

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

Thursday, June 1, 1967

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Richard D. Cleaves of Augusta.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

**Papers from the Senate
Reports of Committees
Ought Not to Pass**

Report of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Increasing all Resident Fish and Game Licenses" (S. P. 299) (L. D. 738)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, the Report was read.

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

Mr. NADEAU: Mr. Speaker, I move that we accept the "Ought not to pass" Report and would like to remark that Commissioner Speers at this hearing said publicly before the group that this would not be necessary unless his pay increase went through. I would just like to have that on record.

Thereupon, the Report was accepted in concurrence.

Report of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reporting same on Bill "An Act to Increase Resident Hunting and Fishing Licenses" (S. P. 300) (L. D. 739)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

Ought to Pass in New Draft

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act to Authorize a Bond Issue in Amount of Three Hundred Thousand Dollars for Capital Improvements, Construction, Renovations and Repairs on Public Owned Dams Located on Great Ponds" (S. P. 421) (L. D. 1075) reporting same in a new

draft (S. P. 661) (L. D. 1679) under title of "An Act Providing Funds for Rebuilding the Dam on Ebeeme Lake in Piscataquis County" and that it "Ought to pass"

Report of the Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act Placing State Highway Department Employees on the Merit Service Step System" (S. P. 310) (L. D. 749) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 662) (L. D. 1680) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

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

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

Ought to Pass

Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Retirement Benefits for Policemen and Firemen of the Lewiston Police and Fire Departments under the State Retirement System" (S. P. 568) (L. D. 1438)

Report of the Committee on State Government reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Appointment of the Deputy Secretary of State" (S. P. 142) (L. D. 270)

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.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act Establishing the Maine Medical Laboratory Act (S. P. 475) (L. D. 1208) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 25 and passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" on May 23.

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

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

**Non-Concurrent Matter
Tabled and Assigned**

An Act to Appropriate Moneys for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1968 and June 30, 1969 (S. P. 597) (L. D. 1575) which was passed to be enacted in the House on April 21 and passed to be engrossed on April 18.

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

In the House: On motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland, tabled pending further consideration and assigned as a Special Order of the Day for 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.

**Non-Concurrent Matter
Tabled and Assigned**

Bill "An Act relating to Applications for and Marking of Absentee Ballots" (H. P. 215) (L. D. 305) which was indefinitely postponed in the House on April 6.

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

In the House:

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its former action and concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, moves that the House recede from its former action and concur with the Senate.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. McMann of Bath, tabled pending the motion of Mr. Ross of Bath to recede and concur and specially assigned for tomorrow.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Providing for a New Charter for the City of Waterville" (H. P. 945) (L. D. 1385) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in the House on May 15, and which was recalled from the Engrossing Department by Joint Order (H. P. 1180).

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

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Report of the Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act relating to Temporary Loans by State" (H. P. 1026) (L. D. 1492) reporting Leave to Withdraw which was accepted in the House on May 26.

Came from the Senate with the Report and Bill recommitted to the Committee on State Government in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mr. Martin of Eagle Lake, the House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

**Non-Concurrent Matter
Tabled Until Later in Today's
Session**

Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Clarifying the Location of Town Line Between China and Winslow" (H. P. 1118) (L. D. 1595) which Report and Bill were recommitted to the Committee on Legal Affairs in the House on May 17.

Came from the Senate with the Report accepted in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mr. Farrington of China, tabled until later in today's session.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Create Down East Community Hospital District No. 1" (H. P. 1161) (L. D. 1662) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on May 18.

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 Senate.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Grant Public Utilities Commission Control over

Cooperatives" (H. P. 1168) (L. D. 1669) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in the House on May 23.

Came from the Senate with House Amendment "A" indefinitely postponed and the Bill 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 Senate.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Pledging Credit of State for Maine School Building Authority Bonds (S. P. 622) (L. D. 1624) which was indefinitely postponed on final passage in non-concurrence in the House on May 26.

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

In the House: On motion of Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston, the House voted to adhere.

Orders

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

Tabled Until Later in the Day

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that there is appropriated from the Legislative Appropriation the sum of \$200 to each of the Indian representatives to aid in defraying expenses incurred while representing their tribes at the One Hundred and Third Legislature.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may speak to his order.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am presenting this order this morning as I feel that perhaps these Indian representatives in this session of the Legislature have had quite a job to carry out, and where they are not represented now in legislative districts I would feel that this session should give them some additional compensation to pay for some of their expenses. I do feel,

however, that in the next legislative session they will be represented by Representatives in the Legislature and this is why I am doing this by House order so that it would take care of the problem at this time.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am opposed to this order, and I don't see where we have had any more bills relating to Indian affairs than usual. Only recently, in the last few sessions, we elected a man to head up Indian Affairs, which is a highly paid proposition. He is also looking after Indian affairs. I have been here quite a while myself as well as you have without extra compensation. For these reasons I don't think it's right to increase compensations to any other people or groups of people. I voted against increasing the salary of the Legislature and myself and I feel that I am being consistent in being against this order. I hope the order does not receive passage.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In support of the order introduced by the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hinds, I would like to indicate to the Members of the House that L. D. 186, now in the other body, is going to be amended in the other body with an amendment which will provide twenty round trips for the travel representative to the Legislature and would also give meal and housing expenses actually incurred while attending legislative sessions. The \$200 involved in the order supported by the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hinds, has the support of the Republican leadership and we feel that it will help correct a possible injustice existing at this session and we feel that Senate Amendment "C" to L. D. 186 will fill out our entire commitment to the travel representatives.

It will be up to the next session of the Legislature to make what-

ever adjustments it may wish to make in the program. I would urge every member of the House to vote in favor of the order presented by the gentleman from South Portland and when the vote is taken I request a division.

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

Mrs. CARSWELL: Mr. Speaker, I can't seem to find a copy of this order — has it been reproduced?

The SPEAKER: The answer is in the negative.

The Chair recognizes the same gentlewoman.

Mrs. CARSWELL: Mr. Speaker, I move that this matter be tabled until later in the day and until it's reproduced.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Carswell, moves that the Joint Order offered by the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hinds, be tabled until later in today's session pending passage. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Joint Order was tabled pending passage, ordered reproduced and later today assigned.

Mr. Lewin of Augusta was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. LEWIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In this busy schedule of ours it is always refreshing to pause a moment to bear respects to a fellow Representative, and this morning we would speak of one of whom we hold in high esteem. I would ask that we extend happy birthday greetings to our youthful seventy-seven old Representative from Freeport, Ben Crockett. Thank you. (Applause, the members rising)

Mr. Crockett of Freeport was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. CROCKETT: My good friends, that was quite an ovation.

I have had several of these during my lifetime as a Legislator, and I see many of the boys that are here with me now who started in the 97th Legislature. I have made a lot of good friends since

I have been here, all over the State, and I hope to continue if God gives me the same privilege that he has up to now. I thank you all for your feelings towards me. (Applause)

Mr. Hunter of Durham was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. HUNTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to give you a little background on our esteemed Representative, Benjamin S. Crockett. You know, for years I was known as George Hunter, the big man from Freeport, and I served the Town of Freeport as one of its municipal officers and during this time this car with Vermont plates full of clothing in the back of it came to Freeport with this sort of a man peddling clothing. I learned that his name was Ben Crockett and he bought the Ern Rogers place up on the Merrill Road. So after a few days or a few weeks before some of the cow traders come around and says—this fellow Crockett's a pretty good fellow; you can't cheat him too much but you can cheat him just a little bit—he catches on kind of quick. Those are the kind of people that we would like, we wouldn't like someone that we could take over too easily.

And if you remember, Levi Patterson was in the Legislature down here—of course in those days there's only a very few of us Democrats around, and Ben announced that he was going to run. And you know I as a loyal Democrat have worked for Ben all the time and I'd say it from the rooftops that Ben Crockett is the best representative that Freeport ever had. I've taken Ben in my own car and we've gone out calling on places around; although I was out of Ben's territory as time moved on, if I needed anything done at Augusta I always came to Ben Crockett.

Ben was the man that got me interested in the State Legislature, he was sort of my spiritual advisor on everything. Every year Ben would invite me down here and I would spend one night or a day and all night traveling around with Ben and the queerest thing about

it I used to have a good time then and I've never had a good time around Augusta since I have been on my own. Ben knows his way around Augusta and Waterville and a few towns in between and he makes a great Legislator and we are proud of him, and to both he and his wife Babe I want to wish the best of luck to them. Thank you, very much. (Applause)

Mr. Crockett of Freeport was granted unanimous consent to briefly address the House.

Mr. CROCKETT: May I just say to my good friend, George Hunter, thanks. I know that he means what he says sincerely.

Mr. Hanson of Solon presented the following Joint Resolution and moved its adoption:

In the year of our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred and Sixty-seven, We, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the One Hundred Third Legislative Session assembled, do honor and congratulate the National Grange on its completion of 100 years of service.

WHEREAS, the Order of Patrons of Husbandry, better known as the Grange, is celebrating its first century of service; and

WHEREAS, this rural organization was founded on principles that are called the "Declaration of Independence of the American Farmer" and endorses the motto "In Essentials Unity, in Non-essentials Liberty, In All Things Charity" and seeks the greatest good for the greatest number; and

WHEREAS, on April 17, 1967, a commemorative National Grange stamp was issued with suitable ceremonies in the Department of Agriculture which is most appropriate inasmuch as the Grange was instrumental in elevating the United States Department of Agriculture to cabinet status; and

WHEREAS, the Grange has made significant contributions to the development of rural America and an informed citizenry; and being interested in the home, church, educational, social, economic and legislative needs of the farmer; and

WHEREAS, the Grange has always been interested in advancing the highest in moral and spiritual values; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: that we, the Members of the Legislature of the State of Maine, salute the Maine State Grange and the National Grange for their contribution to the economic and social welfare of Maine's agricultural industries and in aiding the family farmer; and be it further

RESOLVED: that copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Maine State Grange and to the National Grange. (H. P. 1188)

The Joint Resolution was adopted and sent up for concurrence.

House Reports of Committees Ought Not to Pass Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Beliveau from the Committee on Legal Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Definition of Practice of Professional Engineering" (H. P. 451) (L. D. 626)

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Lewin of Augusta, tabled pending acceptance and specially assigned for tomorrow.)

Mr. Hanson from the Committee on Taxation reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Establishing a Highway Use Tax" (H. P. 1036) (L. D. 1528)

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Ought to Pass in New Draft New Drafts Printed

Mr. Cushing from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act to Increase the Term of Office of Mayor, City Council, Board of Police and Board of Education, Wardens and Ward Clerks of the City of Biddeford and Change Date of Election" (H. P. 666) (L. D. 921) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1186) (L. D. 1687) under title of "An Act Increasing Salary of Mayor and Councilman, Reducing the Number of Members on the City Council, Increasing the Term of Office of Mayor, City Council, Board of Police and Board of Education, Wardens and Ward

Clerks of the City of Biddeford, Changing Date of Election, and Providing for Electing Civil Service Commission for the Fire Department of the City of Biddeford" and that it "Ought to pass."

Mrs. Giroux from the Committee on Retirements and Pensions on Bill "An Act relating to Restoration to Service under State Retirement Law" (H. P. 325) (L. D. 459) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1187) (L. D. 1688) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Reports were read and accepted, the New Drafts read twice and tomorrow assigned.

Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment

Mr. Conley from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act to Change Date of Caucus Election of City of Biddeford" (H. P. 665) (L. D. 920) 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. 665, L. D. 920, Bill,
"An Act to Change Date of Caucus Election of City of Biddeford."

Amend said Bill by striking out in the 11th line (9th line of L. D. 920) the underlined word "biennial"

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

Mrs. Cornell from the Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act to Create a Maine State Board of Human Research and Development" (H. P. 75) (L. D. 100) 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. 75, L. D. 100, Bill,
"An Act to Create a Maine State Board of Human Research and Development."

