Bills

Bill "An Act Concerning Duty of Reasonable Care to Social Invitee" (S. P. 432) (L. D. 1036)

Bill "An Act Establishing the Maine Medical Laboratory Act" (S. P. 475) (L. D. 1208)

Bill "An Act relating to Municipal Financing of Industrial and Recreational Projects" (S. P. 193) (L. D. 545)

Bill "An Act Creating a Council-Manager Form of Government for the City of Saco" (S. P. 552) (L. D. 1505)

Bill "An Act Providing Hospital Insurance Benefits under Social Security Act for State Employees" (H. P. 1065) (L. D. 1532)

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.

Emergency Measure Tabled and Assigned

An Act to Appropriate Funds and Provide Staff for Alcoholism Services (S. P. 9) (L. D. 15)

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

(On motion of Mr. Littlefield of Hampden, tabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for tomorrow.)

Bond Issue Tabled and Assigned

An Act to Authorize Construction of Self-Liquidating Student Housing and Dining Facilities for the State Colleges and the Issuance of Not Exceeding \$5,400,000 Bonds of the State of Maine for the Financing Thereof. (H. P. 1160) (L. D. 1659)

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

(On motion of Mr. Hinds of South Portland, tabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for Thursday, May 25.)

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act relating to Approval of Secondary Schools (S. P. 401) (L. D. 1032)

An Act relating to Construction of Public Camp Sites by the For-

est Commissioner (S. P. 502) (L. D. 1217)

An Act relating to List of Prospective Jurors and Selection of Jurors (S. P. 620) (L. D. 1612)

An Act Creating a State Employees' Suggestion Awards Board (S. P. 643) (L. D. 1648)

An Act to Correct Errors and Inconsistencies in the Public Laws Related to Sea and Shore Fisheries (H. P. 242) (L. D. 350)

An Act relating to Right of Entry and Inspection of Nursing Homes and Boarding Homes (H. P. 406) (L. D. 572)

An Act Appropriating Funds to Expand Homemaking Services in the Department of Health and Welfare (H. P. 440) (L. D. 615)

An Act relating to the Computation of Secondary School Tuition (H. P. 979) (L. D. 1421)

An Act relating to Allowance for Widows of Justices of the Supreme Judicial Court and the Superior Court (H. P. 1138) (L. D. 1620)

Finally Passed

Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Search of Lost Persons in the Woodlands of the State (S. P. 209) (L. D. 548)

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

Orders of the Day

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

Resolve to Reimburse Elinor Nichols of Poland for Well Damage by Deposit of Salt on Highway (H. P. 968) (L. D. 1410) (In House, Indefinitely Postponed) (In Senate, Passed to be Engrossed as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-259)

Tabled — May 19, by Mrs. Lincoln of Bethel.

Pending — Further consideration.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Foster of Mechanic Falls, the House voted to adhere.

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

Resolve to Reimburse Richard Jewell of Mechanic Falls for Well Damage by Deposit of Salt on Highway (H. P. 969) (L. D. 1411) (In House, Indefinitely Postponed) (In Senate, Passed to be Engrossed as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-246)

Tabled — May 19, by Mrs. Lincoln of Bethel.

Pending — Further consideration.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Foster of Mechanic Falls, the House voted to adhere.

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

Resolve to Reimburse Henry T. Parent of Mechanic Falls for Well Damage by Deposit of Salt on Highway (H. P. 970) (L. D. 1412) (In House, Indefinitely Postponed) (In Senate, Passed to be Engrossed as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-249)

Tabled — May 19, by Mrs. Lincoln of Bethel.

Pending — Further consideration.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Foster of Mechanic Falls, the House voted to adhere.

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

HOUSE REPORT — Ought Not to Pass — Committee on Business Legislation on Bill, "An Act Increasing License Fees for Small Loan Agencies" (H. P. 966) (L. D. 1408)

Tabled — May 19, by Mr. Scott of Wilton.

Pending — Acceptance.

On motion of Mr. Scott of Wilton, the "Ought not to pass" Committee Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

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

HOUSE REPORT — Ought Not to Pass — Committee on Labor on Bill, "An Act relating to Minimum Wages for Firemen" (H. P. 516) (L. D. 729)

Tabled — May 19, by Mr. Lewin of Augusta.

Pending — Acceptance.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Lewin of Augusta, retabled pending acceptance of "Ought not to pass" Report and specially assigned for Thursday, May 25.

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

HOUSE MAJORITY REPORT (9) — Ought Not to Pass — Committee on Business Legislation on Bill, "An Act relating to Countersigning Fees for Insurance Agents and Brokers" (H. P. 875) (L. D. 1287)—MINORITY REPORT (1)—Ought to Pass.

Tabled — May 19, by Mr. Harriman of Hollis.

Pending — Acceptance of either Report.

On motion of Mr. Harriman of Hollis, the Minority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted and the Bill read twice.

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

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "B" to H. P. 875, L. D. 1287, Bill, "An Act Relating to Countersigning Fees for Insurance Agents and Brokers."

Amend said Bill in the 7th line (6th line in L. D. 1287) by striking out the underlined words "or surety" and inserting in place thereof the underlined punctuation and words '**surety, inland marine and ocean marine**'

Further amend said Bill by striking out in the 8th and 9th line (7th and 8th lines in L. D. 1287) the underlined words "a negotiated amount of commission based on services rendered or to be rendered by the countersigning resident agent" and inserting in place thereof the underlined words and figures '**50% of the commission of the first \$50 of commission, and a negotiated amount of commission on the balance of the commission based on the services rendered or to be rendered by the countersigning resident agent**'

House Amendment "B" was adopted and the Bill assigned for third reading tomorrow.

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

HOUSE MAJORITY REPORT (8)—Ought Not to Pass—Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill “An Act Revising the Laws Relating to Guides Under Fish and Game Laws” (H. P. 356) (L. D. 503)—MINORITY REPORT (2)—Ought to Pass.

Tabled—May 19, by Mr. Wood of Brooks.

Pending—Acceptance of either Report.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Wood of Brooks, retabled pending acceptance of either Report and specially assigned for Thursday, May 25.

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

HOUSE MAJORITY REPORT (6)—Ought Not to Pass—Committee on Labor on Bill “An Act relating to Minimum Wage Law” (H. P. 1008) (L. D. 1475)—MINORITY REPORT (4)—Ought to Pass.

Tabled—May 19, by Mr. Harri-man of Hollis.

Pending—Motion of Mr. Ewer of Bangor to accept Majority Report.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Dennett of Kittery, retabled pending the motion of Mr. Ewer of Bangor to accept Majority “Ought not to pass” Report and specially assigned for tomorrow.

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

Bill “An Act relating to Application of State Aid for School Construction” (S. P. 13) (L. D. 29) (In Senate, passed to be engrossed)

Tabled—May 19, by Mr. Richardson of Stonington.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

Mrs. Hanson of Lebanon offered House Amendment “A” and moved its adoption.

House Amendment “A” was read by the Clerk as follows:

HOUSE AMENDMENT “A” to S. P. 13, L. D. 29, Bill, “An Act

Relating to Application of State Aid for School Construction.”

Amend said Bill by striking out everything after the enacting clause and inserting in place thereof the following:

‘R. S. T. 20, §3457, amended. The 2nd paragraph of section 3457 of Title 20 of the Revised Statutes, as enacted by section 2 of chapter 475 of the public laws of 1965, is amended to read as follows:

Said apportionment shall apply similarly to payments made for capital outlay purposes on school construction, approved by the commissioner after August 28, 1957, in administrative units where the April 1st enrollment of resident and tuition pupils in grades 9 through 12 for that year is over 700 pupils, in all administrative units where school buildings are constructed to house pupils from kindergarten through grade 8, and in all community school districts approved by the State Board of Education which incur debt after April 1, 1965; and in other smaller administrative units when in the judgment of the Legislature, on recommendation of the board, the formation of a School Administrative District by consolidation is not geographically or educationally practical. Any administrative unit qualifying for school construction aid under this section by virtue of receiving tuition students from surrounding municipalities must render at least 2 years’ notice to the sending municipalities before discontinuing such acceptance.’

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the adoption of House Amendment “A”.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Lebanon, Mrs. Hanson.

Mrs. HANSON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have presented this amendment to L. D. 29 because I feel that it would accomplish the following: One, it would provide school construction aid to every unit in the State of Maine. Two, the cost to the State in the next biennium is approximately the same as the amount needed in the original L. D. 29, the price tag estimated to be about \$400,000. for

the biennium. Three, help will be provided for all units alike and is not discriminatory, as the L. D. certainly is in asking for construction aid for fewer than a dozen high schools.

I feel strongly, more so as I hear more and more debate, that the original L. D. will weaken dangerously the Sinclair Act's usefulness, if not entirely destroy its effectiveness, in forming new S.A.D.'s.

Fourth, this amendment carries with it the additional strength of providing assistance to those communities who have the least taxable property and are least able to help themselves. For instance, compare my three towns of Lebanon, North Berwick and Berwick, which have the majority of their acreage in striped lands, swamps and growing woodlands, with sparse populations, most of whom are in the low income bracket, to an area such as Cape Elizabeth, with closely knit urban, highly-taxed house lots, and population in the higher salary range.

The amendment would provide assistance to the same communities that seek assistance under the provisions of the original bill, as well as extend aid to all other units in the State. I move the adoption of this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Winthrop, Mrs. Baker.

Mrs. BAKER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise to express opposition to this Amendment. I'm reminded of the cliché often used, "A funny thing happened on the way to the coliseum" — only this is not a funny thing happening to this worthy, fair, piece of legislation that was on its way to be engrossed.

Now, let me give you a little of the history of the original L. D. 29. This bill was prefiled before our Legislature convened. It was heard before the Education Committee, a large hearing — in fact the room was filled. There was only one opponent and it was quite understandable he had to oppose it because of his job with the State Department. One person appeared

neither as a proponent or an opponent, but only to make a statement.

There were present superintendents and citizens of towns that would not even be affected by this legislation as well as those that would. All who appeared and spoke were in favor of the legislation as it appears in the original L. D. 29.

Now this amendment is actually nothing like the bill at all. It would go further actually than a redraft. It has not been heard with a public hearing; that is, it has not been held for public hearing. We know nothing of the impact of this, on the State, and certainly all the towns involved in this complete change should have had an opportunity to attend a public hearing. I did read in the Kennebec Journal this morning that the sponsor of the amendment made a statement as to its cost and again did here at this time. But certainly the committee as a whole has not had a chance to hear anything from the public or anything about the cost and impact, and they might feel quite differently about signing out such a bill.

It would seem to me that as long as this measure was accepted by the House as "Ought to pass" in concurrence and has successfully gone on to the engrossed stage, it is certainly unfortunate that an amendment such as this, which is entirely foreign to the original bill, should have to be a stumbling block now on the way of passage, for this is a fair, worthwhile bill. I would move for a division on the acceptance of the report and hope you will vote against accepting the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Crosby.

Mr. CROSBY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As has been stated previously, L. D. 29 was prefiled back in 1966. Now, six months later, for some unknown reason, we are presented with an amendment which in my opinion kills the original bill. Representing a town which is vitally affected by L. D. 29, I rise in support of the defeat of the amendment. Kennebunk has a fully

accredited high school. This year we have 553 students. Next year we will have 575. Thirty-five per cent of these students are nonresident tuition students from the towns of Kennebunkport, Arundel and Lyman. It is my feeling that we are providing all of the services of a district without receiving any of the benefits. It is my suggestion now that you kind folks allow this original bill to pass to a point where it will reach the Appropriations Table and allow them to decide the disposition.

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

Mr. HEWES: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of this House: The original bill was to lower from 700 to 500 the number of students required in a high school to receive certain new building construction aid. I do not know of any evidence or indication that the 500 figure is an unfair figure. This amendment, House Amendment "A" which is H-335, is, in my opinion, just a tactic to obstruct the passage of L. D. 29. As the lady from Winthrop, Mrs. Baker, said, this L. D. 29 was prefiled. The institution, that is, the Department of Education, has been opposed to this bill for several weeks and months and now that it is almost on its way to passage, it has authored and sponsored this amendment which, in effect, will kill the effect of L. D. 29.

I do not know what the basis is for this, as a factual matter, because there is no evidence that the 500 figure is not a fair figure.