Amend said Bill in section 2 by striking out in the 2nd line (same

in L. D. 100) the figure "10%" and inserting in place thereof the figure '\$2,500'; and by striking out all of the last paragraph.

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

Mr. Dennett from the Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act Increasing Number of Visitors for Maine Maritime Academy" (H. P. 382) (L. D. 529) 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. 382, L. D. 529, Bill,
"An Act Increasing Number of Visitors for Maine Maritime Academy."

Amend said Bill by striking out in the last line (same in L. D. 529) the underlined figure "24" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure '16'

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

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act relating to Dates for Harness Racing Meets" (H. P. 385) (L. D. 532) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. STERN of Penobscot
—of the Senate
Mrs. CORNELL of Orono
Messrs. RIDEOUT of Manchester
WATTS of Machias
STARBIRD
of Kingman Township
MARTIN of Eagle Lake
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WYMAN of Washington
LUND of Kennebec
— of the Senate.

Messrs. DENNETT of Kittery
PHILBROOK

of South Portland
— of the House.

Reports were read.

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

Mr. SUSI: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move that we accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report, and when the vote is taken I request that it be taken by division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi, moves that the Majority Report be accepted.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, when the vote is taken I move that it be taken by roll call.

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

Mr. SUSI: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill has been with us for quite a long time now. It hasn't come to the surface until just recently. I think most of us have been aware that it is in the works. There's been a lot of information and misinformation on it. Like most bills that come before us they get to be known by names which we tack on them and which in everyday talk amongst ourselves we refer to certain bills by certain names; and the two names that have been used on this bill rather commonly are, first, the bill that sets up the Bangor Race Track, or, depending upon who says it, the bill that kills the agricultural fairs.

Well, I'd like to explain these misconceptions and explain the bill.

I was involved in years past for many years in promoting fluoridation in my home town, and at every meeting we had for many years there was a dentist who came and said — you know I think this stuff could cause cancer, and so we would be delayed for another year or two. There was never any conclusive proof given that fluorides did cause cancer, but everybody knew that they didn't

want cancer and that they didn't want their children to have cancer, so it cast a cloud over this issue of fluoridation for many, many years, not only in our community but in communities throughout the State. And so I think that this accusation of this bill being a bill to kill the fairs has cast a cloud over this bill too.

What is this bill actually, and what would it do?

Now, the Harness Racing Commission administers harness racing in the State of Maine, and the law as it is now written contains provisions — first, to the effect that the Commission cannot grant racing dates to any organization whether it be an agricultural fair or an extended meet which would be detrimental to an agricultural association conducting a meet. There can be no dates granted by the Commission to any organization in a county adjoining a county where a fair is being conducted by an agricultural association, and certainly there is a provision that during the period from August 10 to October 20 there can be no extended meets granted any dates, period.

Now the effect of these provisions is in general that extended meets during the summer in Maine are excluded, because there certainly would be argument before the Commission, whether justified or not, that any granting of dates to extended meets during the summer months or the tourist months would be detrimental to an agricultural association, and the Commission would have to uphold the law as it is written — would have to honor those arguments, and so preclude the possibility of any dates during that time.

Now what does the bill do? The change is this, that it eliminates the sections I have just referred to you, and those sections have been replaced by an amendment which was prepared by the Committee and the amendment reads as follows: "The Commission is directed to assign such dates for holding harness horse races or meets for public exhibition with pari mutuel polls as will be in the best public interest, and in determining the same shall consider the

interests of the agricultural associations of Maine; the improvement and promotion of harness racing in the state, and the encouragement and promotion of the breeding of Maine's standard bred horses."

Now this is the section that will replace these specific exemptions that would be removed by the bill. Now there is no mention about a Bangor track nor any other specific track. If this bill were enacted, then there are to my knowledge around three or four outfits, different interests, who are interested in going before the Commission and applying for summer dates for extended racing. There is nothing in here that would prevent the agricultural fairs to continue their racing just as they always have, and this would allow the Commission to solve the problems rather than these specific laws passed by a legislature in the past, sponsored by the agricultural associations obviously.

Now, for those who are not addicts of two-dollar windows, the difference between extended meets and fairs are that extended meets are race meets conducted over a period of several weeks or more in a single location. The whole plan is geared to racing alone; that is, there are no carnivals in connection with it. The admission fees generally are very low. They attempt to provide comfortable facilities for their patrons, good seating, paved parking areas, and the whole key to this being that it's possible because they do have several weeks racing over which to write off the cost of these facilities.

Another point I would like to mention now is that an extended meet in the summer in Maine would provide employment for about 500 people, and in extended meets in other states the people employed at summer extended meets are usually college students or teachers on vacation, so that it could make a considerable contribution to our economy in that respect.

The fairs have shown considerable interest in this legislation, so let's take a look at the fairs in Maine, particularly as they relate to Maine as it is today.

Now fairs were established generally about a hundred years ago in the State of Maine, they are regional facilities. They were set up so that practically everyone who lived in the State of Maine could within a day's buggy drive at the most, attend a fair at the end of harvest season, and they provided as a showcase for their agricultural products. In my area when I was a young man, there were fairs at Harmony, Unity, Athens, Norridgewock, Exeter, those towns. I as a child went to most of them and there are none of those fairs left now as the automobile came along and people traveled greater distance and all of you from your own experience know of many fairs I am sure that did exist and are no longer in existence.

Now, they were geared to the family farm system. Some hundred years ago when these fairs were established family farms represented the homes of about eighty per cent of our population here in the United States. Now five to six percent of our population produces our agricultural products here in the United States, and this percentage is still declining.

I have a book here, "Farms and Farmers in an Urban Age." It's a twentieth century farm study that I read through this past weekend and it's an excellent explanation of what's taking place in America agriculture. This book was written in '63 and the prediction was that we would be in the position of five to six percent of our people producing all the food by 1970. We've reached that point, actually in 1966, so their conclusions are correct only it's happening much quicker than what they had anticipated. These fairs are and always have been conducted on a one day a week situation, and because they are one-week stands the fairs haven't, even with the considerable subsidy which they receive from the state, ever been able to generate the kind of revenue required to develop facilities to accommodate the number of racing fans which now exists.

Because of the rural location of most of these fairs they are not

well situated to serve a great majority of our population which is now urban, nor, two, to serve our summer visitors which would best attend a facility located on or near a major highway which can handle the traffic volume generated by a modern race meet.

It has been said that I as the sponsor and active proponent of this bill must have strong feelings against the fairs, since the opponents claim that this bill would be detrimental to fairs, which I deny.

Now, if you understood my background I think that it would be very difficult for you to believe that I would go out and attempt to cut the feet out from under the fairs. My association with fairs began about the year 1930 when I received, on my birthday, a Brownie camera and the first place I stopped was down at the Four-County Fair in Pittsfield, which was conducted right after my birthday, and I had a roll of film with my Brownie camera and I shot that whole roll of film of Henry Clukey winning the feature there driving "Peter-pokey." Now I still have these pictures and they're dear possessions of mine, and I stayed that night until after dark and I remember "Louis the Greek" gave me some of the hot-dogs that were left over there, and when I got home — I got some old-fashioned punishment, and you know while I was being punished, I can remember it as though it were yesterday, it hurt, it hurt terribly, but I thought I'd have to do this again, and I did; every chance I got I went to a fair — I went to those fairs that I mentioned to you in my neighborhood. They're as much a part of my heritage or my background as probably anyone in this House; I have a strong feeling for the fairs, but time does march on and I don't think that we can become so fascinated with our past that we deny ourselves any future.

The fears that some of the representatives have indicated to us here in this Legislature, allow this bill to become law and the fairs are finished. While this is a tune that they've learned quite well because it was a dozen or fifteen

years ago that, at that time Gorham Raceway was built which was a facility paying better than anything that was in existence at that time, and the fair people said — if you allow this place to open, if you give them any dates, we're finished! Well, now that's a dozen or fifteen years ago and Gorham has been racing all this time, and the fairs aren't finished. I have stacks of figures here showing that their attendance is up, their handle is up, they're generally as healthy, the fairs are right now as they have ever been in their history and that is what the fair people, if they speak here today, will tell you.

Now a little later Scarborough came along, and this was as far advanced over Gorham as Gorham was over the old fair meets, and when Scarborough came along the fair people said — this is it, this is finish for the fairs if you ever let them operate. Now Scarborough has been operating many years and the fairs still are going; they're filling their facilities, the average fair can seat five or six, seven hundred people. A pony show will attract that kind of a crowd. Today it's no problem at all to get several thousands of people at the height of our tourist season to any sort of an attraction.

I know that many of you here have either seen or heard of a track in — they call it Oxford Speedway down around Norway, South Paris. A fellow came up from Massachusetts recognizing a potential up here that we Maine people don't recognize ourselves. He put in 13,000 seats down there and has had sell-out crowds many times there which is up around 10,000 as I understand it. Now if the fairs wished, they could have said when this was in the works — if you allow the formation of this facility and they start drawing 10,000, 13,000, 15,000 people, surely this is the end of the fairs. Now the fact is, he's been operating down there a number of years, and the fairs are doing quite well, and they will persist on that in their presentation if they wish to make one.

Opponents to this legislation have indicated this bill would be damaging to the fairs on the grounds

that it would deprive them of horses they need to conduct racing and make it impossible to continue their sport of agricultural programs with premiums and so forth.

Now on the first count, the history of harness racing goes back to the buggy horse. It started back when there were no automobiles; people had their buggy horses, and they'd train them for a while prior to their local fair and they'd race them there — it was very much a hobby. They gave ribbons or whips or whatever as prizes, and everyone was very happy with the situation. Now this all changed in 1937 when a fellow by the name of Phillips invented what is used exclusively now in harness racing, a starting gate, or an automobile with a gate on behind which brings all the horses away evenly, and night lighting. Now with the advent of these two improvements there was a harness racing track constructed in New York City, Roosevelt Raceway to accommodate 40,000 people, and that was the beginning of harness racing becoming the fastest growing spectator sport in the United States.

Now with the advent of these changes, there was a transition from harness racing as a hobby to harness racing as an occupation for a great many people. With the advent of these tracks in our country, of which there are many, many of them now, we became an export state on horsemen, harness racing officials; this was a hot-bed up here of this sport, it has existed and prospered for many years here in Maine. But through the years our people have been leaving in increasing numbers to work in these out-of State tracks where, of course, their opportunities are much greater than they are here in Maine.

Now, how does this all tie in to the accusation that the fairs make that there wouldn't be horses up here? Now, because this is a commercial thing now, these horsemen are generally young men with families who are trying to support them following this trade. The average stable up here is around twelve horses, and they obviously aren't all top horses. There are

some that aren't that good, and if they have to leave they take all of their horses out of state; if they come back, they bring all their horses back here. Now I don't believe the day will ever come when there will be top horses at the agricultural fairs again, but the only hope in my opinion of their having horses to race at agricultural fairs is to offer an opportunity at decent purses for the better class horses to race up here in Maine, so that these other horses will be in Maine and be available to furnish horses for the fairs. Fairs say we can't, even with this present legislation which reserves the summer exclusively for us, we can't get horses in the numbers that we want to conduct our meets in the summer.

Well now that's something like saying—if you go out and start a job and say I can't hire any men, there just aren't any men available. What you neglect to mention is that you're offering \$1.00 an hour. Now it's pretty obvious that you aren't going to hire men at \$1.00 an hour, but right now, in Lewiston there is a harness racing meet being conducted and they're giving a good percentage of eight, ten and twelve hundred dollar purses over there—they're getting good crowds and a good handle, and they're in a position where they can give these purses, and horses wait ten days or two weeks for a chance to race. Now just as soon as this standard meet racing is over, these horses will be leaving the state for just one reason and one reason only, and that is that they can't live at the purses that the fairs can afford to pay them up here and keep their entire stables up here just for racing for fairs.