Further, this amendment would coerce communities to build elementary schools rather than high schools or secondary schools, whether or not they need the elementary school. It might be that the community, so as to get this aid, will construct an elementary school rather than a high school.

Further, athletic facilities which will receive aid, as you know, from the recent passage of the Supreme Court's ruling, the athletic facilities will be built on elementary grounds rather than on high school grounds, so that the community will receive the aid provided by the Department of Education. In short, I move the indefinite postpone-

ment of House Amendment "A" under the filing number of H-335, and request a division.

The SPEAKER: The pending question now is the motion of the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Hewes, that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this session a veteran legislator told me that service on the Education Committee was sitting on a hot spot, but I could win Brownie points. I am more certain at the moment of the first part of that statement than I am the second. Mr. Speaker, that is not a complaint; it is merely an observation.

These nine towns who now want to weaken the Sinclair Act, and reduce the incentive to take towns which need help, retards the formation of school districts. Now, these nine towns are Cape Elizabeth, Gorham, Kennebunk, Scarborough, Winthrop, Limestone, Madawaska, Millinocket and Winslow. Several of those towns you will recognize as very desirable towns in which to live, residential towns. Several of them do not have any desire to become mill towns. Another town, Limestone, has the richest agricultural soil and the largest quantity, I think, of any town in the State. Madawaska, a very fine paper mill, bonds, ledger, one of the larger mills. Millinocket, up until a very short time ago, was the largest newsprint mill in the United States, and it is only because they have gone to other grades that they no longer hold that title. Winslow, the Scott Paper Company. I recall, and I am not informed right up to date, but I recall a number of years ago when over 40% of the taxes paid in that town was paid by Scott's predecessor paper company.

I don't like to see the Sinclair Act weakened. I don't like to see the benefits go to the State's wealthier communities at the expense of the less fortunate ones. I feel we are breaking faith with those towns that went ahead and took in smaller adjoining contiguous towns in order to get 700, and help the students from those towns to get

a good high school education. Those towns that took in other towns, Presque Isle, No. 1 S.A.D., Houlton, Fort Kent, Belfast and Skowhegan. One substantial reason for the success of the Sinclair Act was the support the Legislature gave to that Act over this last ten years. I hope we will not withdraw that support at the present time.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to speak on the bill; however, I would like to comment on the amendment. It seems to me we are debating both the bill and the amendment right along together here. As I look at this amendment, it seems to me that it embodies a completely new concept in the field of construction aid to school districts. I don't believe that we should embark upon such a concept as this at least without a public hearing, which I understand this amendment does not have. I believe that it should require a full two years of study by the school people and others in the State before we embark upon such a radical concept as this amendment embodies. I hope you will go along with the motion of the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Hewes, in the defeat of this amendment.

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

Mr. PENDERGAST: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As a representative of several towns involved in this L. D. 29, I believe it is only a matter of a few years until there will be a school administrative district formed, which will make L. D. 29 only a temporary measure, but we do need the aid now. I urge your support in the indefinite postponement of the amendment under Filing H-355.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, are we only considering the amendment, or the bill and the amendment?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that the

pending question is the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "A". Is the House ready for the question? The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Hewes, to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A" to L. D. 29. All those in favor will vote yes, all those opposed no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken. 119 having voted in the affirmative and 8 having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Lebanon, Mrs. Hanson.

Mrs. HANSON: I respectfully request that this be tabled until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Lebanon, Mrs. Hanson, moves that item 9, L. D. 29, be tabled until Wednesday, May 24, pending passage to be engrossed.

Mrs. Baker of Winthrop requested a division on the tabling motion.

The SPEAKER: A vote has been requested on the tabling motion. All those in favor of this matter being tabled until Wednesday, May 24, will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken. 32 having voted in the affirmative and 91 having voted in the negative, the tabling motion does not prevail.

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, I guess I'm not as quick as the hammer, but I certainly am against the passage of this piece of legislation, L. D. 29—

The SPEAKER: The matter is no longer before us. Would the gentleman move that we reconsider whereby it was passed to be engrossed?

Mr. DUDLEY: I so move.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, now moves that the House reconsider its action whereby this matter was passed to be engrossed.

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

Mr. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, may we have a division on the reconsideration?

The SPEAKER: A vote has been requested on the reconsideration motion.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this bill. I was here when we passed the original Sinclair Act, and we talked of both the figure 500 and 900, and so forth, and after a lot of deliberation we decided on 700 as being the best possible figure. Now this only leaves out, as you have been told by the gentleman from Caribou, nine towns, all wealthy towns, or well-to-do so to speak, as far as education is concerned.

Now, what this does to the zone that I represent, or the area that I represent, District 31 which we formed, and which I had several town meetings with the selectmen at that time, and had several town meetings to finally get this town or this group of towns together in District 31. In doing so, we had to take in several towns that were undesirable to take into a district because they cost our town and the bigger towns a lot of money, but we took them in to make up the figure of 700. I know several other districts did the same thing.

I think this is very bad, and I am afraid it is going to make a lot of distrust on the part of the people that I represent when you now turn around and say you can get in a district with 500. I think there are several other districts affected the same way. I think it is a lot of injustice and I hope that the House will finally never enact this bill, L. D. 29. Thank you. I hope you reconsider and we discuss it a little.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify one point. The figure for a district is not 700. The figure for a district formation is 300. What we are dis-

cussing in this bill is a single town district.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Gill.

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise to oppose the motion to reconsider this action. I believe that this particular legislative document has received a very thorough discussion, and I would remind the gentlemen that we can debate at this time just as well as after it is reconsidered. So, I would suggest that we debate it at this time.

I come from one of the more well-to-do communities that does not receive any type of a benefit from the passage of this Act, but I have observed the communities throughout the State that would receive some benefit from this Act. For that reason I oppose the reconsideration of this.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, that the House reconsider its action whereby this Bill was passed to be engrossed. All those in favor of reconsideration will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

25 having voted in the affirmative and 96 having voted in the negative, the motion to reconsider did not prevail.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque.

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker, is this document presently before this House?

The SPEAKER: The Chair advises the gentleman that the reconsideration motion lost, 25 to 96.

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

Bill "An Act Revising the Credit Union Law" (H. P. 963) (L. D. 1406)

Tabled — May 19, by Mr. Harri- man of Hollis.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed. (Committee Amendment "A" (H-291))

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: At the time the Business Legislation Committee gave out its report I was one of the signers of the Majority "Ought to pass" Report. Although I had at that time some misgivings, I did not want to sign the Minority Report because when I sign a minority report I want plenty of strong reasons to do so, and I expect to defend my position.

Since our original report, and the discussion held in this House, I have done a lot of research on L. D. 1406, and I am now convinced that it is not in the best interests of the public or the members of the credit union to pass this legislation.

I first would like to call your attention to the bill itself, to Section 3, and to the new subsection that would add to 2791 of Title 9. This new section deals with the merger of credit unions, and it states in the Bill, "In lieu of voluntary dissolution as provided in subsection 1, or an involuntary dissolution as provided in subsection 2, at a meeting specially called to consider the matter, a majority of the membership may vote to merge the credit union into a central credit union, provided" a proper copy and so forth, "is mailed to the commissioner 10 days prior to the meeting." Now, this seems to be perfectly proper, but let's refer to the statutes and read Subsections 1 and 2 of Section 2791. Subsection 1 provides that a credit union may dissolve by a majority vote of its members. Fine. There can be no quarrel with this. Now, Subsection 2 deals with involuntary dissolution and mentions two reasons for this. The first is for insolvency. If the credit union is insolvent, why should the central credit union take the liabilities into their union and weaken their financial structure?

The second reason says that, if a credit union has violated any of the credit union laws, the Bank

Commissioner, after hearing, and giving the credit union ample time to comply with the law, may revoke the charter of that credit union. After the Commissioner makes his decision, do you think this type of credit union and its officers should be merged into a central credit union?

Credit unions were originally formed to promote savings from their own members and to provide credit to their members, particularly to those unable to get credit from other sources. Because of its original motives, they were given many, many privileges, not accorded others in the same type of business such as liberal charters, subsidies from government, subsidies from industry and exemptions from Federal income taxes.

Like all cooperative groups that start out with a noble purpose they start making a lot of money because of very low operating cost and tax-free privileges, then expansion sets in and it starts at the expense of the people in the same business who are paying taxes actually to support them.

There are two types of credit unions, those federally chartered and those state chartered. The ones we are talking about here today are state chartered. The federally chartered unions I understand are not allowed to merge into one central union. Why should we allow state chartered unions to do this and create a tax-free cooperative or association that eventually, because of its exceptional considerations, will, rather than be an asset to the community and the State, perhaps be a burdensome liability. I move indefinite postponement of this bill and when the vote is taken I request a division.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Hollis, Mr. Harriman, that item 10 be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Robertson.

Mr. ROBERTSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is my assumption that persistence and determination must be virtues, because the opposition of this

simple little bill have tabled it four times while they attempted to determine how they could defeat it by lobbying.

You see, I'm just a freshman legislator over here in Augusta, and I've got a lot to learn. I didn't realize how arduously lobbyists can work, particularly when you have no one lobbying on your side. However, I can assure you that if they expect the sponsor of this bill to throw up his hands in disgust and give up, they have calculated erroneously this time, for the sponsor never gives up when he knows that the ultimate is just and worthwhile and the path to this end is righteous, honest and unquestionably justified.

Now I hesitate to go into the merits of this bill. I think I did that clearly the other day. I received a 75 to 56 vote in favor of this bill. I merely wanted to reiterate a few points because I feel I must if I'm going to defend the stand of the credit union.

This bill had one intention, and one only, and that is to give the opportunity of credit unions that are forced out because of closing of doors, an opportunity to merge and enjoy the benefits and privileges that the members are entitled to when they join a credit union. That is the sole reason for this bill. Under this procedure the member of the credit unions seeking the merger would have to first vote that they want to join a central credit union. The results of the vote of this union would be forwarded to the Commissioner. The merger must then be approved by this Commissioner, and then the Commissioner notifies the central credit union that they can have an opportunity to join with the central, and the central must vote by two-thirds majority that they want to accept this dissolved credit union. Then they must meet to agree and again the Bank Commissioner must agree with the stipulations of agreement that these two unions have regarding the merger.

Now I wish you'd get these three points very clearly — the member of the dissolving credit

union must first vote that he wants to merge; two, the central credit union must vote to accept him by a two-thirds majority; the Banking Commissioner between those two steps must have approved this merger, then the Banking Commissioner must again approve the steps and the agreements that these two credit unions have come to.

Now I think it's very clear to you folks, at least it is to me and I hope it is to you, that the Banking Commissioner has supreme authority. The Banking Commissioner is a banker — can you visualize that he would allow a central credit union to push the banks out of business? This seems to be the problem that is involved here. You'll see that day, ladies and gentlemen, when we have white blackbirds, because a banking commissioner is not going to bend over backwards for a credit union.

It is my sincere feeling that these people who are opposing this measure — and definitely they are the banking institutions, and I am a little surprised at this because these are the very institutions that the credit unions do business with. I personally have \$75,000 invested in savings in one of these institutions. I can assure you they aren't bucking this bill, because if they were it would be drawn out tomorrow morning.

Now, I can't visualize why these particular institutions are opposing this measure. They can give no legal interpretation that we are violating any regulation pertaining to lending institutions. They have come up with the suggestion that we join with a credit union in accounting. Ladies and gentlemen, this is impossible. A State law which I have in front of me says that you can only join within the field of membership, so you cannot join with another credit union.

The Federal credit union and the federal statutes I have here indicate that a Federal credit union can join with another credit union. It doesn't say central. We are talking about a mountain versus a

molehill. We are talking about 24 state credit unions out of a total of 190 credit unions in the State of Maine with 130,000 members. Now these credit unions are principally in Portland, Bangor, Raymond, Westbrook, Freeport, Scarborough, Gardiner, Kennebunk, Orono and South Portland. They are scattered throughout the State. We're talking about these 23 credit unions—can you visualize these 23 credit unions forming into a massive merge that would defeat the purpose of the banks? Ladies and gentlemen, this idea is incredible. It's absurd, to think that the banks would oppose a measure of this type.

Now you know as well as I the only letters you have received in opposition to this measure have come from these banks. Now why are they opposed to it? The only reason I can visualize anyone is opposed to it is because they cannot stand to have opposition of any type.

Now whether a credit union member is in his own credit union or merges with another credit union, he's still going to be a credit union member. He hasn't taken anything away from the economy of the banks or the lending institutions. He hasn't changed his status as a credit union member.

Now this bill is for their protection—that's all that we're asking—it's just, it's righteous, it's in the best interests of the public, it's in defense of the credit union member who assumed he had this protection when he joined this operation.

Now this came out of Committee with an 8 to 2 "Ought to pass" vote, but since that time our lobbyists in the "third house" worked very effectively; they have converted a few people. I don't think they're going to convert the intelligent members of this House. I think you folks can see through a hole in the wall. I don't have a lobbyist out here to defend my bill because the money that these institutions are spending for lobbyists we are turning back to the credit unions and the members are getting this money in the form of

dividends. We aren't going to bring a lobbyist in here to fight this bill, we don't feel it's necessary. We feel we have something that's honest, that's just, that's something the credit union is entitled to.

I sincerely will appreciate the continuation of the fine support that you gave me last week on this bill. It has been tabled many times with the hopes that the banks and the lobbyists would gather support. Perhaps they have, I don't know, but I know I am defending a bill which I feel is right, it's legal and I can't interpret it otherwise. If it were otherwise, I would not stand up here and defend it because you won't find me bringing a bill into this House that is underhanded or is going to undermine organizations. I don't think that the bank should meddle into this thing and attempt to undermine the progress of the credit union, and that's exactly what they're attempting to do, and ladies and gentlemen, they can bring no legitimate reason here. We have the Banking Commission's approval of these things before they merge, and I request that you support this action by defeating the motion made by the gentleman, Mr. Harriman. Thank you.

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

Mr. SCRIBNER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think at this point a little case history might be in order to see just what type of effect and what the benefits really would accrue from this bill. As many of you are aware, a few years ago the Saco-Lowell Shops in Biddeford closed their operation there and it also meant that the credit union necessarily had to be closed and liquidated. They had no place to go, and members of that credit union lost some very valuable benefits. For example, in the credit union they are furnished with free life insurance to the extent of their deposits. This means that an individual that has a deposit in the amount of, for example, \$2,000, has insurance on his own life to the extent of \$2,000. In addition he has life insurance on any amount of a loan that he may have. These

are benefits that—well, go a little beyond what some of the regular financial institutions normally render that are members.

I know in one case, a member of this House has expressed to me the fact that his father was a member of this credit union, and lost all this protection at the time, and unfortunately passed away several months later without the benefit of this insurance and this valuable protection that his membership had built up for him. He also told me that being from this area that he is aware of a number of other individuals who were placed in the same position. I am sure that when a large credit union of this nature goes under, the banks would very readily like to assume this business. These people have their funds when the credit union is liquidated; the banks would like to have these people deposit it in their institutions. They do not provide any of these comparable benefits. Many individuals may be at an age when they cannot obtain life insurance, or may have had a medical history. This type of insurance on deposits is granted to anyone, regardless of their age or medical condition. This is a very valuable protection and these people will be denied this type of protection and the benefits if we fail to pass this bill and to provide some method for these individuals to maintain their benefits as they build up over the years.

This is one small example, and I am sure that the same type of thing could happen today with much of our industrial growth. We have mergers and consolidations going on every day, and every town of any size, every community in this State has a credit union in a church or community or an industrial credit union. I think the industrial credit unions are mostly the large ones. Many of the larger ones for example in Lewiston, Portland or Bangor, may go under as a result of consolidation or a merger, and these people would be denied these benefits. Granted, the banks would like to pick up this business, but I don't feel that there is any justification for their attempt to kill this bill and deny these benefits to hundreds of

thousands of Maine people who, including their families, belong to credit unions in the State of Maine. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hollis, Mr. Harriman.

Mr. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In reply to Representative Robertson, I would like to make this statement in this House that I have never been lobbied by anybody regarding 1406. I can make up my own mind. Everybody in this House knows that I'm for private enterprise and I'm not for anything that smells of anything otherwise. I am for credit unions -- as long as they stay in their own field. But when at the expense of taxpayers they merge into an entity making them large enough to go for the large loans, and the dividends which they pay are dividends from taxes you and I and the banks pay, I want no part of it.

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

Mr. SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We did the right thing last week. Some of the statements that are made here, they're ridiculous and fantastic. Probably my good friend, Mr. Harriman, who I have a tremendous amount of respect for, he probably wasn't lobbying. But, I have to digress a minute and make a little statement regarding lobbyists. And when the head lobbyist for these small loan companies -- and he in my opinion and many other lobbyists are allowed too much freedom. I believe, and I will ask the Speaker a question: Aren't the lobbyists supposed to be behind that glass out there? Are they allowed to come on the floor of this House?

The SPEAKER: If the gentleman is posing a question through the Chair, the gentleman may be assured that the Chair will maintain the decorum of this House and the Members in this House are in order. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. SULLIVAN: I just -- I'm not quite clear that that answers my question. The question: I want to know if paid lobbyists have the right to come on the floor of this House; it's my impression that the

rule is that they be behind that glass - -

The SPEAKER: The gentleman's question is out of order. Does the gentleman wish to continue or shall the Chair rule him out of order?

Mr. SULLIVAN: All right, I will approach that in another way later. Maybe from what was said here they get the impression that banks in general are against credit unions. They are not. I happen to do business with one of the two largest banks in this State and they to the best of my knowledge and belief are not against that; in fact the banks get a lot of their business from the credit unions. Further, I happen to be on that Business Legislation Committee and I think I've got reasonably fair judgement.

I again want to call the attention of the members of this House to this fact. We have on that Committee three unusually able Senators — may I mention their names?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may not refer to the other body in influencing this House.

Mr. SULLIVAN: I'm not referring to the other body, I simply in my opinion want to mention the fact that these three sen — well if you look on your — you will find their names. One of them in addition to being a very able Senator is an unusually able lawyer, about of the type of the Majority Leader in this House. Now seriously, some of these statements that are made are ridiculous. And that should go through the way it went through last week. Thank you.

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

Mr. GAUDREAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wish to rise in support of this bill, which would afford a degree of protection to the credit union members in the State of Maine, which number approximately 130,000. When a credit union is forced to liquidate because the business is forced to close its doors, the members have no protection or no agency to turn to for a guarantee of their savings. They are not guaranteed that they will recover

a hundred percent of their savings that they have accumulated through the years. A member will automatically lose a \$2,000 insurance receipt which he has acquired on his savings and in a lot of cases cannot acquire elsewhere. He loses his prerogative of membership which afforded him the opportunity to secure a reasonable dividend on his invested money or to borrow money at a reasonable rate of interest.

When his credit union is dissolved he cannot join another in his area because another credit union cannot accept him unless he is affiliated with the church, the community, or business which the credit union represents. This bill is designed to enable these displaced members to have the right, if they so vote and have the approval of the Bank Commissioner, to join a central credit union which will supply this needed protection from the viewpoint of savings and loans. With this legislation the credit union seeks only to attain a self-sufficiency that the member has the right to expect. This insured protection will cost the state and Federal Government nothing. The central credit union wishes to guarantee or underwrite the local unions so that the officers of the credit union can truthfully and justly say to its members — your savings are protected in case your credit union is forced to liquidate.

I belong to a large credit union in Lewiston and I cannot visualize that it would want to merge, unless it was forced to because of financial reasons, with another credit union in order that it could become larger. As a matter of fact, when a credit union becomes too large financially and is unable to loan its money to its members, it is more difficult to pay a reasonable dividend to those who invest their money. The reason for this is that the surplus money must be invested in other organizations and the principal institutions of these investments are the savings banks who are opposed to this merger provision.

In my opinion, this merger to assist a small credit union who is forced to liquidate is beneficial. It is needed legislation for the pro-

tection of the 130,000 members. Thank you.

Mr. Harriman of Hollis was granted consent to speak a third time.

Mr. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It seems as though I get the theme through the proponents of this legislation that they are worried about their members being covered financially and losing money through a credit union dissolving and they hope to solve this through a central credit union. I would suggest that they do not have to go to a central credit union. They can set up a stabilization fund and accomplish the same purpose.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Robertson.

Mr. ROBERTSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I'm not going to belabor this question; I think you have all the facts. I do want to say in answer to the question of Mr. Harriman—and I do not accuse him of being lobbied because I respect the judgment of this man. I admire him as a member of this Legislation Committee and he does an excellent job on it, I can assure you.

I merely want to state that you all have credit unions in your communities and your church and your business. Now 130,000 members are looking for you to support this measure to give them this degree of protection. I think you owe them this. I do not conceive it is going to be harmful to any other institution and I can conceive no reason why they should ask for its defeat. You represent these people and I request that you represent them well. I would request that when the vote be taken that it be taken by the yeas and nays in order that the credit union members might know that you have supported them in this measure, and I thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from China, Mr. Farrington.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an inquiry through the Chair as to insurance—the bank insurance on savings accounts, and if it would be pos-

sible for these credit unions to buy such insurance.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from China, Mr. Farrington, poses a question through the Chair to any member who may answer if they so choose.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Robertson.

Mr. ROBERTSON: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to get into the field of insurance because when I do my blood boils about circumstances that exist relative to insurance that are going to be brought out onto this House a little later. However, I am going to just answer this one question at the moment. Insurance which we are talking about is \$2,000 worth of insurance that an individual acquires because of an investment of that amount in the credit union. When he gets older, up to sixty-five or seventy he loses this insurance and if he was forced to dissolve he could not get the same insurance by joining another credit union. Of course if he goes to the bank or some other institution he loses this protection.

Now this insurance is provided free of charge to every member of the credit union as is the insurance on their loan. If a person has a loan at the credit union, he not only is insured as far as life is concerned—he's insured as far as disability is concerned. Now this, ladies and gentlemen, is a protection that is made to him because no other institution does this. I can bring out facts to show you that other institutions not only charge him for the insurance—they charge him excessive rates for the insurance, far beyond what they paid for it. And then they keep the dividends. I won't go into that point, but I do want to bring out that it is an important point to the member of the credit union, that he retain these privileges and rights which he had when he joined. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Hollis, Mr. Harriman, that L. D. 1406 be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make this observation.

Mr. Harriman of Hollis was then granted permission to speak a third time.

Mr. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. There is no business that I know of can get rid of obligations or operating costs, and I don't think the credit unions are any exception. If they buy insurance they pay for it; if they pay for it, it goes into operating cost; if it goes into operating cost, they have to give a lower dividend. There's nothing free under the sun, except the Faith of God.

Mr. Robertson of Brewer was granted permission to speak a third time.

Mr. ROBERTSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I just want to clarify that point. Insurance is given free to the credit union member. The credit union member pays at the utmost 11.8% for a loan at a credit union, plus all his free insurance. No other institution, lending institution in the State of Maine, will guarantee him that. He will pay anywhere from sixteen to thirty-six percent for this same service, and he is not going to receive this insurance free. We do this because the money which you invest in the credit union goes back to the membership. I don't think it's time to procrastinate this further; I would ask that this vote be taken by the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Hollis, Mr. Harriman, that House Paper 963, L. D. 1406, Bill "An Act Revising the Credit Union Law," be indefinitely postponed. A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All of those desiring a roll call will vote yes and those opposed will vote no, and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken, and more than one fifth of the members present having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Hollis, Mr. Harriman, that L. D. 1406 be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of indefinite postponement will vote yes, those opposed will vote no, and the Chair opens the vote.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Baker, R. E.; Benson, Birt, Bragdon, Brown, Bunker, Clark, Cookson, Cornell, Cottrell, Danton, Dennett, Dickinson, Drummond, Dunn, Evans, Farrington, Foster, Fuller, Gill, Hanson, B. B.; Hanson, P. K.; Harriman, Hawes, Healy, Hewes, Hodgkins, Huber, Humphrey, Jameson, Jannelle, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Maddox, McNally, Nadeau, N. L.; Pendergast, Porter, Prince, Richardson, G. A.; Ross, Sahagian, Scott, C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Snow, P. J.; Thompson, Trask, Truman, Waltz, White.