Now, practically what changes could we expect on the enactment of this bill? First, not just the Bangor people as has been represented, but undoubtedly several interested groups would submit different proposals for the establishment of a commercial track in Maine to the Harness Racing Commission. It would then be the Commission's responsibility to determine under the guidelines of the bill as amended to adopt

a policy which might include a commercial track, and agricultural fairs operate concurrently in separate sections of the state. They might not. At the present time the Commission can only abide by the law as it now stands in the face of what everyone connected recognizes to be a serious situation. This legislation would free their hands to plan a solution rather than allowing a degeneration to continue as it is now into a hopeless situation.

At the present time the state is subsidizing the fairs at the rate of \$276,000 a year. I don't know how many people are aware of that, but that is the way it is; and then to break it down into days, there are some of the fairs who are receiving subsidy from the state now at the rate of around \$5,000 per day that they operate. Now that's real money.

If we want to increase the subsidy for the fairs from state's fund from the present quarter million to a half a million dollars, or a million dollars — and that's our decision, I'd have no argument with it, but let's do it by increasing the present two cents per capita tax for this purpose to five cents, or ten cents or twenty cents, whatever is needed on all the people—if that's what we want, but not throw all this load, which is true under the existing legislation, on a very narrow segment of our population, namely, the horsemen; and by so doing tell them the fact that if you wish to pursue your trade in your home state, you must work for one half or one third of what you could be getting were it not for this legislation that is now on the books, which more and more of them are being forced to do—leave the state. After all, racing officials, pari mutuel employees tote board rentals, pari mutuel machine rentals, starting gate rentals, and all other services connected with racing operate in the free market and require and get the same rates from fairs as they get from extended meets. And under this law that we now have, our horsemen are directed that they must offer their services during the height of the season for

whatever the fairs can give them, or get out of state.

Now to summarize let's lessen the tax burden on State of Maine people by allowing the revenue from this source to reach its potential, which is far beyond what we are now realizing, and at the same time make it possible for Maine people to enjoy the type of entertainment which they overwhelmingly want as witnessed by these signatures obtained by interested citizens all over the state; and I have their signatures and the number, 4,210 signatures that were obtained in a very short time in all sections of this state. This represents what the people of this state want, not a small lobby.

Let's provide for the ever increasing number of summer visitors who like to fish, swim, boat and so forth in the daytime up here, but on a summer routine they're apt to be sleeping late and come evening after supper they like to go out for an evening's entertainment and if there is a clean attractive place they will spend money up here, they'll help share our tax load with us, and it's the type of entertainment — if you agree with this, that most of our people come from north of Washington and east of Chicago. This is an area in which every section has commercial harness racing, and at home these people who are tourists here in Maine in the summer support commercial racing at home, they will support it up here and be happy to have it.

I say let's approve this legislation and allow our Commission to handle this so that the fairs can perform the functions which they have been developed for, which they have the capacity for and which they can be comfortable doing, namely, serving as a recreational institution for their respective area — one week annual stance as they are now doing, but at the same time allow the development of facilities, which one would require no state expenditure to accomplish—in fact these would be state revenue producing facilities if they're ever approved. Two, would provide the capacity for the crowds which would attend mid-summer racing; the average

fairground can handle seats for maybe up to a thousand, I think five or six hundred is more like it, and we can easily get crowds here during the summer from five thousand people on up. It would permit Maine horsemen to earn sufficient to allow them to stay in Maine, and they are a recreational asset just as much as our mountains and our streams and all else, we need them here; and four, would bring state's revenues up to its potential from this activity. Thank you very much for your patience.

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

Mr. TRUMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in support of the good gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi. I've studied over his bill. I think he has a good bill here, and I hope you go along with this honorable gentleman and the Majority Report. Thank you.

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

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill had a very good hearing at the Maine Fair Association meeting in January, and out of twenty fairs polled, there was just one fair association in favor of this bill. The fairs would come up with a lot more premium money for the classes showed at the fairs, the purse money is increasing, they have built new additional stalls and widened their tracks and improved their grandstands, and if this bill passes here today it's going to be a detriment to these smaller agricultural fairs and I hope that when this House votes it will go along and accept the Minority "Ought not to Pass" Report.

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

Mr. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I go along with Mr. Susi. I don't think this bill would hurt the fairs — I think it would help their funds. I am also for it for another reason, and if I am incorrect in this statement I hope somebody

representing the fairs will correct me, but this would be private enterprise, it will pay all taxes on all bases the same as any other private corporation would. It would get the exemptions that fairs get at the present time which I believe is practically tax-free from all angles. For that reason, I would support the bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Wight.

Mr. WIGHT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think it's very clearly stated in the Statement of Facts on the bill that this bill would remove certain sections of the law which provides that the State Harness Racing Commission shall reserve certain dates each year exclusively for the agricultural fair associations. With these sections removed, the Commission would be free at their discretion to assign harness racing dates. Now this is certainly going to interfere with the operation of all of our fairs in the state and fairs in the state do help I feel in many ways. The ten thousand 4-H boys and girls, Future Farmers, get their only encouragement from premiums paid by the fair.

Now this will not interfere with the extended fair dates that are now available for extended dates in any part of the state. I feel this is going to open up for meets and take the horses away from the fairs that are trying to operate now, and they're certainly having hard enough time to survive. I feel this bill is not a good bill.

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

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, through the Chair I would like to address a question to the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may pose his question.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Susi, on this Racing Commission, are the fairs currently represented?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi, who may answer if he

chooses, and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. SUSI: Under the present law as it is written now and in this regards, it hasn't changed at all. There is a provision that at least one member of the Harness Racing Commission has to be a member of an agricultural association. The present Commission, which if this bill were adopted would administer harness racing affairs in this state, is made up of a chairman who is the president of a fair association, another member who is associated with the Presque Isle fair, and a third member representing the public. So at the present time there are two members of the Commission that are directly connected with the fair associations and they would be administering the law which I would like to read again.

Now if you can see any harm in this please kick my shins as I walk out today. "The Commission is directed to assign such dates or holding harness horse races or meets for public exhibition, with pari mutuel polls as will be in the best public interest." Is there anything wrong with that? I don't think so. "And in determining the same shall consider the interests of agricultural associations meets." So you will have a board made up of three people, two of whom are directly associated with the fairs, a chairman, a president of a fair, a director to consider the interests of the agricultural associations of Maine, improvement and promotion of harness racing in the state and the encouragement and promotion of the breeding of Maine standard bred horses. Now that would be the new law as drawn up by the Committee.

I don't believe there has been any evidence given there's any harm in this.

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

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address another question to the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi. If this bill goes into effect, isn't it so that the reserve dates that are now available to the fairs will be excluded?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, poses a

further question to the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi, who may answer if he chooses, and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. SUSI: That's true, there is now a period during which the Commission can grant dates exclusively to the agricultural fairs; no one else can be considered. That would be removed, and the section that I just read would be put into effect; and that would just throw it open to the Commission's judgment. If they were of a mind they might allow the formation — and I say if they are of a mind, they might allow the formation of an extended meet in an area, and for the period that that extended meet was being conducted allow fairs to operate at a distance of seventy-five or more miles, for instance, away from that, and I can't picture any conflict whatsoever in this regard.

Now there is another element to it — I know that I'm worrying this to death, but it is quite a complicated subject and all the time I've been here there never has been any discussion on it. All of this legislation sponsored by the agricultural fairs has gone through without any discussion whatsoever and I think it's time that we get acquainted with this segment of our state's operations. At the present time, as I have said, the fairs are getting subsidies to the tune last year of \$276,000. Now this isn't funds that they generate themselves. 83 percent of that \$276,000 was generated by the extended meets that race in the off seasons, they start in March over in Lewiston and they run clear through until December. and during the summer they have to give up their dates to the agricultural fairs.

So, as the extended meets increase their operations the subsidy is tied directly into the handle generated by the extended meets. So as they generate more money at the extended meets, the fairs get more money under the existing laws. Their subsidy has gone up, since 1957 it was \$125,000; last year it was \$276,000. Now that isn't increase just at the fairs — it's mainly increase at the extended meets, and if this legislation were to go through and if the Com-

mission were of a mind to grant dates to another extended meet I can see where it would double again in a very short time, including the revenue to the state, including — oh I could go on forever about fairs.

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

Mr. NADEAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I attended this hearing and there's a lot of things here that are not being said. You are going to wonder why there was a six to four divided report on this and I'm going to tell you. They didn't do it because of the people that spoke against it, because there was twenty to one at least who spoke against this bill, not for the bill. However, it seems to me that the lobbyists have been at work and have swayed this Committee to come out even to a six to four — it should have been at least one to nine in reverse.

The things that I would like to have you remember which were brought out at the hearing, that this bill will remove all the protection that these agricultural fairs have had. Another thing, these fairs have paid out in this past year alone to the tune of a quarter of a million dollars to Future Farmers 4-H Club boys and girls. Now how are you going to replace this? Another important factor, in 1964 the state received \$633,000 from these fairs; in 1965, \$693,000; and in 1966, \$818,000.

Now I assure you when you've got something good that's going and we don't have to find this money, which we all realize this is what we're here for, we should not try to eliminate it by a promise of something which is going to be better. If you would have attended this hearing as I did, you wouldn't believe or you couldn't imagine going along and hearing that it came out six to four "ought to pass." I just can't believe it. It just goes that you have got to have paid lobbyists to do a job if you want something done. And I believe that you should listen to this information as given to you on this L. D. 532 and you should hope this ought not to pass.

Mr. Quinn of Bangor was granted permission to speak a third time.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address another question to the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may pose his question.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Susi, at the present time we have harness races at Gorham and Scarborough. Is it now contemplated that there will be another race track within a few miles of Bangor?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, poses a further question to the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi, who may answer if he chooses. The Chair would advise the gentleman to confine his remarks to the answer, and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. SUSI: I tried to explain earlier, Judge, that this would open up so that the Commission could consider applications from any interested group for the formation of a track, and I have knowledge of at least three different interested groups who claim they would present such applications to the Commission — then it's entirely up to the Commission what action they would take on that, when they would open the door for these people to come in.

Mr. Quinn of Bangor was granted permission to speak a fourth time.

Mr. QUINN: I would like to address another question to Mr. Susi of Pittsfield. If this bill passes, Brother Susi, is it not so that this Harness Commission can grant a continuous racing at any and all of these racetracks in competition with any and all the fairs within seventy-five miles of the area?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, poses a further question to the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi, who may answer if he chooses and the Chair recognizes that gentleman and advises him to confine his remarks to the answer.

Mr. SUSI: It would be left in the hands of the Commission, in lieu of the makeup of the Commission you know under what rules they would be operating.

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

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Out of all these groups that have been opposed to this bill, the only fair that is in favor of this bill is Bangor right at the present time.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Union, Mr. Hawes.

Mr. HAWES: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As you that were here last year know that I am for the Maine agricultural fairs, we had quite an argument last year on a certain bill and my position was upholding the fairs, I still uphold the fairs. I am a member of the fair we have in the town of Union from which I come; I am a member of the Maine Agricultural Fair Association. And it has been stated at our meeting in January that all fairs but one were opposed to this, this one fair being Bangor, and I don't think it's any secret that the gentleman who runs the Bangor fair is very much interested in setting up a new track outside of Bangor.

I would like to give you another few facts on why the fairs are opposing this especially why Union Fair is opposed to it. I don't think that the proponents of this can deny the fact that if this bill goes through it will be the end of racing in small agricultural fairs, for the simple reason that there just aren't enough people in the State of Maine to carry on racing both day and night. What it would amount to would be that the small fairs would have to race daytimes and they then would go to a commercial track at night. There aren't enough horses, I wouldn't say that, there probably is, a certain type of horses you can get to race day times, but I don't believe there are enough people in the State of Maine to support racing in the daytime and racing again at a commercial track at night. So it is going to be the small fair that's going to suffer.