NAY — Allen, Bedard, Belanger, Beliveau, Berman, Bernard, Binnette, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Brennan, Burnham, Carey, Carrier, Carroll, Champagne, Conley, Cote, Crockett, Crommett, Curran, Cushing, D'Alfonso, Darey, Drigotas, Edwards, Eustis, Ewer, Fecteau, Fortier, Fraser, Gaudreau, Gauthier, Giroux, Hall, Harnois, Haynes, Henley, Hennessey, Hichens, Hinds, Hoover, Hunter, Immonen, Jalbert, Keyte, Kyes, Lebel, Levesque, Littlefield, Lowery, Martin, Miliano, Minkowsky, Mosher, Nadeau, J. F. R.; Philbrook, Pike, Quimby, Quinn, Rideout, Robertson, Robinson, Rocheleau, Sawyer, Scribner, Shaw, Shute, Snowe, P.; Starbird, Sullivan, Tanguay, Townsend, Watts, Wheeler, Wood.

ABSENT—Baker, E. B.; Bradstreet, Buck, Carswell, Couture, Crosby, Dudley, Durgin, Hanson, H. L.; Harvey, Jewell, Kilroy, Lyette, McMann, Meisner, Noyes, Payson, Rackliff, Richardson, H. L.; Roy, Soulas, Susi, Wight, Williams.

Yes, 51; No, 75, Absent, 24.

The SPEAKER: Fifty-one having voted in the affirmative and seventy-five having voted in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

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

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor,

Recessed until two o'clock this afternoon.

After Recess
2:00 P. M.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

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

Bill "An Act relating to Certain Expenses of Supreme Judicial Court Paid by State to Cumberland County" (S. P. 207) (L. D. 546) (In Senate, passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-85))

Tabled — May 19, by Mr. Starbird of Kingman Township.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

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

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It has been my experience in my past service in this House that members of the House desired to get all the information that they could about matters that were before them for consideration and a determination.

This particular bill provides: "There shall be paid to Cumberland County by the State the sum of \$200 monthly as rental for the sessions of the Supreme Judicial Court in Cumberland County." Now, the Supreme Judicial Court is the Law Court, and the Supreme Judicial Court meets in Cumberland County five sessions a year. It meets in Kennebec County three sessions a year. And I was of the impression that those sessions only lasted three days, but I verified that fact by getting in touch with the Law Clerk. He informs me that last year in Cumberland County the Law Court met 14 days, and in Kennebec County it met nine days. Now, if you allow \$2,400 to Cumberland County for the sessions of the

Law Court, you are allowing them approximately \$172 a day, on the basis of 14 sessions last year.

Now, this Law Court meets in Kennebec County in the County Courthouse, and in the County Courthouse it meets in a Superior Courtroom. In Cumberland County it meets in what is known as the Law Courtroom, but it only meets there three days during its session, and it only has five sessions per year. Now, what happens to this courtroom when the Law Court isn't in session? The Law Court is still being used for court purposes. The Law Clerk informs me that the Superior Court handles cases there when the court is available and the space is needed, and that individual justices of the Supreme Court meet there and hear cases. And the Law Court meets in Portland, and when it does it brings people there from all over the State. There is a lot of business goes into Portland because of the fact that the Law Court meets there. But the courtroom is not used entirely and only and solely for the law sessions. It is used for other trial use and it has been and is supported by the county, and has been over the years supported by the county, just like all of the other courts in the 16 counties of our State.

In the county seat of each county we have what is called a shire town, and in this shire town we have the courthouse. The courthouse is built and maintained by county funds in all of the 16 counties. The same thing is true of Cumberland County. And in these courtrooms the county provides room, not only for the trials of cases, but they also provide jury rooms, both grand and petty, the clerk's office, the court clerk's office, rooms for the records, county commissioners' courtroom, registry of probate, registry of deeds, probate court, and all of those courts that have to do with the county. The Cumberland County Courthouse does the same thing as the other 15 counties, and has been doing it over the years. Now, why suddenly should

we start paying \$2,400 to Cumberland County for the facilities we are already getting on a basis which, as a historical fact, is the same kind of a basis as in all of the counties?

I feel that Cumberland County should continue to do what they have been doing in the past, maintain their courtroom just like all of the other counties. When it becomes necessary to enlarge a county building the county commissioners and the county taxes have to do it. And if you do something for Cumberland County differently, there is no reason then why you shouldn't do it for all of the other 15 counties.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird.

Mr. STARBIRD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have had this item around for quite a while now. We have accepted the unanimous "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee when it was in here before, and now it is back with an amendment.

I think the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, has pretty well explained the situation and although apparently some of the committee members, at least, have had a change of heart since, I want to remind you that it was a unanimous report and I, therefore, move for the indefinite postponement of this bill, this Senate Amendment, and all other papers connected with it.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird, now moves the indefinite postponement of L. D. 546 and all its accompanying papers.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett.

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This is very true, we have had this bill and this amendment around with us for quite some time. But it rather struck me this afternoon that I have met, in my brief career in life, with similar situations. I recall town meetings, which I have been a frequent attendant of, and in these town meetings they have argued for hour after hour on the

expenditure of \$30 for a street light, and an article spending 300-350 thousand dollars went through without a murmur. I have felt that perhaps in these instances the simple townspeople have understood what \$30 was, but did not understand what 350 thousand was.

Now, I think today that this thing is being beat to death on the idea that it is \$200 a month. This is a figure that everyone can understand. Perhaps if it was for a million dollars it would go under the hammer.

You have heard this thing belabored. The arguments that were presented last week were valid, and they are just as valid this afternoon. Now, this bill, as you are reminded, came before the Committee on State Government, and it called for the State to pay a messenger \$3,000 a year, and also pay \$200 per month for the courthouse. It was passed out, as you have been told, "Ought not to pass." Then it came back in amended, with that \$3,000 portion, which was really the portion that killed the bill in the first place, this had been deleted. What remained was \$200 for the courthouse which, I understand, the County of Cumberland provides for the Supreme Court of the State of Maine, and it is a separate courthouse.

Now, I am somewhat again appalled today at the fact that you were told that the Supreme Court, I believe, meets — I don't know what the figure was — nine days, and because they meet nine days you certainly shouldn't pay them any \$200 a month. I think the Justices of the Supreme Court get something like \$21,000 a year. And if they only meet 14 days in the course of a year, I think there is something radically wrong, but I am persuaded that such is not the case. I believe the Justices of the Supreme Court perform a great and valued service to the State of Maine, and they perform this service 365 days a year. I believe also this courthouse in the County of Cumberland is available to them every day in the year, and it is for their use and for their use almost solely, although I would not question that when they are not there that someone else might meet

there, and I think this is perfectly all right.

I am not a resident of the County of Cumberland. I have no ax to grind. And I hate to see arising constantly in this House which I believe in many instances are sectional differences. I do not believe they should exist in this State. As I stated before, I believe this argument is valid today, as valid as it was a week ago, and I certainly hope that the motion made by the gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird, does not prevail. When the vote is taken I ask for a division.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: To add to the remarks made by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, concerning the courtroom facilities, I would point out that the City of Portland did have at one time two of the Supreme Court Justices who lived there and held their offices in the county court building. Upon the retirement of one, there is one Justice that maintains in the county building, adjacent to this courtroom, a suite of offices, law library, and staff to handle his proceedings. He also holds hearings over and above these days mentioned by the gentleman from Bangor. He also holds hearings that an individual justice would sit on in this courtroom. And it can only be used when the Supreme Court doesn't have any use for it, because it is their courtroom, and if this Justice grants permission for someone to use it, that is fine, but, if the Supreme Court has any use for it, it cannot be used by anyone else.

I would hope we would not indefinitely postpone this bill, and I would hope that the House would reaffirm its vote of last week and send this bill over to the other body.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am not going to get into this debate, but I am merely going to give the House some information wherein it concerns the Supreme Court Justices

and the Court. Certainly nobody thinks that they are not doing their work and doing it properly; however, in our County we have two members of the Supreme Court who have their stations in our county building. We give them spacious quarters; the County pays for it. We give them a library, and the County pays for it. So I am not against this bill. However, I think that somewhere along the line, I think that possibly it might be that if we are going to do this for another county, where we have two Supreme Court Justices, with spacious headquarters and with a library that we pay for, somewhere along the line we might be reimbursed in our County also. That is only fair.

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

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, I want to correct my good friend, Mr. Dennett from Kittery, in his remarks that this is a separate courthouse building. This is not a separate courthouse building. There are quarters in the courthouse building for the Supreme Judicial Court. It is a courtroom within the building, and it is a room that is being used for other court work, other than the Law Court work, when it is not being used for the Law Court. And last year the Clerk informed me that it was used for 14 days of Law Court sessions the whole year. Further, that different Justices of both the Supreme and the Superior Court use the courtroom facility when the other courts were being used, which are frequently in Cumberland County.

In Penobscot County we have a Superior Court Justice, we have a Supreme Court Justice, and we have a retired Supreme Court Justice, and that county furnishes all these justices with suites and law libraries for their own individual use. When they decide a Law case, these cases are referred to and assigned to different Justices to write the opinions, and those opinions are worked out in the county where that Justice comes from, the Supreme Court Justice. And every county that has a Justice on the Superior or the Supreme Court furnishes quarters for

their Justice in their county from county funds, and they are not getting one cent of rent. Cumberland County has been doing the same thing over the years. Now suddenly someone wants to pay them \$2,400.

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

Mr. GILL: I would like to ask a question from anyone that would care to answer. Are there any of these counties paying \$3,000 per year for a Supreme Court Clerk or a messenger?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Gill, poses a question through the Chair to any member who may answer if they choose.

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

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, in our County the Court Justice has his own messenger. And this is not a case of supplying money for a messenger; this is supplying money for court rental.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird, that Senate Paper 207, L. D. 546, Bill "An Act relating to Certain Expenses of Supreme Judicial Court Paid by State to Cumberland County" and its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of indefinite postponement will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

66 having voted in the affirmative and 44 having voted in the negative, the Bill was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

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

An Act relating to the Water and Air Environmental Improvement Commission (S. P. 635) (L. D. 1635)

Tabled—May 19, by Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston.

Pending—Passage to be enacted.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that there is a possible amendment being pre-

pared for this measure. For that reason, I hope someone would table it, and I hope someone would table it until tomorrow.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor, retabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for tomorrow.

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

SENATE REPORT — Ought to Pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-132)—Committee on Education on Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Pledging Credit of the State and Providing for the Issuance of Bonds Not Exceeding One Million Dollars for Loans for Maine Students in Higher Education (S. P. 618) (L. D. 1616) (In Senate, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A")

Tabled—May 19, by Mr. Snowe of Auburn.

Pending—Acceptance in concurrence.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Shute of Farmington, retabled pending acceptance in concurrence and specially assigned for Thursday, May 25.

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

Bill "An Act relating to Transportation of Disabled, Collision Damaged, Wrecked or Repossessed Highway Motor Vehicles" (H. P. 59) (L. D. 84) (In Senate, passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-86) and "B" (S-137) (In House, Senate Amendment "A" indefinitely postponed)

Tabled—May 19, by Mr. Richardson of Cumberland.

Pending—Passage to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "B" in non-concurrence.

Thereupon, on motion of Mrs. Lincoln of Bethel, the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "B" in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the fifteenth tabled and today assigned matter.

Bill "An Act Creating the Short Form Deeds Act" (S. P. 537) (L. D. 1442) (In Senate, passed to be engrossed)

Tabled — May 19, by Mr. Richardson of Cumberland.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed. (House Amendment "A" (H-252))

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor, retabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Thursday, May 25.

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

An Act Creating the Maine Higher Education Loan Authority Act (S. P. 59) (L. D. 72)

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

Pending — Passage to be enacted.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Birt of East Millinocket, retabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for Thursday, May 25.

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

Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Pledging Credit of State for Maine School Building Authority Bonds (S. P. 622) L. D. 1624)

Tabled — May 19, by Mr. Bragdon of Perham.

Pending — Final passage.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Bragdon of Perham, retabled pending final passage and specially assigned for Thursday, May 25.

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

SENATE MAJORITY REPORT (7) — Ought Not to Pass — Committee on Public Utilities on Bill "An Act Creating the Maine Power Commission" (S. P. 366) (L. D. 967 — MINORITY REPORT (3) — Ought to Pass in New Draft (S. P. 625) (L. D. 1625) (In Senate,

Majority Report accepted) (In House, Majority Report accepted in concurrence)

Tabled — May 19, by Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Williams of Hodgdon to reconsider acceptance.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hodgdon, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker and Members: We discussed this bill pretty thoroughly the other day and came up with what I believe to be a good sound decision. I then moved to reconsider. The bill was then tabled, thus giving everyone the chance for further study. I can see no need of much more discussion. I'm sure everyone has by now made up their minds on how they will vote. I would sincerely hope that you would all vote against my motion for reconsideration. Thanks.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Camden, Mr. Haynes.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I must apologize for my voice. As a member of the study committee on this 102nd, I hope that the House will vote for reconsideration on this important bill. With our low per capita incomes, increasing taxes, and insufficient industry, low cost public power would improve the economy of the State.

I have an amendment, which if adopted, would bring the decision to the people of this State, those thousands of subscribing rate payers, whose contributions support the private power companies. Without these people the private power monopoly could not exist. As a member of the House, I feel, for me, that primary consideration is owed to the people of our State, rather than to private interests.

Opponents to public power decry what they term "putting the State in the power business." As the present arrangement between the State and private power is in fact a monopoly, so far as the people of the State are concerned, the State is, in effect, in the power business now and not doing too well on the rates, either. Other op-

ponents piously charge that public power would destroy private enterprise. How can a State monopoly be considered private enterprise? An assured return, and no competition. And now for those opponents who point with alarm at public power as being socialism, let's look about us at the other clear forms of socialism which have been accepted as an integral part of our national life.

Millions of Americans, including I think, members of this House, are recipients of medicare benefits. "Medicare", which the medical associations fought bitterly as being "socialized medicine." Thousands of Maine citizens, including members of this House, are recipients of social security benefits. Our taxes for schools and teachers which as we know here, are growing at an alarming rate, also are a form of socialism. Socialism in one form or another is a part of our present society.

Now comes the opponents' claim that private power companies are the only agencies that may competently and safely operate a nuclear fueled steam generating plant. Well, the U. S. Government A.E.C. would certainly refuse to license any plant which was not strictly in conformity with standards of safety and technical operation. No matter which agency constructs and operates such a plant, the operating personnel must be qualified and licensed, as with any steam plant. Thus, the dire picture of poorly trained incompetent personnel implied is untrue.

As for trained personnel, the most outstanding success in the use of nuclear fueled steam plants is our fleet of submarines which have now operated for several years all over the world, beneath the surface of the sea. They do not seem to be greatly handicapped by refueling problems. A large number of the enlisted operating personnel are high school graduates with special training. It is interesting to note that the one privately operated nuclear fueled ship, Savannah, has apparently not been too successful.

As we know here, there are plans to impose new and higher taxes on the people of the State. Is it not equally important to plan

for improvements in our economy and savings for our taxpayers by public power? I hope you will vote, yes, for reconsideration on this important bill.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: With a great many issues I am only too pleased to submit them to the people for their determination. However, some are confusing, and fraught with complications, and such is this today in my opinion. This is a very serious issue, as both sides well know. It has many implications, ramifications, and technicalities. I only fear that the proponents in their genuine enthusiasm would try to simplify this most complicated problem with idealogies based on half or at least semi-truths. They would endeavor to make it emotional and personal, to try to convince the voter that he personally would be getting cheaper power. Certainly everyone, even the opponents would agree to this goal. However, after hundreds of hours of discussion during the past few years these same proponents have been unable to convince many knowledgeable persons of this fact.

Surely I trust the judgment of the electorate. But I don't want them misled and I fear that this is just what would happen. I am confident that those who would cast an affirmative vote would do so only because they thought that their individual power rates would go down immediately. Not only has this not been guaranteed, but there are many knowledgeable persons who feel that the rates might even go up. Therefore, I certainly do not support the motion for reconsideration.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Littlefield

Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The State of Maine needs power for industrial development. What does the Maine Power Commission Plan mean to the citizens of Maine?

It means, according to the Study Report of R. W. Beck & Associates, National Consultant Engineers who

have advised and brought about construction of over \$2 billion of power projects, that the citizens of the State of Maine, by such a proposition could save well over \$200 million in power cost savings over the next twenty years.

It means invested in the State of Maine, man and materials over \$200 million of construction of the project.

It means, according to those who should know, consultant experts, additional industry because of the cheapest possible power, whether it be aluminum or mineral developments or further accentuation or emphasis on use of timber resources, of another \$200 million of economic development for the State.

Under the legislation as proposed, besides the payment of the communities for the loss of tax valuation, if any, it will provide on the basis of known projected sales, approximately \$3 million a year, or nearly \$6 million a biennium in the general fund, to be returned to the communities for educational purposes, using for example formulas that we now are using in relation to increasing educational subsidy.

The magnitude of what you have before you, ladies and gentlemen of the House, should be fully understood if you are truly interested in the economic development and welfare of all citizens of the State.

As to the private utilities and their investors, the best answer to their complaints is that nowhere throughout the United States, where public power develops the resource, can the private utilities point to any private utility whose stockholders or business has been hurt by such a development. Rather, the exact opposite has happened over and over again, as in the case of Niagara-Mohawk Power Company and the New York Power Authority.

This can well be the most important legislation before us in magnitude and overall importance during this entire Session.

I therefore urge you to vote for reconsideration, and then to vote against the "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Bethel, Mrs. Lincoln.

Mrs. LINCOLN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I ask to be excused from voting because of the fact that the gentlewoman from Orrington, Mrs. Baker, has to be absent today because of illness. If she were here, she would vote against reconsideration and I would vote for reconsideration.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Bethel, Mrs. Lincoln, requests permission to refrain from voting because of her reason stated. Is this the pleasure of the House? It's a vote.

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

Mr. HENLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wasn't planning to get up on this issue even though my mind had been for some time definitely made up on the subject of public power. I'd like to discuss just for a moment, not the millions which could be brought into this State by so-called cheaper power. Possibly these allegations are true, if we could get the cheaper power. These growing stories that we hear of what industry will be able to do when we have lower price power, who are the proponents for so-called public state controlled power? So far I haven't been able to chase them down. I think they're something like the Indians of bygone days. They shoot from behind a bush and when the settler tried to find them, they were gone.

I have tried to find the actual power behind the throne, who is pushing for so-called public power authority. I find, for instance, a few people that want me to support public power. I heard from one last night who happened to be an automobile dealer. What earthly value could a little bit cheaper power be to an automobile leader? I got an urge from one other person — I think that's two business people that wanted me to support public power, who runs a small store. His power bill, monthly, runs somewhere between twenty and thirty dollars, so what is his value

in cheaper power? He insisted it would help his business. Again I say that possibly if we could be guaranteed cheaper power, it might get industry into the State.

Again I feel that the price of power is not holding very much industry out of the State. I have checked with several people already in business and one of the biggest items we have in this State to contend with on industrialization is transportation. Public power or cheaper power is not going to make it any easier to get raw materials up here into Maine from the central part of the country or from the Far West, or from the Midwest. Also it isn't going to necessarily give us any more labor markets.

Then again I want to make one more comment on public power, and that is in regards to — one of the gentlemen is speaking about socialism, creeping socialism. We admit, a lot of us, that the Country seems to be headed along the line of creeping socialism. That doesn't mean we've got to like it. It doesn't mean we've got to stick our necks out for some more of it. It seems that some of those things we have no power to stop; it's like a steam roller. We have got our neck into a noose, and I don't know what we're going to do about it. But I still say that we shouldn't go out of our way to bring about some more of it. Now if anybody can tell me of any government business that ever really made a success of itself, I'd like to know about it.

We have, there's one more point I want to make about power projects. It was mentioned the other day, they bring about the argument of the TVA, the Columbia River Project, the Colorado River Project, and these other various big projects, which are federal projects. They are putting out low-priced power. Why? Because power is a by-product — not an end of its own. They did not build these places for power. They built them for flood control; or for irrigation, to control the waters. Consequently, when they had their dam there, they had the

power potential, they'd been foolish if they hadn't made use of it.

Government—and I have no history in government, but I have tried to find out, and I have yet to have proved that government has ever been anything but a liability. We have to have it. It is a necessary evil. It always costs the taxpayer money, whether it's to control the laws or make laws or whatever it does. The government isn't intended to compete with private business.

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am not personally in favor of the State of Maine entering the power business as proposed by Legislative Document 967, and last week I voted against the public power bill. While I believe that in this State we should encourage free enterprise when possible, certainly we should not discourage it. Today I find myself confronted on the horns of a dilemma. I believe that first and foremost I am duty bound to represent the thinkings of my constituency in that I am not a free agent to go against their expressed wishes.

This morning I received the following special delivery letter from the superintendent of the municipally owned Houlton Water Company, which says, in part:

"Dear Malcolm:

As you know, this Company is most interested in the passage of L. D. No. 967 and so testified at the legislative hearing before the Public Utilities Committee on April 4th.

This action was thoroughly discussed by the members of our Board of Directors (Alan H. Clark, James C. Madigan, L. O. Ludwig, Jr., Donald F. Ellis, J. Fred Donald, and Asa H. Roach), and it was the considered opinion of this group that the plan as advanced by the Legislative Power Study Committee of the 102nd Legislature is feasible and would benefit all the citizens of Maine.

On a purely local level, Houlton Water Company could reduce its cost of purchased power from six-

teen (16) mills to five (5) mills which would directly benefit the citizens whom you represent.

I would therefore strongly urge that you reconsider your position of last week and vote favorably for enactment of this bill with the referendum amendment."

Members of the House, these directors may not be known to you, but I know them as sound experienced business men, bankers, and attorneys, and because they come from my constituency I think that I will have to defer to their wishes. I am duty bound to put aside my personal feelings and I am duty bound to reflect the wishes of my constituency. Therefore, **against** my personal wishes I shall vote for this bill with a statewide referendum.

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

Mr. JAMESON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I was informed last week that my pay stopped and yours did, too, most of the members of this House. I don't know what I'm getting up here for and shooting my mouth off on this bill. Seems like all I'm doing is listening. This is the third time I've been on my feet, too. You heard a couple of gentlemen this morning speak on the bureaucracies that are created here in the State, and believe me they are bureaucracies, getting larger and larger every year, demanding more appropriations. You see I'm not going to take much of your time, because I think this is going to be another bureaucracy where we'd be asked every two years for twenty-five to fifty million dollars to finance it. I don't think for one minute that this could prove essential or profitable to the State of Maine, because they'd have to sell their power to the Central Maine Power or the Bangor Hydro Electric Company. What's to convince them that they'll have to drop their rates? As the gentleman from Houlton says, from twelve cents a kilowatt hour to five, of course that is quite a drop but I doubt it very sincerely. So therefore, I will vote to uphold the gentleman from Hodgdon in his motion, that it ought not to pass. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque.

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I certainly hope that this House this afternoon will reconsider the action taken by this House last week. I notice this afternoon that the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, has spoken in opposition because he figures, or he feels, that the referendum will have relatively very little value. I am just wondering that if the amendment presently before our desks on L. D. 306 would make it more palatable to the public. And this referendum would be for the form and arrangements of ballots in general elections. Somehow or other, if we don't have faith in our general public, when we refer something to them after we have expressed our desire that they should vote on it, certainly if it's good for one argument for one particular type of bill, it should also be considered for another type of document, depending on the feeling of the general public.

The gentleman, Mr. Henley, has pointed out that the automobile dealer and the small store owner would not benefit or might not benefit from this type of legislation. I think possibly it's been pointed out throughout the country where they have had public and private power, that the rates have gone down considerably. I think for a small store owner or automobile dealer that pays twenty or thirty dollars a month electricity certainly is not excessive. But I find myself in a dilemma of paying twenty or thirty dollars for just a single home. So other countries, other parts of our own Country have seen fit to join forces between public and private power. Certainly the example shown in New York State of combining their forces has not been a detriment to Mohawk power company in New York. They have prospered with public and private power, and have also lowered their rates. So certainly in this State of Maine we should stand to gain because of our highest rate in the continental United States.