Now this will put an end to our fair in the town of Union. I have a few figures, and this all relates to two reasons what we would lose

if racing went out of Union Fair. I have figured up parking, track maintenance and sheriff patrols and one thing or another, it figured up to about \$1800 we pay out just for that one week to certain individuals that — they look forward to, they look forward to that week at Union Fair when they can make a little extra money, a lot goes to college students, some of it goes to retired people, it all helps out, \$1800 in one week, you divide it up between a group of people, and it helps pay the taxes and one thing and another. And then on top of that the amount of money that comes into the towns, the various towns around, not only the town of Union but all the towns in Knox County. As far as garages, laundromats, stores, we have a store in our own town that estimates if it wasn't for Union Fair that one store in particular would have to close up, they figure they do enough business that one week of Union Fair to keep going the rest of the year.

So I think — I'm for economy all over but I'm not for taking economy out of a number of sections of the state and adding it all into one section. This goes on in every small race track in the state of which there are ten I believe. So really taking — and most of the other tracks have larger racing and spend more money than we do down in our small fair we have.

Now it has been said that racing starts in March and runs to December, and that's about eight months if I figure right. Out of that eight months there are only ten weeks allotted to the agricultural fairs. Now it seems to me that agricultural fairs have been in this state for a good many years, a lot longer than most of us around here, and I can see no good reason for taking racing out of these agricultural fairs. It is part of the way of life in these small communities. I can bring you any amount of people or any amount of names that would hate to see racing eliminated from our small track in Union. Not necessarily a small track, it is the same size track as any track in the State is. The fact is, the track

at Union holds the State record as far as times goes. We spent a lot of money there and we are spending a lot more money there again this year, somewhere around \$25,000 or \$30,000 we are going to spend at our fair, all of it isn't on racing, probably over half of it will be to help out the racing facilities. That money all goes into the county, it is spread out amongst the county, in supplies and help and one thing and another. So I say let's not divide up that economy of the State and put it all into one spot, let's keep it spread out among the many segments of the State, and I hope you will go along with the Fair Association and vote against this bill.

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

Mr. McMANN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I don't know too much about horse races, I am not interested in horse racing, but I do know I go to a lot of fairs and horse racing I understand is the main money that the fairs have to use to run them. And I know that this State of Maine that the fairs are an institution and I hope that we don't do anything to hurt the fairs because it's a family affair. Thank you.

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

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I represent an area, Windsor, Maine, one of the finest agricultural fairs in the state. I am caused to rise this morning to echo the feelings of those who have run this fair for many years. I think we should not lose sight of the fact that this is a privileged business controlled by the state and the fact that the funds received at the races at these agricultural fairs does more than just satisfy race fans. I think a sufficient amount of words have been spoken this morning; this is one bad thing about speaking last, you suddenly don't have too much to say because everyone else has said it. I do hope that what has been said has given you sufficient food for thought so that you will oppose the bill now before you. Thank you very much.

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

Mrs. HANSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As Acton Fair is in the town of Acton, one of the towns I represent, and the people from all of my area are very much opposed to this. They feel that the fairs are a family affair, it's a place that they go to picnic, they make a day of it, the children make floats in the parade, and I would hate to see anything detrimental happen to them.

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

Mr. SOULAS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It has been said during some of the debate that Bangor is definitely in favor of the new legislation. I would just like to clarify a point. This is the first knowledge I have had of this being a situation in Bangor that's really in favor of it. I will say this, however. When I first was a boy I always looked forward to the fairs, especially the great Bangor Fair, and as I have been growing older I have been noticing that the Fair has become more commercialized by strictly horse racing, and there used to be one week that we had the fair and also have horse racing, and this was a day-time activity.

Now I notice that it's two full weeks of night racing and now it's also become an extra week of night racing. So I feel if we are going to do any changing I will favor the change because primarily I don't think the Fair will be affected — number one, if we have one good full week of the Fair which we do have in Bangor now, that will still be all right. If they want to change the dates and move the other two weeks, I don't think it's going to bother the Fair one bit.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi, that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report. 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 on the motion of the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi, that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report on Bill "An Act relating to Dates for Harness Racing Meets," House Paper 385, L. D. 532. All those in favor of accepting the Majority "Ought to pass" Report will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Baker, E. B.; Bedard, Beliveau, Benson, Berman, Bourgojn, Brennan, Brown, Buck, Carey, Carroll, Champagne, Conley, Cookson, Cornell, Danton, Dudley, Edwards, Ewer, Fortier, Giroux, Harriman, Hewes, Hodgkins, Hunter, Lebel, Levesque, Littlefield, Martin, Miliano, Porter, Quimby, Rideout, Robertson, Robinson, Scribner, Snowe, P.; Soulas, Starbird, Susi, Trask, Truman, Watts, Wheeler, Wood.

NAY — Allen, Baker, R. E.; Belanger, Bernard, Binnette, Boudreau, Bragdon, Bunker, Burnham, Carrier, Carswell, Clark, Cote, Cottrell, Couture, Crockett, Crommett, Crosby, Curran, Cushing, Dickinson, Drigotas, Drummond, Dunn, Durgin, Eustis, Evans, Farrington, Fecteau, Fraser, Fuller, Gaudreau, Gauthier, Gill, Hall, Hanson, B. B.; Hanson, H. L.; Hanson, P. K.; Harnois, Hawes, Haynes, Healy, Henley, Hennessey, Hinds, Hoover, Huber, Humphrey, Immonen, Jalbert, Jameson, Jannelle, Jewell, Keyte, Kilroy, Kyes, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Lycette, Maddox, McMann, McNally, Meisner, Minkowsky, Mosher, Nadeau, J. F. R.; Nadeau, N. L.; Noyes, Pendergast, Philbrook, Pike, Prince, Quinn, Rackliff, Richardson, G. A.; Richardson, H. L.; Rocheleau, Ross, Sahagian, Sawyer, Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Shute, Snow, P. J.; Sullivan, Thompson, Waltz, White, Wight, Williams.

ABSENT — Birt, Bradstreet, D'Alfonso, Darey, Dennett, Foster, Harvey, Hichens, Payson, Roy, Scott, C. F.; Tanguay, Townsend.

Yes, 45; No, 91; Absent, 13.

The SPEAKER: Forty-five having voted in the affirmative and ninety-one in the negative, the motion to accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report does not prevail.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Hawes of Union, the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Taxation reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Trade-in Credit for Watercraft under Sales Tax" (H. P. 47) (L. D. 66), which was recommitted.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. HANSON of Gardiner
SUSI of Pittsfield
ROBINSON of Carmel
DRIGOTAS of Auburn
ROSS of Bath
HARRIMAN of Hollis
—of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WYMAN of Washington
FARLEY of York
YOUNG of Hancock
—of the Senate.
Mr. COTTRELL of Portland
—of the House.

Reports were read.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report of the Committee.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, moves that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Nadeau.

Mr. NADEAU: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question through the Chair to Mr. Ross.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may pose his question.

Mr. NADEAU: What would be the cost of granting this?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Nadeau, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, who may answer if he chooses. The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. ROSS: The answer to that question is \$40,000 for the biennium.

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

Mr. NADEAU: I would like to know, has anyone on this Committee who, shall we say, signed the Majority "Ought to pass" Report come up with a plan as to how we are going to raise this money that we are now getting?

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson.

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to correct the statement that was given by the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, I think it was entirely in error, but according to the estimates that I have here enactment of this bill would amount to approximately \$40,000 for each year of the biennium. I will also state that it was definitely the feeling of many of the boat dealers and of the members of the Committee who had signed the Majority Report that the increase in the sales would greatly exceed the amount of loss that is estimated in this bill.

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

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am the only member who signed the "Ought not to pass" Report, and my main reason for signing the "Ought not to pass" Report is because that more than half of our municipalities' boats are not taxed at all. On the Taxation Committee and in the community in gen-

eral we feel that boats should be taxed. However, we have not arrived at a formula although each year, in each session, we get closer to one.

I have voted against the trade-in tax on automobiles and I would support the majority position in this instance if boats were taxed; but we all know that the owners of boats today store their boats in the wintertime in these communities that are tax sheltered, where they do not tax boats, and I want to bring that to your attention. We should tax boats and until they are taxed I think we should delay this issue here and I would move for the indefinite postponement of this bill.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cottrell, now moves that both reports and bill be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson.

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker, to clarify the question in the mind of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cottrell, I would say that there is, or has been a bill before our Committee in regards to the taxation of boats. It appears that the assessors in the various communities have not been able to catch up with the boats because they are being moved from one community to another and so forth. We have requested, our Committee has requested a letter be sent out to all of the states which have any boating laws, registrations or taxation of any type. At the present time we have received approximately twenty-three or twenty-four replies from various states and I feel very sure that it is very possible for the Committee to come up with a new bill which might be acceptable to the boat manufacturers, boat dealers, the owners, whereby that possibly they might be paying an excise tax with an annual registration.

Now this, I am speaking wholly on my own, and this is an idea that the Committee has because we've had these bills before us for every session since I can remember. I would like to say, referring back to L. D. 66, that the State of New Hampshire has no tax. Massachu-

setts has a tax only on the trade-ins. I thank you.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I had hoped that this perhaps could go to third reader before we would debate it, but since the motion before the House now is indefinite postponement of course it has to be debated at this time.

There are many persons who don't believe that we should weaken or erode by the tax exemption route our tax structure. By and large I feel the same way. In 1951 when we enacted the Sales Tax there were many persons who felt it should be strictly across the board. However, that was not done; we do have exemptions and these normally are put on for one of two reasons. In many case because they feel it would be a stimulant to business and on others, like the exemption of food, it would lessen the burden on the consumer.

Now, since we've seen fit to take this exemption route I believe that we should treat all segments the same and in like cases we should have the similar treatment. For instance, the bill before us today is certainly a stimulant for business and also a help to the buyer. It affects one of the fastest growing businesses we have in the state today — the boating business. Now next to a home and an automobile, a boat probably is the largest single item that a person purchases, so to me it's only logical that we should treat this like we treat automobiles, and had this House and the other body decided to do away with that exemption I would withdraw this bill, but since we evidently still have that exemption I think they should be treated the same.

I will grant that in the strict sense of the word perhaps a boat cannot be considered a necessity, but you know we could make a very good case in point from a family health aspect. A boat does provide, clean, healthful, restful out-of-door recreation for not just one person but for the entire fam-

ily, and in the hectic world that we live today this certainly is a release from our tensions and one that should be given careful consideration; and to answer the question of the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Nadeau, where the money is coming from — of course there are many bills lying on the Appropriations table in the other body, and in the final analysis the money may not be available, but I feel that this is one of them that certainly deserves a restful consideration at that point.

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

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Today is June 1st, and I rise to support the motion of the gentleman from Portland for indefinite postponement of this bill. We are not about, in such a good financial condition in this state, when we can extend the courtesy to broaden our exemptions on our sales tax to the segment of our — in a business community which primarily deals with pleasure boating. I am the owner of a boat, and I know a great number of you are, but just as the House Chairman of Taxation has stated, this will cost \$40,000 per year, and as far as putting this bill through the mechanics to extend it over to the Appropriations table I feel it is a waste of time and money, and it's a very nice day outside, so I believe we should go for indefinite postponement at this time and save the state some money.

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

Mr. NADEAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would just like to thank Mr. Ross for admitting that we are here to raise money, and I'd like to have the 103rd Legislature not be known as a give-away legislature. Now this is also a special group—the next thing you're going to have—tomorrow or the next day, let's repeal a little, let's have trade-in on TV's, stoves, refrigerators, and a thousand others items, and we can start with the drugstores, so I hope you will back up Mr. Cottrell and indefinitely postpone this bill.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cottrell, that both Reports and Bill "An Act relating to Trade-in Credit for Watercraft under Sales Tax," House Paper 47, L. D. 63, be indefinitely postponed. The Chair will order a vote. All those in favor of indefinite postponement will vote yes, those opposed will vote no, and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

100 having voted in the affirmative and 19 having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

Sent up for concurrence.

**Divided Report
Tabled Until Later in
Today's Session**

Majority Report of the Committee on Taxation reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to Remove Sales Tax Exemptions on Rentals, Repairs, Installation and Servicing of Tangible Personal Property" (H. P. 123) (L. D. 149)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WYMAN of Washington
YOUNG of Hancock
—of the Senate.

Messrs. HANSON of Gardiner
SUSI of Pittsfield
ROBINSON of Carmel
ROSS of Bath
HARRIMAN of Hollis
—of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. FARLEY of York
—of the Senate.

Messrs. DRIGOTAS of Auburn
COTTRELL of Portland
—of the House.

Reports were read.

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

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker, I move that we accept the Majority Report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, moves

that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report.

Whereupon, on motion of Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor, tabled until later in today's session.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Taxation reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act Increasing the Sales Tax" (H. P. 288) (L. D. 408)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WYMAN of Washington
YOUNG of Hancock
—of the Senate.

Messrs. HANSON of Gardiner
ROSS of Bath
SUSI of Pittsfield
ROBINSON of Carmel
COTTRELL of Portland
—of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. FARLEY of York
—of the Senate.

Messrs. DRIGOTAS of Auburn
HARRIMAN of Hollis
—of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor, Reports and Bill were indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

**Divided Report
Tabled and Assigned**

Majority Report of the Committee on Taxation reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Increasing the Gasoline Tax" (H. P. 428) (L. D. 592)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. FARLEY of York
WYMAN of Washington
YOUNG of Hancock
—of the Senate.

Messrs. HANSON of Gardiner
DRIGOTAS of Auburn
ROBINSON of Carmel
COTTRELL of Portland
—of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. SUSI of Pittsfield
ROSS of Bath
HARRIMAN of Hollis
- of the House.

Reports were read.

(On motion of Mr. Susi of Pittsfield, tabled pending acceptance of either Report and specially assigned for tomorrow.)

Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Taxation reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Refund for Malt Liquor Excise Taxes" (H. P. 768) (L. D. 1115), which was recommitted.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. WYMAN of Washington
- of the Senate.

Messrs. SUSI of Pittsfield
ROBINSON of Carmel
ROSS of Bath
HARRIMAN of Hollis
COTTRELL of Portland
- of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. FARLEY of York
YOUNG of Hancock
- of the Senate.

Messrs. HANSON of Gardiner
DRIGOTAS of Auburn
- of the House.

Reports were read.

(On motion of Mr. Hanson of Gardiner, tabled pending acceptance of either Report and specially assigned for tomorrow.)

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act to Permit State Employees and Teachers to Insure Spouse and Children Under the Group Life Insurance Program" (S. P. 257) (L. D. 637)

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

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

Mr. FRASER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: You heard

my objection to this bill yesterday; the facts haven't changed, the danger which exists in this bill is there. It creates a false sense of security among the families of these so-called low income groups where it concerns their health. I'll give you an example. A man works under this group coverage; he has a feeling of security — his wife and children are insured, and he works until he is forty or forty-five years old and maybe older — he leaves the employ of the employer who was insuring him and his family — his policy becomes cancelled and at that stage he may or may not be insurable. It was much better for him to have permanent protection on his wife and children which would cost very little more than this term costs, and then when he moves, the policies will move with him. Again, I move for indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Mexico, Mr. Fraser, now moves indefinite postponement of L. D. 637.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Winthrop, Mrs. Baker.

Mrs. BAKER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In spite of the opposition to this bill from the insurance companies, state employees and teachers are the only ones who will be able to insure their spouses and children under its provision. I said yesterday that this would be of considerable value to the low-income workers, which it will. To those who say it may stop employees from taking larger life insurance policies, I point out that there are hundreds upon hundreds of employees who have not taken out any such insurance as of today, and that this easy to apply form, payroll deduction, base coverage will be most beneficial to all these people.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I sincerely hope that the interests of a few will not hold back the welfare of many. In my opinion this bill should be passed and when the vote is taken I request the yeas and nays so the State employees and teachers will know just how you folks have voted.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I listened rather intently yesterday to the debate on this particular issue, on the proponents and the opponents of this bill. It appears to me that this particular bill is a fringe benefit that we are granting employees of the state. Now this particular benefit is granted to employees in business — it's granted to those in industry.

Now today when an individual applies for a job in a business or industry I find that he seeks — and not only seeks but he expects the benefits of insurance if he is to accept a job in our modern industrial world. Now he doesn't expect that the insurance which he will receive will include himself and not the members of his family, that they will be excluded from the insurance that he might attain, and he doesn't expect that he is going to have to go out and buy another policy to cover the rest of his family.

Now this package program has been working for years in business and in industry, and for the life of me I can't comprehend why it is going to be so unworkable and border on the realm of impossibility in the category of our state employees. It is my opinion that we should not be discriminatory and stipulate that these employees cannot be included in a blanket policy. Why should they not have an opportunity to take advantage of the savings involved by having the members in their immediate family protected in their individual insurance coverage? Why should they be forced to seek a second source of insurance when workers in other fields with greater salaries can be covered for their family members under the insurance package which is supplied to them by their employer?

Now it does appear — I have nothing against insurance agents — we all have to make a living, but it does appear that most of the opposition stems from the representatives or dispensers of insurance.

Now I did not hear yesterday, I have not yet heard today a good and sufficient reason why the employees of our state should not enjoy the prerogative which has become a way of life in modern business. In most of our industries the unions, which most of our industries have today, have bargained and received insurance coverage that is far in excess of the coverage we are talking about here. And in most cases, I might add, this insurance is at least partially paid for by the employer.

Now this bill does not ask for that. This bill does not ask for state money — it asks only that the employees have the right to have their family protected under this insurance. They will pay for the additional coverage.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I think that we should give this opportunity and this right to the employees of the state. It certainly does mean savings to these employees, savings to individuals who are in the low income bracket; certainly they are the ones who need the savings. In many cases if we don't give them this opportunity they will not have their family protected because they cannot afford to go out and buy a second source of insurance. They shouldn't have to. This in our modern business world is a practice. I would shudder to think if my corporation in which I work said to me — I can insure you, but you go out and get another insurance for your family. It would be laughable in our situation. Why is it that we have to discriminate against state employees — they're still white also. Thank you.

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

Mr. SCRIBNER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I'm a little concerned with this bill. I was concerned with it yesterday when it came before us and I'm still concerned today. I'm concerned in general with this whole problem which we have; I do think it is a problem with the group life insurance as issued through the Maine State Retirement System.

The cost for \$10,000 insurance is presently \$78.00 per year for

term insurance. Now I'm a little concerned and I realize that I buy term insurance through my professional association, through a well-managed plan, I pay \$32.00 a year for the same amount of insurance. This means that the state employees are paying twice. I understand that many of the state employees do not desire this type of insurance because of the high cost which it entails. They can buy term insurance cheaper from a regular agent than they can through the state. I also understand that there is some individual who is some sort of a master agent for this particular plan, and I'd be interested in knowing what this would mean in additional commissions to this individual if another category is brought under this particular program. This bothers me somewhat.

The management of the group life insurance for the state employees is a very large group. I would think that it would go out for bid frequently — it should go out once a year. I believe that there are greater economies and savings that would accrue to the employees where they would pay the whole cost of this, and I'm opposed to expanding this coverage at this time; and at some future date we as legislators are going to have to look into this group insurance program which we offer to the state employees, and I think there are some changes that need to be made in this particular program.

I would like to pose two questions through the Chair to anyone here who may answer. Number one is we have some ten thousand state employees as well as teachers; I'd like to know how many of these ten thousand employees avail themselves of group life insurance. I don't have the figures, I'd be interested in knowing; I understand that it is fairly small.

The other question is — what would this particular program mean in additional commissions to the man who processes this for the state. I understand that he receives a commission on every policy that is sold.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mrs. Carswell.

Mrs. CARSWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I feel that this would be another fringe benefit for people who are working in our institutions. As we all know, it is very difficult to keep help, especially in the mental institutions, and as I said before, I feel that this will be another fringe benefit which will entice them to stay and it will certainly attract more people to seek positions in these jobs.

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

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I can't speak for or against the state employees in this matter. I can speak for the teachers perhaps and raise some questions. No one who is familiar with insurance is against group insurance. Of course there is one central principle in insurance, and that is that the breadwinner should insure himself adequately before he insures other members of the family.

In speaking of group insurance, the idea was developed to insure a group working in the same factory, in the same line of work, and we find that the teachers are not really a homogeneous group in this matter. Another thing that comes to my mind is that we become more heterogeneous when we join the state employees as a group and so the rates will be reflected in that varied kind of a group.

The private insurance companies today, of which there are about a thousand, they're competitive, they're regulated by the state, they sell family group life insurance, and it's really a true group because it takes the young, married couple. It places an adequate amount of insurance on the husband, and then some decreasing term on the wife with a small amount on each child, and because that group is very much alike, the rates are very much lower than the rates of this group insurance.

Now in our teaching field today, over sixty percent of the teachers

are female. Of the other forty percent which are male, about sixty-two percent are in the category of age twenty to age thirty-five. For some reason at age thirty-five the males disappear from our teaching force, and of the sixty percent of the teaching force which is female, I don't know as there is any statistic now which tells us how many of them are married, so I raise these questions.

I do know that the teachers are more interested in a less decreasing term insurance after retirement; they're more interested in spending their dollars for a more adequate and sufficient retirement plan which melts away in our inflationary days. I do know that the teachers studied Social Security and many of them were attracted to it, but after a thorough study they decided that they'd be a great deal better off in putting their dollars and the State's dollars into their own retirement plan; and so, I know too, I think that the state employees studied Social Security in the interim between this session and the last, and I don't think that they've come out in favor of Social Security, so I think that this whole matter really — I think that teachers would appreciate it perhaps, if it were studied very carefully.

As I look at the bill, we do not have a copy of the policy, we do know that insurance is cut off for the younger ages, for the children at nineteen where your competitive private group plans for the family, it runs until twenty-five, and there are various other things that might influence one's judgment if he had an opportunity to read all the fine print in the actual policy. And so I feel at this time that I must go along with the motion to indefinitely postpone.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: First of all I'd like to point that if you take a look at L. D. 637 you'll find that it is rather a simple bill, and I really can't see what another study would do. This as you may

know and as you may recall from what I said yesterday is voluntary legislation. It would be a fringe benefit for those on it, and would not be for those who did not want to participate. We as legislators are always trying to find ways to get qualified people to serve the State of Maine and to serve the school administrative districts in this state. This is one of the things that we as legislators can do. Also, perhaps the record should be made clear that this bill will not automatically open the door for group coverage of the spouse and children of all group life insurance policies in this state.

The L. D. we are referring to deals in particular with the retirement and group life insurance coverage of state employees and teachers, and no one else. The general insurance law would have to be changed in the 104th Legislature to allow such broad expansion as was claimed yesterday by some individuals who spoke on behalf of the insurance companies.

I hope that the House will join with twenty-three other states that have this type of insurance which you can really call a burial type insurance, because if you take a look at it you will find that the maximum amount that will be allowed as far as coverage is concerned is \$2,000 for the employee's spouse and \$500 or \$100, depending on the age, as far as any child is concerned, and thus I hope that we will allow the teachers and the state employees to participate in this voluntary insurance plan if they so desire. Therefore I would hope that you would vote against the motion to indefinitely postpone, and I would also remind the members of this House that this bill was the unanimous report from the State Government Committee.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to belabor this issue. I do want to reiterate I am in favor of granting this opportunity to the employees. On the other hand, I am a little bit concerned about the figures presented to this body by Representative Scribner from Portland. I'm not question-

ing them, because I find in my experience in this Legislature with Mr. Scribner that when he quotes a figure it's usually accurate, but I am a little bit amazed at the figure it's costing our state employees to have this type of insurance. I don't know how this insurance is handled—I don't know if it's put out for bid properly or what procedure is taken; but I do say this and as has been brought out by Mr. Scribner, that this type of insurance can be purchased elsewhere on a much cheaper rate even despite the fact that it is a more limited number. It does seem that I would like to see these folks get the opportunity to have the insurance for their families; on the other hand I think the situation bears study to ascertain why we are not getting a lower rate than we are at the present time for these employees of the State of Maine. Certainly we have a number of employees, there's no reason why we shouldn't have a blanket policy that's within reason as far as rates are concerned. Thank you.