Another remark made by the same gentleman, Mr. Henley, that the government is a liability, in most instances. My feeling of government is that it's only a liability if you make it so. So those are some of the few arguments this afternoon that I would leave with you for thought, that it's my personal feeling that we should reconsider this document this afternoon and certainly hope for a final passage. Thank you.

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

Mr. SNOWE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I'd like to read into the records an editorial from the Lewiston Daily Sun, a newspaper from the highly democratic city of Lewiston, dated Monday, May 22, 1967, entitled, "The Latest Gimmick."

"Those who would put the state of Maine in the power business, in competition with the existing utilities, deserve commendation for perseverance! Even though accustomed to defeat by now, they come back with a fresh gimmick and new enthusiasm every time. Their resourcefulness is little short of amazing and makes it the more unfortunate that their objective is undesirable.

Last week, the Senate killed the proposal to put the state in the nuclear power production business, in two tests, albeit by a narrow margin. The matter was knocked down in the House by a more substantial vote.

But did that discourage the proponents?

Not at all. They came up with a new gimmick — one of a long line, incidentally. This time, the public power advocates want to put a referendum clause on the defeated bill so that the people of Maine would vote on the issue. It is a gimmick because it is another attempt to breathe life into a proposal already dead.

Even though opponents of public power have demonstrated that they are in the majority in both branches, the latest gimmick was given a chance to be heard in the House. The reconsideration of the bill's defeat was tabled until tomorrow in what constitutes a

glimmer of hope for the proponents. There is justification for giving them a chance to be heard.

A referendum on the public power issue would be an expensive, time consuming process. It would force the investor-owned utilities to spend large amounts of money to defend their right to operate without competition from the state government which regulates them. At the same time, the out of state money interests which have been financing the years long battle for public power, in hopes of profiting from the bonds which would have to be issued, would pour more funds into an effort to overrule the Legislature.

Both Senate and House have decided the public power issue correctly and in the best interests of Maine and its people. We hope that when the latest gimmick is put to a vote in the House tomorrow, it will be defeated."

Also I have a copy of the "Value Line Survey," printed weekly by the Arnold Bernhard & Co., Inc., dated May 19, 1967. This national publication is printed by experts in the field of finance for the benefit of people interested in purchasing stock in various companies. The following statement was made in this publication regarding the two public power bills now before us, and I quote; "It is our understanding that most of the support for these bills has stemmed from interests outside Maine."

I urge every member of this House to vote against the reconsideration motion.

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

Mr. PIKE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In all the talk last week and today, one thing that's hardly been mentioned, I'm afraid it hasn't been thought about very much, is a technical thing, it would apply to either public or private—What are you going to do if your biggest power plant has to be taken down for repairs or as in this case, replacement of the fuel elements? This can take, and has taken, in most of these things, a long time. Now up to date, to the very best of my knowledge, no plant, no nuclear plant has been

put in except somewhere in a system, a network where the rest of the system could take care of the load when the big one is closed down. The present tendency is in large power markets to put these things up as twins, or even as triplets. In Chicago they're putting up triplets. Down in North Carolina they're putting up twins. Even TVA is putting up a twin, so that when one is out for repairs or overhaul, something else can take up the load.

This I know, we all realize is a very very serious matter. It's a decision that may change our whole future in the matter of energy in this State. It involves a tremendous amount of money. The amount of money that would be involved in this bill here is just the entrance fee. Where the Federal Government took over and started TVA they did the bold thing and they just bought the private company out, so that there was no more complication. To a great extent the same thing happened in the State of Washington. Here originally as you remember, the bill said that they could sell to industry directly, thereby under-cutting the old arrangement of franchises and rate regulation. That, as I am very glad to see, has been eliminated. I do still think that there are enough weaknesses in this proposal—that this bill ought not to be passed at the present time.

It isn't a very simple thing — public power versus private power. On one side is the hybrid with private operation, investor ownership and state control of rates — and incidentally of bond issues in almost every movement the boys take. On the other side, instead of public power, up to date it looks like promoters power. We've had the same bunch of promoters in here for three or four years. They're trying to sell us—this is the fourth bill of goods — Cross Rocks, Greater Allagash, the one last year which was the predecessor of this one. You may remember that they had a firm bid on the power plant. You may not have noticed, however, that the company that gave them a firm bid on the power plant went out of the nuclear business in a very few months afterward — decided they

couldn't make it. Fortunately they didn't have the contract.

I can't help but believe that we will benefit by a cooling off period here, and I do hope that we will not vote to reconsider, and I do not think that the referendum is a good idea at all. Now we talk about the high education of the voters. Very, very few of them have any notion of the very vital, technical matters involved in either nuclear energy or in ordinary, the power production by steam, by coal or oil. If it ever came on the ballot what it would say—public power on one side and private power on the other, we don't know what the result would be and it might turn out to be a horrible mistake.

I do hope that at this time we will not vote to reconsider. Thank you.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I merely rise to request a roll call on the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER: The yeas and nays have been requested.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Huber.

Mr. HUBER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Many sections of this country have gone through just exactly what we've been going through for several months, namely, debate—extensive, strong, sometimes partisan, and occasionally bitter debate on public power versus private power.

Many of these areas have successfully traded debate for rebate and changed the marquee to read "Public Power and Private Power." The two work side by side, complement each other, and the areas served are reaping the benefits!

I submit to you that no crystal ball is need to predict the elimination of "versus" in favor of the word "and" in the State of Maine. Public power and private power. The two together in our State. It's inevitable, there is room for both, and depending on your own degree of optimism regarding the future social and economic development of Maine, there is a need.

I personally don't find this public power in conflict with my own

personal Republican philosophies at all. Government in the business of helping this Country grow is not reserved for the Democratic Party. The Republican Party of Abraham Lincoln stood for the Government giving free land to develop the West, stood for the Government helping build a trans-continental railroad, stood for land grant colleges. Many people would think this was no place for Government.

Theodore Roosevelt would undoubtedly have been concerned about the combination known as the Big Eleven Power Loop, as is, according to my reports, the Anti-trust Division of the United States Department of Justice right now.

George Norris, Republican Senator from Nebraska in the '30's is given credit by no less an authority than the late John F. Kennedy, as being a Father of the TVA System. Nebraska itself is furnished electricity entirely by public power, and is about as Republican as you can find. In Iowa, too, a private power company is presently arranging a joint venture with the public-power built nuclear plant whereby the private power company would buy the power, and is happy to do so. In the State of Washington, Republican Governor Daniel Evans sings the praises of industrial development and higher wages as the result of public power working together with private power companies.

Republican Legislatures in the State of New York, Republican Governors such as Dewey and Rockefeller, worked out projects at Niagara involving the New York State Power Authority, and it was the last Republican Congress in 1953 and 1954 that passed the necessary Acts, due to certain international accomplishments with Canada, that allowed the Niagara Project of the New York Power Authority to become a reality.

The point that I am trying to make here is that Members and Leaders of both Parties recognize the role public power has and is playing all over the United States in bettering economic development and a higher standard for all citizens.

The impression that seems to be created around here is that one party is for and one party therefore is against, and it's a false impression which was disproved by recorded votes at the other end of the corridor and which I feel certain will be again disproved by votes to be taken in here today.

L. D. 1625 carries enough legislative safeguards to warrant submitting it to the people for a decision, and I think that the citizens of Maine may not be so resistant to change as we are.

I hope you will vote to reconsider our former action and accept the amendment for a state-wide referendum.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fort Kent, Mr. Bourgoin.

Mr. BOURGOIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House; I have been observing the Province of New Brunswick, our northern neighbor, who has had public and private power for the last twenty years, and the improvement of that Province, which was twenty years behind us, and has gone ahead of us twenty years in the future through public and private power, should give everybody a very deep thought about this bill before you.

As of now, Maine public power, Maine Public Utilities, or service in Presque Isle, is buying quite a lot of this public power from New Brunswick at a cheaper cost than they can manufacture it themselves, and one third of our utilities are manufacturing their own power now, even with the proposed plan of the Big Eleven Loop it would not be enough for our industry in 1972. Thank you.

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

Mr. SNOW: Mr. Speaker, I served on this Public Utilities Committee, and where there is so much talk around about a referendum on this very important issue I have a few notes I would like to pass on to you people in regard to my thoughts.

The voters in Maine have sent us here to Augusta to make decisions for them. They have faith in us or we wouldn't be here, someone else would be sitting in

these chairs. Now, I feel that these same people back home realize our decisions would be formed from the information that would be presented to us, and the wisdom which we will use in digesting this information. They have faith also in the judgment and hours of time that is necessary to reach the point where we cast our votes. Now, I don't think they want us here, at the cost that is involved in this complicated business, failing to take a firm stand on these various issues, and passing back to them decisions for them to make when they know very well it will lack the time and the advantages we have been receiving here, especially on any subject as complicated and difficult to understand as this one would appear to be to the people back home. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. D'Alfonso.

Mr. D'ALFONSO: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We've been hearing a great deal about the liability of government. We have heard about some of the instrumentalities of government that are to be used by the people. How often does this Legislature submit to the people the right to vote upon something that this Legislature has approved? Don't we send Constitutional Amendments to the people? Don't we send bond issues to the people?

There are many things that we send back to the people, and there are many things that the people can send back to us through petition.

This legislation is actually only a vehicle. It would simply give the state the right to submit to a future legislative body plans as to whether or not it would be good for the state and beneficial for the state to construct a power plant. Don't we have the right to at least give the people the benefit of a right to vote for themselves as to whether or not this is a liability of government, whether or not it is an horrendous thing that this Legislature is attempting to do?

What about the Wiscasset plant that is proposed? This particular plant, if constructed, would be a

part of the Big Eleven Power Loop. Is this truly "Maine Yankee" atomic, or is it in reality, "New England Yankee" atomic? Who is to derive the benefits from this so-called "Maine Yankee" atomic plant? Certainly not the State of Maine, as it supposedly has been outlined that it will. Primarily and substantially, those who would benefit from the Wiscasset plant would be the other New England states, the same way in which Central Maine Power Company now only benefits a small fraction from the Rowe Atomic Energy Plant.

Why do the private power companies, the investor-owned power companies, continue to oppose steadfastly and vehemently the Dickey-Lincoln School Project? Their plans have no design for a great hook-up with this plant that has been approved by the two splendid Senators from this State, but the proposed FEC plant would have a hook-up with the Dickey-Lincoln School plant, which is absolutely necessary because Dickey-Lincoln School will provide peaking power, and a plant as huge as that needs a huge atomic plant to provide base power.

There's been talk about what happens if an FEC plant had to shut down. Who takes over? Remember now, we have invited both private power and public power to work together. What's going to happen when Wiscasset has to close down? What good is Wiscasset going to be to the State of Maine knowing that private power doesn't want Dickey - Lincoln School? Isn't it true that private power doesn't want any public power — particularly in the New England States? New England is the last stronghold of private power. What is really so wrong with it — public power? Is there any evidence that it has hurt any part of the Country? Is there any evidence that people have not benefited from public power? All the evidence is to the contrary — it has benefited; it has helped the people. It has been the best thing that ever happened to such places as New York State, Washington State, the southeastern part of the United States. All of the rest

of the country—except New England! If you believe in upholding the stronghold of private power to the detriment of the people in this State as to benefits to be derived from our participation in the fascinating world of tomorrow which can come about only through the development of nuclear energy and technology, then by all means tell the people that you are not going to give them the right to vote on this bill in referendum, and then live with your own conscience.

We do send things to referendum. The instrumentalities of government must be exercised for the benefit of the people. Government is organized—has been organized, deriving its just powers from the consent of the government, and in this particular case, this particular legislation is so important, so vitally important, we should use that one instrument of government to find out from the people whether or not they want this or not. The instrument of a referendum. If you would deny them this right then go right ahead, and if you do, then we can take also the same kind of a look at the amendment being proposed for L. D. 306, in connection with the ballot. This amendment would send this particular legislation back to the people for referendum, so we would also have to consider this a liability.

Government has never been a liability. Anyone who reviews the history of government will realize government is not a liability—it is a fact of societal organization. Without it, we would perish—there would be no discipline, and discipline in public power is needed as much today as discipline is needed in such authorities as the Maine Industrial Building Authority, the Maine Recreation Authority— and how many other authorities do we have in this state? Do you mean to tell me the State of Maine is not in the business of disciplining the people of this state as to how they can act or will act? They certainly are. They control us—which is good, but it doesn't hurt us. I don't think anyone is being hurt in this state by anything that's

being done now under the various authorities and commissions. Government has the right and the power—the just power—to do everything that it possibly can to help the people take that first step into the exciting world of tomorrow, and we can do it by sending this to the people on referendum.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hodgdon, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We've heard a lot about what the New Brunswick Electric Power Commission does and what the Central Maine Power Commission actually does and what the public power expects to do. Now I have a whole folder of rates of what they actually have done in the past, but I won't quote them to you because I have them from all over the United States. These figures I received from the New Brunswick Electrical Power Commission and the Maine ones I received from the Public Utilities Commission. I'll just make one comment. In the year 1965 the average revenue per residential kilowatt-hour in New Brunswick was .0305. In the State of Maine, the same year, 1965, the average to domestic consumers was .0302. We were three ten-thousandths, I guess it is, of a cent cheaper, and the Central Maine Power Company the same year was—said it was .0299, a little bit cheaper than the average. So, actually the New Brunswick Power Commission isn't furnishing their people power quite as cheap as the State of Maine is getting right now. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Hodgdon, Mr. Williams, that the House reconsider its action of May 19, whereby it accepted the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report on Bill "An Act Creating the Maine Power Commission," L. D. 967. The yeas and nays have been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of

one fifth of the members present and voting. All of those desiring a roll call will vote yes, those opposed will vote no, and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken, and more than one fifth of the members present having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Hodgdon, Mr. Williams, that the House reconsider its action of May 19, whereby it accepted the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report on L. D. 967. All those in favor of reconsidering this action will vote yes, those opposed will vote no, and the Chair opens the vote.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Bedard, Belanger, Beliveau, Berman, Bernard, Binnette, Bourgoin, Brennan, Carroll, Champagne, Conley, Cote, Cottrell, Crommett, Curran, Cushing, D'Alfonso, Danton, Drigotas, Eustis, Fecteau, Fortier, Fraser, Gaudreau, Gauthier, Giroux, Hawes, Haynes, Healy, Hennessey, Huber, Jalbert, Keyte, Lebel, Levesque, Littlefield, Lowery, Maddox, Martin, Miliano, Minkowsky, Nadeau, J. F. R.; Nadeau, N. L.; Philbrook, Quinn, Robertson, Robinson, Rocheleau, Scribner, Starbird, Sullivan, Townsend, Wheeler.

NAY — Allen, Baker, R. E.; Benson, Birt, B ragdon, Brown, Bunker, Burnham, Carey, Clark, Cookson, Cornell, Crockett, Crosby, Darey, Dennett, Dickinson, Drummond, Dunn, Edwards, Evans, Ewer, Farrington, Foster, Fuller, Gill, Hall, Hanson, B. B.; Hanson, H. L.; Hanson, P. K.; Harriman, Henley, Hichens, Hodgkins, Hoover, Humphrey, Immonen, Jameson, Jannelle, Kyes, Lewin, Lewis, Lycette, McMann, McNally, Meisner, Mosher, Pendergast, Pike, Porter, Prince, Richardson, G. A.; Richardson, H. L.; Rideout, Ross, Sahagian, Sawyer, Scott, C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Shute, Snow, P. J.; Snowe, P.; Susi, Thompson, Trask, Truman, Waltz, Watts, White, Williams, Wood.

ABSENT — Baker, E. B.; Boudreau, Bradstreet, Buck, Carrier, Carswell, Couture, Dudley, Durgin, Harnois, Harvey, Hewes, Hinds, Hunter, Jewell, Kilroy, Lincoln, Noyes, Payson, Quimby, Rackliff, Roy, Soulas, Tanguay, Wight.

Yes, 53; No, 72; Absent, 25.

The SPEAKER: Fifty-three having voted in the affirmative and seventy-two having voted in the negative, the motion to reconsider does not prevail.

Out of order and under suspension of the rules Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee is directed to study in depth, with the cooperation of the Public Utilities Commission, Maine's electric power rates, and that said committee shall hold a series of public hearings in northern, eastern, central and southern Maine to effectuate the foregoing Order; and be it further

ORDERED, that the committee report its findings, together with any necessary recommendations or implementing legislation, at the next regular or special session of the Legislature.

Thereupon, on further motion of the same gentleman, tabled pending passage and specially assigned for tomorrow.

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

SENATE REPORT — Ought Not to Pass—Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act Providing Funds for Roads and Athletic Field at Maine Maritime Academy" (S. P. 208) (L. D. 547) (In Senate, Report accepted)

Tabled—May 22, by Mr. Truman of Biddeford.

Pending—Acceptance in concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. TRUMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move we

substitute the bill for the report, and I would like to speak to my motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Truman, now moves that the House substitute the bill for the Report. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. TRUMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: At the Academy down in Castine we have a very serious problem with our roads. The area where the midshipmen muster every morning for colors and do a lot of their marching is all gravel. In bad weather, rain or snow, it is somewhat of a mud bowl. Around the area of the new Student Union Building and the new Margaret Chase Smith Gymnasium we have the same condition. This, being a military school, and the cadets march from one building to the other, they pick up this dirt and carry it from building to building. This creates quite an enormous cleaning task and cleaning bill. Of course, this is State money that we use.

For those of you that were at the graduation a couple of weeks ago, and then again the dedication of the new Student Union Building, you can somewhat sympathize with our problem there.

The bill originally as drafted called for funds for roads and an athletic field. The Committee, in their wisdom, and I can appreciate their "ought not to pass" Report, had this athletic field at a price tag of \$97,000, which I can see at this time is not feasible. But we do need these roads very badly. So, I would ask all of you to vote to substitute the bill for the report so that I can get an amendment put on this. I have since talked with all the members of the Committee with an amendment to delete this athletic field, and they feel that they will not oppose it, so I hope you will go along and substitute the bill for the report. And I request a division. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Truman, now moves that the House substitute the bill for the report, Bill "An Act Providing Funds for Roads

and Athletic Field at Maine Maritime Academy." Is the House ready for the question?

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

A viva voce vote being taken, the Bill was substituted for the Report in non-concurrence, read twice and tomorrow assigned.

Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston presented the following Joint Resolution out of order and moved its adoption:

WHEREAS, Donald C. Hansen has been selected as a public affairs reporting fellow of the American Political Science Association for the 1967-1968 academic year, starting in September; and

WHEREAS, this fellowship is supported through grants from the Ford Foundation and offers qualified working journalists reporting public affairs the opportunity to attend the college or university of their choice for a year of advanced study; and

WHEREAS, Donald C. Hansen is cognizant of the fact that fair and impartial reporting is a prerequisite to the sacred trust enjoyed by a successful political writer; and

WHEREAS, Donald C. Hansen is not only a competent professional journalist, he also is a person who possesses an abundance of friendship, loyalty and honesty which are among the greater human qualities; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the 103rd Legislature hereby extend to Donald C. Hansen heartiest congratulations for his outstanding accomplishment in his chosen field of journalism and wish him Godspeed in his new assignment; and be it further

RESOLVED, that a copy of this Joint Resolution, signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate and duly attested by the Secretary of the Senate to Mr. Hansen as a token of our esteem. (H. P. 1175)

The Resolution was adopted and sent up for concurrence. (Applause, the Members rising)

The SPEAKER: Would Mr. Hansen come to the front of the Hall of the House.

An behalf of the House, the Speaker is moved to say to Mr. Hansen that with an ovation like this he can be assured that he has earned the love and respect of many of you who have known him since he came to the State House, and you people who are here for the first time. I probably might be the only one here that might differ with you, but through the years I too have learned to respect and admire this man, even though we might have had differences in the past. And I add to this, Donald Hansen, God Speed and the very best of luck to you.

Would you like, on behalf of the Speaker at his invitation, to say thank you to the Members of this body.

Mr. DONALD HANSEN: Thank you very much. I appreciate it. (Applause)

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

An Act relating to Nonlapsing Funds for Land in Town of Wells for Park Purposes (H. P. 771) (L. D. 1118)

Tabled—May 22, by Mr. Farrington of China.

Pending—Passage to be enacted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from China, Mr. Farrington.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: A short explanation: The Towns and Counties Committee was supposed to have reported this out in a new draft. This is merely a correction. I now move that the rules be suspended for the purpose of reconsideration.

Thereupon, under suspension of the rules, the House voted to reconsider its action of May 15 whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed.

Mr. Farrington then offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 771, L. D. 1118, Bill, "An Act Relating to Nonlapsing Funds for Land in Town of Wells for Park Purposes."

Amend said Bill by striking out all of the Title and inserting in place thereof the following: 'An Act Relating to Nonlapsing Funds for Land in York County for Park Purposes.'

Further amend said Bill by striking out everything after the Title and inserting in place thereof the following:

'Emergency preamble. Whereas, Acts of the Legislature do not become effective until 90 days after adjournment of the Legislature unless enacted as emergencies; and

Whereas, the project for a State Park in Wells, York County, authorized by the 102nd Legislature cannot be accomplished, with the result that the funds appropriated therefor will lapse; and

Whereas, the following legislation is vitally necessary to prevent the lapsing of such appropriation in order to provide for the acquisition and development of a State Park in York County; and

Whereas, in the judgment of the Legislature, these facts create an emergency within the meaning of the Constitution of Maine and require the following legislation as immediately necessary for the preservation of the public peace, health and safety; now, therefore, Be it enacted by the People of the State of Maine, as follows:

P. & S. L., 1965, c. 161, Section B, amended. That part of Section B of chapter 161 of the private and special laws of 1965, under the caption "STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION", which relates to acquisition of land in Wells, is amended to read as follows:

*Wells York County \$125,500 ———

* Any balance of the above starred appropriation shall not lapse and may be used towards the acquisition and development of a State Park in York County.

Emergency clause. In view of the emergency cited in the pre-

amble, this Act shall take effect when approved.

House Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

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

Mr. HENNESSEY: Mr. Speaker, I have an inquiry as to Legislative Document 984, which we took up yesterday. Is that in the possession of the House?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would answer in the affirmative.

Mr. HENNESSEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This was legislation leave to withdraw yesterday and I would like to have the House reconsider this and bring it back for further study. To me this is a very important bill and, under the circumstances, I feel it is going to be left out without a lot of work being done to really assure the people what is actually happening in this, even to the extent that if this is built the people in need will not be able to take advantage of it. So, I would like to have this reconsidered and brought back.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from West Bath, Mr. Hennessey, now moves that the House reconsider its action of yesterday whereby L. D. 984, "An Act to Authorize Bond Issue in the Amount of One Million One Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars for Construction at Pineland Hospital and Training Center and of Regional Care Facilities for the Severely Mentally Retarded at Bangor," Senate Paper 371, L. D. 984, whereby it accepted the Leave to Withdraw Report. Is it the pleasure of the House to reconsider our action?

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Speaker, as a matter of explanation, I stated yesterday that I had no objection to this bill being held. We were considering reporting it out in another form and, because of the fact that many things could happen before the wishes of the Appropriations Committee are put

through this House, I see no objection to the request of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Hennessey, that he have this back before us and hold it until he knows what does happen to the bill that we are considering.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to reconsider our action whereby we accepted the Leave to Withdraw Report of yesterday? All those in favor say yes. Those opposed, say no.

A viva voce vote being doubted by the Chair, a vote of the House was taken.

92 having voted in the affirmative and 4 having voted in the negative, the motion to reconsider prevailed.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Hennessey of West Bath, tabled pending acceptance of the Leave to Withdraw Report and specially assigned for Thursday, May 25.

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

Bill "An Act to Authorize General Fund Bond Issue in Amount of Two Million Eight Hundred and Fifteen Thousand Dollars and to Appropriate Moneys for Construction, Extension and Improvement for Airports" (H. P. 1166) (L. D. 1667)

Tabled — May 22, by Mr. Lesvesque of Madawaska.

Pending—Passage to be engrossed.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Bragdon of Perham, retabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Thursday, May 25.

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

Bill "An Act to Grant Public Utilities Commission Control Over Cooperatives" (H. P. 1168) (L. D. 1669)

Tabled—May 22, by Mr. Williams of Hodgdon.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

Thereupon, Mr. Williams of Hodgdon offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1168, L. D. 1669, Bill, "An Act to Grant Public Utilities Commission Control Over Cooperatives."