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

Mr. SCRIBNER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I'd like to pose a question through the Chair to any member of the Committee on State Government as to, at the hearing on this bill what rates are contemplated for this expanded coverage. Is it the rate that's presently being charged—if it is I consider it grossly excessive.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Scribner, poses a question through the Chair to any member of the State Government Committee who may answer if they choose.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, if I remember correctly, the figure that was quoted was that if any state employee tried to get group coverage insurance outside of this program, it would be in the vicinity of \$18.00 for the spouse and for the children within the family. If they could get it in the group life insurance program as provided by

the Maine Retirement System, the cost to them would be about \$9.00 per year for that same coverage.

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

Mr. NADEAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Just to answer some of the facts that Mr. Robertson got from Mr. Scribner, I have here in my hand Dave Smith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame. As some of you might know I'm a basketball official—Mr. Benson used to be one and I can recognize several others who have been here—Mr. McMann. When we can get—and this is just a small group, mind you—and here it is right here in bold print, up to \$30,000 for \$22.24! Now there's no kick-back in this game though. This is why the state insurance is so doggoned high! I am not an insurance agent, that's why you ought to defeat this. I am not working for a group.

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

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I spoke briefly yesterday on this matter. I bring to your attention the fact that insurance rates are controlled pretty much by the Commission. I think in the area of business the directors of the corporation would study any program—I think that perhaps this is also true about MESA, the association that represents the state employees. The type of insurance, depending on the application whether or not it pays dividends—many factors involved. I certainly feel sure that this organization is capable of protecting their state employees in this respect, and it's almost to be assumed that with as large a group as there is within the association that they would receive a very fine rate. I question the fact that they're paying more than anyone else.

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

Mr. SCRIBNER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to remind the ladies and gentlemen of the House that

a couple of months ago we passed a bill to completely revise the membership on the Maine State Retirement System because it was felt that they were earning far too low a return for the retirement system of the state and many major changes were made in that program for the first time in several decades. I believe there is a very serious possibility this same situation exists regarding the insurance programs which are administered by the same body. I don't believe that just by virtue of the fact that we have some dedicated people serving on these boards that necessarily they were always providing the least costly, most efficient services for the people, such as the state employees who are insured under this. It's a simple system. They tell the State Controller to start taking it off their pay; a lot of people don't shop around for a competitive rate — I feel that this opens the door to a great many abuses.

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

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think I'm more interested in facts than letting the chips fall where they may, because facts generally influence our judgement and improve it, and I think I can state this as a verifiable fact; the rates aren't made in group insurance by the Commissioner, or by even the insurance company. They are finally made by the experience of that particular group, and I know that if the teachers alone, in this instance, were separated from the state employees they would have a much lower rate as experience unfolded. As I say, I'm not going to fight fiercely one way or another on this, but I would like to have us make our judgment on the basis of facts and I still think that this matter should be more carefully and thoroughly studied before we jump.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think it might be possible that some peo-

ple might be confused. We are not concerning ourselves here with major medical. This is an extension of a policy that presently exists, and this policy when it originated went out on bids and was given to the lowest bidder.

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

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I don't want to belabor this point. However, I have talked with many people who are state employees and am yet to find one person who is in favor of this.

Presently, or I would say as of June 30, 1966, there were 14,000 people covered under the state plan. They were paying sixty-five cents a month per thousand for this group insurance and I consider this excessively high for this type of coverage.

I am wondering what happens to the dividends — how many state employees have received dividends under this plan? I'm sure the Union Mutual Life Insurance Company, which is the carrier, is a good company; it's a company which is approved in New York State. I would like to briefly answer Mr. Robertson from Brewer to the effect that when he states many companies are allowed this, I know of no company in the State of Maine who writes insurance out of an office in the State of Maine who is now authorized to write this type of coverage. I think we're confusing the issue here to the extent that we're speaking about group life insurance coverage for dependents, spouses and their children.

The State of Maine presently has Blue Cross and Blue Shield. This is available to the employees and to their dependents. The State of Maine presently has a major medical plan which is available to those who are employees of the Maine State Employees Association. This is available to their dependents also.

I fully concur with the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Scribner, and the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cottrell, that this item needs considerable amount of study. I

also believe that to attract and hold people for the State of Maine that we must provide higher insurance limits for those who will retire. Presently the State of Maine has a twenty-six percent turnover in its employees. I wonder what happens to the money that these people pay in under group insurance benefits? I think perhaps if this were studied somewhat and then we could come up with a plan that would provide our retired employees more group life coverage until the time—for the rest of their lives, then we would be coming up with something that would be worthwhile. I think this thing requires study; I do not think that we should do this on an emotional situation, that we should study the facts and that this present coverage is now available on an individual basis, and I would state again that I am a licensed life insurance salesman; I do sell this family type coverage. I went over my insurance in force since we went over this—I have approximately four million dollars worth of life insurance in force; less than one percent is in the family type insurance plans.

As far as the group insurance, this wouldn't benefit me one particle. I just am firmly convinced that we're jumping the gun on this thing, it requires more study, and if we're going to do anything we should do it for those people who are going to retire and provide them some benefits to cut down the turnover in the state personnel. Thank you.

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

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am pleased to understand that Mr. Brown is interested in facts, in the manner of this.

He made a statement that to his knowledge that there is no state employee that is in favor of this. I understand this proposal was discussed at all the various chapters of the Maine State Employees Association and was investigated by their insurance committee, and I felt that I should rise and make this statement so

that the members of the House would not be led to believe that this is something that possibly was concocted in the higher levels of the Maine State Employees Association.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Manchester, Mr. Rideout.

Mr. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I hold in my hand the policy that I offer to my employees. It includes health and accident, life insurance for the employee and his dependents. Now Mr. Brown made the statement that he knew of no one that is writing this type of policy. It was written for me by the State Mutual Life Insurance Company.

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

Mr. SOULAS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In answer to the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Scribner's questions, I'll take question number one. He states that \$75.00 a year for \$10,000 of term insurance is a little on the high side. Well this totals out to the amount of approximately sixty-two cents a thousand. This includes all age groups, no physical examination required, and I know of no insurance company regulated by the laws of our state that can possibly sell term insurance to the individual, to all ages, for this small amount without taking a physical examination.

Question number two—commission to the agents. If insurance is sold to the individual by an individual agent, his commission is usually fifty to fifty-five percent, first year commission, and then it regulates itself down to fifteen, seven and years ago it was all for a ten-year interval period after the first year of sale. If, however, the insurance is sold by a company agent on a group basis the commission is twenty percent, first year commission; reduces to two percent the following year. Any additional enrollees after the first year, there is no additional commission. This means that the company has to service all these people—it's their full responsibility to see that once a person leaves a plan that

he has a full right to convert all or part of the insurance he has under the term. Again, no physical examination required.

I am a life insurance agent. I still favor this type of coverage.

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

Mrs. CARSWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: For clarification, the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Brown, mentioned that there should be some type of coverage for retired state employees. I understand that there is a bill in this session that will, if passed, take care of these people.

I also understand that this is permissive legislation, and I think that the teachers and the state employees ought to have the opportunity to make up their own minds, so we should permit them to do so. Now I don't think that we should call our teachers and state employees ignorant or dumb, or anything else. I think that they are pretty capable, let's say most of them, of deciding what they want to do with their money, and I think that we should let them decide what they want to do with seventy-five cents a month, and pass this bill.

Mr. Cottrell of Portland was granted permission to speak a third time.

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Again in the interest of the facts. Our good friend from Bangor, Representative Soulas, I know works for a company that sells the major medical to the teachers, but I think he was comparing apples and peaches when he compared rates—he was comparing the company life insurance rates in this instance of permanent insurance commissions with term; that is, he was giving the term rates for the group which in this instance don't have any dividend return, as against the commission rates on permanent life insurance — not term. The term life insurance commissions are about the same as group life insurance.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? For the Chair to order the yeas and nays

it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present. 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 on the motion of the gentleman from Mexico, Mr. Fraser, that L. D. 637, Bill "An Act to Permit State Employees and Teachers to Insure Spouse and Children under the Group Life Insurance Program," be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of this bill being indefinitely postponed will vote yes, those opposed will vote no, and the Chair opens the vote.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Beliveau, Benson, Ber-
man, Binnette, Brown, Buck, Carey,
Carrier, Carroll, Cottrell, Crom-
mett, Curran, Drigotas, Dudley,
Dunn, Durgin, Eustis, Fortier,
Fraser, Fuller, Gauthier, Hawes,
Henley, Hennessy, Hewes, Hinds,
Hodgkins, Hoover, Huber, Humph-
rey, Immonen, Keyte, Lycette,
McNally, Meisner, Nadeau, J. F.
R.; Porter, Quimby, Robertson,
Rocheleau, Sahagian, Scott, C. F.;
Scott, G. W.; Scribner, Shaw,
Shute, Starbird, Sullivan, Susi,
Trask, Wight.

NAY — Allen, Baker, E. B.;
Baker, R. E.; Bedard, Belanger,
Bernard, Boudreau, Bourgoin,
Brennan, Bunker, Burnham, Cars-
well, Champagne, Clark, Conley,
Cookson, Cornell, Cote, Couture,
Crockett, Crosby, Cushing, Danton,
Dickinson, Edwards, Evans, Ewer,
Farrington, Fecteau, Gaudreau,
Gill, Giroux, Hall, Hanson, B. B.;
Hanson, H. L.; Hanson, P. K.; Har-
nois, Haynes, Healy, Hichens, Hun-
ter, Jalbert, Jannelle, Jewell, Kil-
roy, Kyes, Lebel, Levesque, Lewin,
Lewis, Lincoln, Littlefield, Martin,
McMann, Miliano, Minkowsky,
Mosher, Philbrook, Pike, Prince,
Quinn, Rackliff, Richardson, G. A.;
Richardson, H. L.; Rideout, Ross,
Sawyer, Snow, P. J.; Snowe P.;
Soulas, Tanguay, Thompson, Tru-

man, Waltz, Watts, Wheeler, White, Williams, Wood.

ABSENT — Birt, Bradstreet, Bragdon, D'Alfonso, Darey, Dennett, Drummond, Foster, Harriman, Harvey, Jameson, Maddox, Nadeau, N. L.; Noyes, Payson, Pendergast, Robinson, Roy, Townsend.

Yes, 51; No, 79, Absent 19.

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

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

Third Reader Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act to Clarify Errors and Inconsistencies in the Fish and Game Laws" (S. P. 660) (L. D. 1678)

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

(On motion of Mr. Hanson of Solon, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for tomorrow.)

Bill "An Act relating to Additional Appeals Under Liquor Laws" (H. P. 1185) (L. D. 1685)

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

Amended Bills

Bill "An Act Appropriating Operating Funds for Vocational Educational Institute in Washington County" (S. P. 136) (L. D. 266)

Bill "An Act relating to Joint Accounts in Banks and Loan and Building Associations" (H. P. 1001) (L. D. 1463)

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)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, Bills read the third time, Resolve read

the second time, all passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

Bill "An Act relating to Directors of Insurance Companies" (S. P. 386) (L. D. 1020)

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

Bill "An Act relating to Minimum Wages for Firemen" (H. P. 516) (L. D. 729)

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

Bill "An Act Providing for Associate Degree in Nursing at Aroostook State College" (S. P. 296) (L. D. 735)

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

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act relating to Meetings of the Advisory Council of the Department of Economic Development (S. P. 86) (L. D. 167)

An Act Eliminating Tolls from Bridge Across Jonesport Reach (S. P. 335) (L. D. 868)

An Act relating to Notice of Legislative Hearings (S. P. 347) (L. D. 931)

An Act relating to Reimbursement to Towns for Construction of and Snow Removal from Highways (S. P. 360) (L. D. 957)

An Act to Provide for Practical Nursing Course at Central Maine Vocational-Technical Institute (S. P. 400) (L. D. 1031)

An Act relating to Pecuniary Injuries in Actions for Injuries Causing Death of a Minor (S. P. 504) (L. D. 1219)

An Act to Provide a Feasibility Study for Express Highway

Through Washington County (S. P. 519) (L. D. 1339)

An Act Providing for the Purchase of Land by the Seed Potato Board (S. P. 640) (L. D. 1646)

An Act relating to Snow Removal from State Highways (S. P. 658) (L. D. 1671)

An Act relating to Form and Arrangement of Ballots in General Elections (H. P. 216) (L. D. 306)

An Act relating to State Aid for Construction of Highways (H. P. 604) (L. D. 848)

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

Enactor

Tabled and Assigned

An Act relating to Wearing Fluorescent Clothing When Hunting in Southern Zone for Two Years (H. P. 671) (L. D. 943)

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

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

An Act Providing for Area Directional Signs for Route 6 and Maritime Provinces (H. P. 831) (L. D. 1239)

An Act relating to Tax Exemption for Benevolent and Charitable Institutions Conducted for Benefit of Nonresidents (H. P. 949) (L. D. 1380)

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

Orders of the Day

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

Bill "An Act Regulating Snow Traveling Vehicles" (S. P. 654) (L. D. 1666)

(In Senate, passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-171))

Tabled — May 26, by Mr. Dudley of Enfield.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I tabled this little jewel the other day in hopes that I could amend this, although I guess to amend it I find it needs amending in so many places it would practically need in my opinion a redraft. It has five pages which there is something on nearly every page that I don't approve of.

Let me try to point out just a few of the things and I will try to be as brief as possible because I realize it's lunch time

On page 2, it says, under section 2155, page 2, no registration shall be required for snow traveling vehicles owned and operated over snow on land where the person lives or land on which he has contractual rights, so he is exempt.

We go over a little further and it says, no person shall have the right to operate a snow traveling vehicle upon controlled access highways or right-of-ways or limit thereof. This is on page 3, and it goes on to say — No person shall operate a snow traveling vehicle upon the main traveled portion, or snow plowed banks or any other public way, so we're not selling a license to travel there.

If you go over to page 5 it says: the enactment to this Act does in no way constitute giving a license or permission to cross or go on the property of others, so we are already saying in this piece of legislation that he doesn't have to have a license on his own land and we are like it seems to me selling him a bill of goods or a license that he can go nowhere on.

Now there is other things that I would like to point out too. It says on page 3 operating under the influence. It is unlawful to operate a snow traveling vehicle while intoxicated, I think it should be that way, but it goes on to say or at all under the influence of intoxicating liquor any place. Now this is quite broad, at all under the influence; who is going to determine

if a man has had a drink or two? Most people when they go fishing do have. I suggest if you drive one of these over an open lake and pond it might be necessary that you do have a little to keep from freezing up, and I think that this last few lines I would object to, I don't think they should drive if intoxicated, but I don't think they had ought to drive if half froze to death either. On page 4, this kind of legislation I am always opposed to, being this bill or any other one. On page 4 about the middle of the page it says the Secretary of State shall have the authority to adopt and amend such regulations as he may deem necessary. That's our job; let's not pass it on to somebody else, we'll do the amending. I hope that some day we can come up with a bill that we won't need to pass it on to some department head to really make over, and this goes on and on. I would suggest that on the same page 4 if I was going to make an amendment I would say that we didn't need it on our open lakes and ponds, they are not giving us any trouble there. Now let me tell you that a few places I have been hearing that they did have a problem, snowmobiles breaking down people's shrubbery and so forth, and this bill in no way, in no way at all helps the very thing that they was trying to help. They have no right to go on people's shrubbery now, and this bill don't give them the right. Now some will say that it does give them a number, but I talked to some that says they are out there in the night. I would look kind of pretty out there in the night with one of these snow scoots going around with a flashlight looking for the numbers on it, and I would a lot rather identify the person. There is a lot of other things. It says reckless operation on page 3, reckless operation. Unlawful for any person to operate recklessly. Who is going to determine if it is reckless? I wouldn't know and I don't believe anybody else would know if it would be reckless.

Now the trouble with it in some places with children or quite young people so to speak, on page 4,

item 5, twelve years and older. It seems to me twelve years is quite young and some other people think it is not young enough. They should be able to operate them at age six, but it's quite a piece of machinery. And in relation to the numbers we are not even selling them for this price, we are not even selling them a number plate, we are asking them to paint it on the vehicle which they have paid \$800 or so for and take a sloppy old paint brush and paint a number on it. I don't think we are giving them anything, the right to go anywhere or not even giving them a number plate and besides that it don't correct what we started out to try to correct, so I think in view of such a long amendment and so many things, I at this time would move the indefinite postponement of L. D. 1666 and I hope you people will understand the seriousness of my objections and go along and indefinitely postpone this measure and hope that some Legislature in the future will have more time to come up with something more satisfactory. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, now moves the indefinite postponement of L. D. 1666.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Glenburn, Mr. Cookson.

Mr. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I must rise to oppose the good gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, not that I oppose all of his objections, because I will agree that there are some objections to this bill which I myself disagree with, but in it there are a great many good things too, and one thing that I'll bring up here first is the fact that he said that we will have to paint numbers on these machines and this calls for the Secretary of State to furnish numbers which will be given to each registration, each vehicle to be put on so that they will all be alike all over the State.

The part in here about driving under the influence of liquor — I think this is good. I know during last winter I put in quite a lot of — went through a lot of trouble with fifteen or twenty of these vehicles who were using my prop-

erty for a chance to run around on, and kept me awake until three or four o'clock in the morning, and incidentally with a lot of anti-freeze in them too, so I think that we do need something, and I would hope that you would not go along and indefinitely postpone this bill, but would rather hope that somebody would table this and we will set down and get together and take the good things and come up with a bill at this session. If we wait until another session, you're going to see more land posted "no trespassing" than you've ever seen from deer hunting, I can assure you of this, because people are getting awful tired of the trees, the shubbery and everything else being trampled by these machines. And I love the machines and everybody else does, but we have got to put a little bit of control on them. The manufacturers, the same people who sell them and everybody else wants this because they realize it is going to get out of hand because of these few people who will abuse it, and this is why there has to be some law made and I hope that you will go along and oppose the indefinite postponement, and I hope somebody will table this.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wouldn't know which way to travel when I leave this session of the Legislature if you go ahead and indefinitely postpone this bill. I come from Aroostook County, as some of you probably are aware, we have long winters and a lot of snow, and there are a lot of people up there, in my area especially, who are very interested in coming up with some type of legislation to control these snowmobiles. There are many of them in that area and they are very devoted to their snowmobiles, and they wanted to come up with a bill that would attempt to control them, and some of them from my district came down and I saw to it that they met with certain people of the Legal Affairs Committee, and I will say this in regard to their comments

when I sent them a copy of the bill that the Legal Affairs Committee came up with, and it seemed to me that they couldn't have complimented them any better because the word that I got was it's a wonderful bill — we couldn't have done better ourselves.

Now I agree that there are probably imperfections in this bill, but at this time in the session rather than tabling it, I would hope that we would go along with it and if there are imperfections, there is going to be another Legislature if we finally get through. I hope you will go along with the passage of this bill in spite of perhaps some imperfections that may be in it.

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

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I move to table this bill until June 5, that would be Monday.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Camden, Mr. Haynes, now moves that item one, L. D. 1666 be tabled and specially assigned for June 5 pending the motion of Mr. Dudley of Enfield that it be indefinitely postponed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

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

Mr. PENDERGAST: Mr. Speaker, I would inquire if the House has in its possession H. P. 1143, L. D. 1627, Bill "An Act Providing for a Tax on Real Estate Transfers."

The SPEAKER: The answer is in the affirmative.

Mr. PENDERGAST: I move that the rules be suspended.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman moves that the House reconsider its action of yesterday whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Mr. PENDERGAST: I now move that House Amendment "A" under filing 307 be indefinitely postponed and I would speak briefly to my motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Kennebunkport, Mr. Pender-

gast now moves the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "A" and the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. PENDERGAST: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This amendment which we adopted yesterday is faulty in its wording and poorly drawn. For instance, this amendment eliminates any provision for the declaration of value, but it leaves the declaration of value to be stamped. It is not clear in this amendment where the — how the payment of tax would be indicated in any case. I would like to point out to the House that as an Assessor in my home Town of Kennebunkport for seven years, I know how important this bill is to the State and to local assessors, and I urge all members of the House who have had experience in town government to vote with me to indefinitely postpone this amendment, and I would ask for a division.

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

Mr. CONLEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I notice that the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Beliveau, who presented this amendment yesterday is not in his seat, and I think it is only right that someone should table this until later on in today's session.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Richardson of Stonington, tabled pending the motion of Mr. Pendergast of Kennebunkport to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A" and assigned for later in today's session.

On motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland.

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 second tabled and today assigned matter:

Bill "An Act to Revise the Laws Relating to Authority for Grant-

ing Degrees and to Approval of Degree - Granting Institutions" (S. P. 637) (L. D. 1641) (In House, enacted) (In Senate, passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-168)

Tabled — May 26, by Mr. Minikowsky of Lewiston.

Pending — Further consideration.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we are making an effort to study this bill and amendment with the possibility that it may be contradictory to two bills we have already passed this year, I would hope that someone would table this until Monday, June 5th.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Littlefield of Hampden, tabled pending further consideration and specially assigned for Monday, June 5.

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

SENATE REPORT — Leave to Withdraw as Covered by Other Legislation — Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act Providing a Bond Issue in the Amount of Six Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars for a Vocational Educational Institute in Washington County" (S. P. 137) (L. D. 267) (In Senate, Report accepted)

Tabled — May 26, by Mr. Bragdon of Perham.

Pending — Acceptance in concurrence.

On motion of Mr. Dunn of Denmark, retabled pending acceptance in concurrence and specially assigned for Friday, June 2.

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

Bill "An Act to Make Allocations from the General Highway Fund for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1968 and June 30, 1969" (H. P. 1173) (L. D. 1672)

Tabled — May 26 by Mr. Richardson of Cumberland.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

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

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like item 4 tabled until next Monday.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Crockett, moves that this matter be tabled until Monday, June 5, pending passage to be engrossed.

Mr. Waltz of Waldoboro requested a division.

The SPEAKER: A vote has been requested on the tabling motion. All those in favor of this matter being tabled until Monday, June 5, will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

44 having voted in the affirmative and 60 having voted in the negative, the tabling motion did not prevail.

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 H. P. 1173, L. D. 1672, Bill, "An Act to Make Allocations from the General Highway Fund for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1968 and June 30, 1969."

Amend said Bill in section 1 by striking out in the last line of that part designated "GENERAL ADMINISTRATION" the words and figures "Building Construction 1,000,000"

Further amend said Bill in section 1 by striking out all of the last 3 lines (same in L. D. 1672) and inserting in place thereof the following:

'Total Allocations		
\$38,830,000	\$40,473,000	

Amounting to \$38,830,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 and \$40,473,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.'

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of the last sentence of section 2 (same in L. D. 1672)

House Amendment "A" was adopted.

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

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker, I now move this matter be tabled until next Monday.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Crockett, now moves this matter be tabled pending passage to be engrossed as amended and specially assigned for Monday, June 5.

Mr. Waltz of Waldoboro requested a division.

The SPEAKER: A vote has been requested. All those in favor of this matter being tabled pending passage to be engrossed as amended and specially assigned for Monday, June 5, will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair will open the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

53 having voted in the affirmative and 52 having voted in the negative, the tabling motion did prevail.