Amend said Bill in section 1 by striking out all of the 2nd and 3rd underlined sentences of the first paragraph of that part designated "**\$2301**" and inserting in place thereof the following underlined sentences (same in L. D. 1669): **'No corporation for either or any of such purposes, whether organized or authorized to do business under this section or by special Act of the Legislature, or any person, association or cooperative organized under chapters 221 to 227 shall have authority without the consent of the Public Utilities Commission to furnish its service in or to any city or town in or to which another corporation, person, association or cooperative is furnishing or is authorized to furnish a similar service. No consent from said commission shall be required for any corporation, person, association or cooperative to render such service as it is rendering on the effective date of this Act.'**

Further amend said Bill by adding at the end, a new section, as follows:

'Sec. 6. Effective date. This Act shall become effective 91 days after the adjournment of the Legislature.'

House Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended and sent to the Senate.

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

Bill "An Act Revising the Motor Vehicle Dealer Registration Law" (H. P. 1164) (L. D. 1665)

Tabled—May 22, by Mr. Drummond of Sidney

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

Mr. Lebel of Van Buren offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1164, L. D. 1665, Bill, "An

Act Revising the Motor Vehicle Dealer Registration Law."

Amend said Bill by inserting after section 1 a new section 1-A, to read as follows:

'Sec. 1-A. R. S., T. 29, §291, amended. The first sentence of section 291 of Title 29 of the Revised Statutes is amended to read as follows:

The Maine Motor Vehicle Dealer Registration Board, as heretofore established and in this subchapter called the "board", shall consist of 5 members, 2 one of whom shall be a new motor vehicle dealers dealer, 2 one of whom shall be a used motor vehicle dealers dealer, one of whom shall be an equipment dealer, one of whom shall be a transporter plate holder and one of whom shall be a person other than a motor vehicle dealer.'

Further amend said Bill in section 2 by striking out in the 7th line (6th line in L. D. 1665) the underlined punctuation and word " , loaner" and by striking out in the 11th line (9th line in L. D. 1665) the underlined punctuation and word, "loaner" and by striking out in the last 2 lines (same in L. D. 1665) the underlined punctuation and words " , transporter or loaner" and inserting in place thereof the underlined words 'or transporter'

Further amend said Bill in section 5 by striking out all of the first 3 lines (same in L. D. 1665) and inserting in place thereof the following:

'Sec. 5. R. S., T. 29, §332-A, additional. Title 29 of the Revised Statutes is amended by adding a new section 332-A, to read as follows:'

Further amend said Bill in section 5 by striking out all of that part designated "**\$332-B.**"

Further amend said Bill in that part of section 6 designated "**\$334.**" by striking out everything after paragraph A of subsection 2 and inserting in place thereof the following:

'B. Not actively engaged in buying or selling. On proof that a new motor vehicle dealer, used motor vehicle dealer, motorcycle dealer, boat trailer dealer or equipment dealer is no longer actively engaged in the business of buying and selling motor vehicles.

C. Records. On proof that a new motor vehicle dealer, used motor vehicle dealer, motorcycle dealer, boat trailer dealer, equipment dealer or holder of transporter registration fails to keep and submit any records required by law.

D. Violations. On proof that the new motor vehicle dealer, used motor vehicle dealer, motorcycle dealer, boat trailer dealer, equipment dealer or transporter plate holder has been convicted of a violation of any of the provisions of sections 295 to 340 or of section 832 or Title 17, section 3203.

E. Use of plates. On proof that a new motor vehicle dealer, used motor vehicle dealer, motorcycle dealer, boat trailer dealer, equipment dealer or transporter plate holder has used or permitted the use of his plate on a motor vehicle or trailer not owned or controlled by the dealer or holder of transporter plates. The use of any such plate on any vehicle as stated herein shall be prima facie evidence that such was permitted by the dealer or holder of transporter plates.

F. Temporary plates. On proof that a new motor vehicle dealer, used motor vehicle dealer, motorcycle dealer, boat trailer dealer, equipment dealer or transporter plate holder has issued or permitted the issuance of a temporary plate for use on motor vehicles not sold by the dealer or holder of transporter plates. The use of any such plate on any vehicle shall be prima facie evidence that such use was permitted by the dealer or holder of transporter plates.

G. Limitation of use. On proof that the holder of a transporter registration certificate has violated any limitations of use imposed on such certificates under section 332 or by the board.

H. Selling stolen motor vehicle. On proof that new motor vehicle dealer, used motor vehicle dealer, motorcycle dealer, boat trailer dealer, equipment dealer or transporter plate holder has been knowingly selling stolen motor vehicles or trailers, in which event his registration may be revoked for a period not to exceed 5 years.

I. Personal use. On proof that transporter plates were used by the person to whom they were issued by the board on any car owned by him, or owned by anyone else, in lieu of registration, for personal use or pleasure.'

Further amend said Bill in that part of section 6 designated "§335." by striking out in the 3rd, 6th and 7th, and 15th and 16th lines (3rd, 6th and 14th lines in L. D. 1665) the underlined punctuation and words ", loaner plate" or ", loaner plates"

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of section 7 and inserting in place thereof the following:

'Sec. 7. R. S., T. 29, §336, sub-§6, repealed. Subsection 6 of section 336 of Title 29 of the Revised Statutes, as enacted by chapter 109 of the public laws of 1965, is repealed.'

Further amend said Bill in section 8 by striking out all of paragraph B and inserting in place thereof the following:

'B. For the personal use of such dealer or the immediate members of his family, provided they are members of his household, or'

Further amend said Bill in section 8 by striking out all of the last blocked paragraph of that part designated subsection "9." and all of subsection "10." and inserting in place thereof the following blocked paragraph:

'Transporter plates may not be used on towing units. Transporter plates may not be used for demonstration and they may not be used in lieu of registration for personal use, personal business or personal pleasure at any time. Each use of a transporter plate shall be considered a one-time movement to or from a service point.'

Further amend said Bill in section 9 by striking out in the 4th line (3rd line in L. D. 1665) the underlined punctuation and word ", loaner" and by striking out in the 8th and 14th lines (7th and 11th lines in L. D. 1665) the underlined words "or loaner"

Further amend said Bill in section 11 by striking out all of the

4th and 5th lines (3rd line in L. D. 1665) and all of the first underlined paragraph and inserting in place thereof the following:

'§832. Insurance before registration for dealers and transporters

The Secretary of State shall not issue new motor vehicle dealer, used motor vehicle dealer, equipment dealer, transporter, motorcycle dealer, trailer dealer or boat trailer dealer registration plates, until the applicant therefor shall have procured and filed with the Secretary of State a certificate showing that the applicant is covered by an automobile bodily injury and property damage liability insurance policy providing coverage as set forth in this Title with respect to the plates issued, approved by the Insurance Commissioner, insuring against any legal liability in accordance with the terms of said policy for personal injury or death of any one person in the sum of \$50,000 and for any number of persons in the sum of \$100,000 and against property damage in the sum of \$10,000, which injury, death or damage may result from or have been caused by the operation of any vehicle bearing such registration plates. In lieu of such insurance, the applicant may file with said Secretary of State a bond or bonds issued by a surety company authorized to do business in the State in the amount of at least \$50,000 on account or injury to or death of any one person; and subject to such limits as respects injury to or death of any one person of at least \$100,000 on account of any one accident resulting in injury to or death of more than one person, and of at least \$10,000 for damage to property of others.'

The SPEAKER: Is it now the pleasure of the House to adopt House Amendment "A"?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Van Buren, Mr. Lebel.

Mr. LEBEL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This L. D. 1665, An Act Revising the Motor Vehicle Dealer Registration Law, is a very important bill. When we repeal and replace a law we should try to replace it to make it a better law. This is what I am

trying to do with House Amendment "A", Filing No. H-342.

This amendment I just presented is not as bad as it looks. What this amendment does is to try to be fair with everybody and stop abuses of dealers' plates, and also have dealers in every category represented on the Board.

Before I explain my amendment I would like to have you know that I am not against the new and used car dealers and not against the lobbyists, because there are some very nice gentlemen lobbying for this bill and I am not opposed to them because they are friends of mine.

What this amendment does is it amends the members of the Board. The Board was formerly made up of two new car dealers, two used car dealers, and one who was not a person engaged in selling cars. The way I have changed it is to have representation by one new car dealer, one used car dealer, one heavy equipment dealer, one transporter registration holder, and one not interested in selling cars.

We repealed the loaners plates. The loaners plate was for the body shop, transmission shop and general repair garage. I spoke to quite a few body shops and garages and they are not interested in these loaners plates, so I feel this should be repealed. I repealed the paragraph under Section 366, Section 7, wreckers, because we don't want dealers plates to be used on wreckers because they would be able to go up to 35 miles and I think they should be licensed, every wrecker should be licensed.

As far as the personal use of the dealers plate, in this bill it says: "For the personal use of such dealers or immediate families, and for the personal use of regular employees of such dealers." If we do let this go, it means that we do have a lot of dealer plates on the road, and I think that is where the abuse comes in.

In the final paragraph I have changed the insurance. For the past 25 or more years all they had in insurance was 5, 10 and 20, and I changed it to 10 for bodily

injury and 50 to 100, and I hope you do go along with the acceptance of this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunkport. Mr. Pendergast.

Mr. PENDERGAST: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: L. D. 1665 is a new draft of L. D. 1533 which, after several lengthy meetings of the Committee on Transportation, came out of Committee 8 to 2 ought to pass.

In 1966 when our present Governor, Kenneth M. Curtis, was Secretary of State, I understand he attended several meetings regarding the Dealer Registration Board. In September of last year there was appointed a committee of two new car dealers, two used car dealers and a member at large to review the entire structure and operation of this law for the purpose of presenting to the 103rd Legislature a redraft.

This Committee has made an honest attempt to provide the Dealer Registration Board with the authority to accomplish the purpose for which it was created. Under the present law the Dealer Registration Board has no authority to suspend or revoke certificates and registration plates when violations have occurred.

Perhaps you will recall a few years ago a certificate and plate were issued to a garage in Scarborough, which was later found to be operating a still. You may also recall at a later date there was a stolen car ring operating in our State using dealer certificates and plates. In both of these cases the Dealer Registration Board was powerless to recall the certificate or plates, which they had issued in good faith. Now, you must admit that this is a ridiculous situation.

Under L. D. 1665 the Board will have the authority to police these situations. This bill has also eliminated many abuses. It has limited the use of dealer plates in many instances. There have been two new categories created under this bill: the heavy equipment dealer and the loaner plate, and I feel this bill is a step forward in

limiting the past abuses and making this law enforceable. I sincerely urge that you vote favorably in passing L. D. 1665, without any amendments, as it came out of Committee 8 to 2 "ought to pass." Therefore, I now move the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "A" under Filing H-342, and request a division.

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

Mr. DANTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Because of the fact that I overheard an individual the other day boasting how he was using his own car for his private and personal use, and never had to register that car, and used the registration of the dealers plates as a means of registering the car, I would like to inquire through the Chair, if I may, whether or not this present bill, without the amendment, would take care of a case such as that?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Danton, poses a question through the Chair to any member who may answer if they choose.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Van Buren, Mr. Lebel.

Mr. LABEL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: No, it won't stop them from using them. Before it never said in the book that the employees could use them. Now they did put in the bill that the employees can use the plates. Before it was not mentioned in the law.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Danton of Old Orchard Beach, tabled pending the motion of Mr. Pendergast of Kennebunkport to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A" and specially assigned for Thursday, May 25.

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

An Act Providing for Action in Aid to Dependent Children Cases Involving Fraud (H. P. 672) (L. D. 944)

Tabled — May 22, by Mr. Hennessey of West Bath.

Pending — Passage to be enacted.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Hennessey of West Bath, under suspension of the rules, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed on May 12.

On further motion of the same gentleman, under suspension of the rules, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby Committee Amendment "A" was adopted on May 11. And on further motion

of the same gentleman, Committee Amendment "A" was indefinitely postponed and the Bill passed to be engrossed without Amendment in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

On motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland.

Adjourned until nine-thirty o'clock tomorrow morning.