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

JOINT RESOLUTION relating to Expressing Legislative Opinion to Congress Concerning Federal Grant-in-Aid Programs (H. P. 1169) (In Senate, indefinitely postponed)

Tabled — May 31, by Mr. Levesque of Madawaska.

Pending — Further consideration.

On motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland, the House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

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

Bill "An Act Appropriating Funds to County of Lincoln, Town of Wiscasset and Town of Westport for Reimbursement of Funds Expended on Westport - Wiscasset Bridge Span" (H. P. 1181) (L. D. 1683)

Tabled — May 31, by Mr. Hennessy of West Bath.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

Mr. Dunn of Denmark offered House Amendment "B" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "B" to H. P. 1181, L. D. 1683, Bill, "An Act Appropriating Funds to County of Lincoln, Town of Wiscasset and Town of Westport for Reimbursement of Funds Expended on Westport-Wiscasset Bridge Span."

Amend said Bill in the 2nd line (1st and 2nd lines in L. D. 1683) by striking out the words "Unappropriated Surplus of the General Fund" and inserting in place thereof the words 'General Highway Fund'

Further amend said Bill by adding at the end the following paragraph:

'The appropriation of money under the breakdown, as shown, to the County of Lincoln, Town of Wiscasset and Town of Westport shall be credited toward the share of the county and towns as listed for the building of a new bridge built under the bridge act.'

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

Mr. DUNN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In order that we may have a little clearer picture of this problem, I would like to read a paragraph from the Report of the Research Committee that checked it out. It says:

"Prior to 1950 the only access to Westport Island, just west of the Town of Wiscasset, was by ferry. The Westport-Wiscasset Bridge District was created in 1947. A combination causeway-bridge was built and open to traffic in June, 1950. Although it was hoped that the project would be self-supporting, this did not prove to be the case. Consequently the State took over the District's obligations in 1955. Toward this end, Lincoln County paid \$95,000, Wiscasset, \$25,000, Westport, \$10,000 and the balance of \$185,000 was paid directly from state funds. The bridge has been maintained by the Highway Department since this date of transfer. Although accessibility to the Island is now satisfactory, many serious problems

have arisen affecting the area economy, safety and pollution. This is due to the type of construction. The original proposal was for a high level steel bridge. However, because of cost reductions, Army Engineers recommended and approved the present causeway and small bridge. At that time the present side effects and serious consequences were not foreseen.

The causeway itself acts as a dam both against incoming and outgoing tides."

So in solving one problem another one was caused, and pollution is caused by stagnant water and rotting seaweed.

Now this bridge was built by the Highway Department and it seems to me that any corrections should be made by the Highway Department, and hence this amendment. This would take the money from the highway funds rather than from the general fund, and in the second part of the amendment, the County and the Towns paid out this money a few years ago, so it is water over the dam so to speak, so instead of reimbursing them directly, this would credit this money toward their share in building a new bridge, a high-level bridge under the Bridge Act, and so I think this is totally a Highway problem and it should be given to them, and I hope you will support me in this amendment.

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

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

Mr. HENNESSEY: Mr. Speaker, this is Representative Harvey's bill and I know how he feels about some of the things on here, and I think Mr. Dunn has gone into correcting some of the problem. There is also another meeting scheduled with the Army Engineers and I am just wondering how this will affect that meeting along with this amendment. I would pose a question through the Chair to Mr. Dunn, in his opinion how would this affect a future meeting with the Army Engineers?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from West Bath, Mr. Hennessey,

poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Denmark, Mr. Dunn, who may answer if he so chooses and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. DUNN: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I can't answer that, I think probably his best bet would be to table this for one more day until the answer comes up.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Hennessey of West Bath, Bill "An Act Appropriating Funds to County of Lincoln, Town of Wiscasset and Town of Westport for Reimbursement of Funds Expended on Westport-Wiscasset Bridge Span" H. P. 1181, L. D. 1683, was tabled pending the adoption of House Amendment "B" and specially assigned for Friday, June 2.

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

An Act relating to Coverage Under Employment Security Law (S. P. 456) (L. D. 1133)

Tabled—May 31, by Mr. Durgin of Raymond.

Pending—Passage to be enacted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Raymond, Mr. Durgin.

Mr. DURGIN: Mr. Speaker, I ask this be tabled until Monday, June 5.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Raymond, Mr. Durgin, now moves this matter be tabled pending passage to be enacted until June 5.

Mr. Ewer of Bangor requested a division.

The SPEAKER: A vote has been requested. All those in favor of this matter being tabled until Monday, June 5 will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

48 having voted in the affirmative and 60 having voted in the negative, the tabling motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Raymond, Mr. Durgin.

Mr. DURGIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill, L. D. 1133, An Act relating to Coverage under Employment

Security Law, I refer to it as the second cousin to a bill that we indefinitely postponed in the House here a couple of weeks ago on the Workmen's Compensation Law cutting the coverage from three down to one. This does the same thing with the Employment Security Law. I therefore move the indefinite postponement of this bill and all its accompanying papers.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Raymond, Mr. Durgin, now moves the indefinite postponement of L. D. 1133.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In opposition to that motion, I sponsored at the very first of this session L. D. 23 which would have reduced the coverage from four to one. This would have been noted as item three, page five of the Republican Platform, and I quote from that: "We urge Employment Security Coverage be extended to include an employee who works for an employer of one or more workers." This bill was withdrawn as covered by other legislation, and that is the bill before us now.

This bill embraces the same philosophy as my original bill and the remarks contained in the Republican Platform except that it is slightly watered down with qualifications. I have always felt that what is good for one segment of our economy, certainly should be equitable to all. Coverage is now granted only to employees who work for persons who employ four or more workers. Until 1955 this number was eight.

Now I have heard it said that this would encourage idleness. Of course that is something that I do not want to do, but I am confident that this will not do that. I do want to encourage equality if it does not pose a hardship on the employer, and I certainly don't believe this does this.

Furthermore, we were advised by the Commission that this poses absolutely no administrative problems whatsoever. If we have concern for the working persons in the State of Maine, and not just "lip-service" concern, certainly leg-

islation such as this is only fair. But aside from equality, there are other reasons.

As I mentioned before, the figure used to be eight, but this was changed in 1955 both by National legislation and then enabling State legislation. Now there was no reason for this original magic figure of eight. I think probably on the National level it was purely political expediency, because they were passing original Federal legislation that was untried at that time, and I am sure that this figure of eight was to eliminate certain objections, but when the worth in the bill itself was seen, this was cut to four both on the National level and on the State level.

Now I am told by some people that this would hurt certain small businessmen, but let's look at a couple of examples on both sides of the fence. An employee now works part-time for an employer who is covered and part-time for one who is not. When he becomes unemployed, his benefits are based only on the earnings of the covered person, thus reducing considerably his available benefits. Now on the other side as far as the employer goes. When a worker has separated to accept other work for an employer who is not covered and if he works in excess of five weeks and then is laid off, he then collects unemployment, but those charges revert to the former employer although he had absolutely nothing to do with the recent separation.

Of course in the basic law there are still some eleven exemptions; a person working for the State, for the Government, in Agriculture as domestic help, in religious, charitable, scientific and so forth. Perhaps someday these will be changed, but that is not our purpose today. Our purpose today is to say that only those in businesses should be covered if they employ more than one person, we should cut the coverage from four to one, and I believe that this will prove to be of benefit eventually to employers and employees alike.

Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston requested a roll call vote.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Ewer.

Mr. EWER: Mr. Speaker, I can add practically nothing to the address of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, but there is one thing that I think I should comment about that the gentleman from Raymond, Mr. Durgin spoke of. He spoke of the Workmen's Compensation Law which was killed in this present Legislature cutting the limit from four to one. There is quite a difference, a very important difference between Workmen's Compensation and Unemployment Insurance inasmuch as a man hurt on the job who is not covered by Workmen's Compensation because his employer only employs one or two men, has another form of protection, he can go to law, common law, and bring a suit against his employer, and possibly he could get more than he could get if he were covered by Workmen's Compensation, but for the man who loses his job under the Unemployment Insurance Act, there is no protection whatever. That man is just as much on his own and out on his ear if he is employed as one employee as he would be if he was working for a factory that was employing a thousand. For that reason alone, I hope that this motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Raymond, Mr. Durgin, that L. D. 1133 be indefinitely postponed. 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 those desiring a roll call will vote yes and those opposed will vote no and the Chair will open 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 on the motion of the gentleman from Raymond, Mr. Durgin, that An Act relating to

Coverage Under Employment Security Law, Senate Paper 456, L. D. 1133, be indefinitely postponed. All of those in favor of indefinite postponement will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Baker, E. B.; Belanger, Benson, Bragdon, Bunker, Carroll, Clark, Crosby, Dennett, Dudley, Dunn, Durgin, Edwards, Farrington, Foster, Hall, Hanson, H. L.; Hanson, P. K.; Harriman, Hawes, Haynes, Hoover, Huber, Jewell, Kyes, Lewis, Lincoln, Lycette, McNally, Meisner, Mosher, Pendergast, Philbrook, Pike, Porter, Prince, Quimby, Quinn, Rackliff, Sahagian, Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Shute, Susi, Trask, Waltz, Wight, Williams.

NAY — Allen, Baker, R. E.; Bedard, Beliveau, Berman, Bernard, Binnette, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Brennan, Buck, Carey, Carrier, Carswell, Champagne, Conley, Cookson, Cornell, Cote, Cottrell, Couture, Crockett, Crommett, Cushing, D'Alfonso, Danton, Drigotas, Eustis, Evans, Ewer, Fecteau, Fortier, Fraser, Fuller, Gaudreau, Gauthier, Gill, Giroux, Hanson, B. B.; Harnois, Healy, Henley, Hennessey, Hewes, Hichens, Hinds, Hodgkins, Humphrey, Immonen, Jalbert, Lebel, Levesque, Lewin, Littlefield, Martin, McMann, Miliano, Minkowsky, Nadeau, J. F. R.; Nadeau, N. L.; Noyes, Richardson, G. A.; Richardson, H. L.; Rideout, Robertson, Rocheleau, Ross, Roy, Sawyer, Scott, C. F.; Scribner, Tanguay, Thompson, Truman, Watts, Wheeler, White, Wood.

ABSENT — Birt, Bradstreet, Brown, Burnham, Curran, Darey, Dickinson, Drummond, Harvey, Hunter, Jameson, Jannelle, Keyte, Kilroy, Maddox, Payson, Robinson, Snow, P. J.; Snowe, P.; Soulas, Starbird, Sullivan, Townsend.

Yes, 48; No, 78; Absent, 23.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair will announce the vote. Forty-eight having voted in the affirmative and seventy-eight having voted in the negative, the motion does not prevail.

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

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

HOUSE MAJORITY REPORT (8) — Ought Not to Pass — Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Clothing Allowance for Employees of Public Works Department of Lewiston" (H. P. 293) (L. D. 413) — **MINORITY REPORT (2)** — Ought to Pass.

Tabled — May 31, by Mr. Gaudreau of Lewiston.

Pending — Acceptance of either Report.

On motion of Mr. Gaudreau of Lewiston, the Minority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted, the Bill read twice and tomorrow assigned for third reading.

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

SENATE REPORT — Leave to Withdraw as covered by other legislation — Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act to Authorize Bond Issue in Amount of One Million One Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars for Construction at Pine-land Hospital and Training Center and of Regional Care Facilities for the Severely Mentally Retarded at Bangor" (S. P. 371) (L. D. 984) (In Senate, Report accepted)

Tabled — May 31, by Mr. Hennessey of West Bath.

Pending — Acceptance in concurrence.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Southwest Harbor, Mr. Benson.

Mr. **BENSON**: Mr. Speaker, I move this item be tabled until the next legislative day.

The **SPEAKER**: The gentleman from Southwest Harbor, Mr. Benson, now moves that item 9 be tabled until Friday, June 2, pending acceptance of the Report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

(Cries of "No")

All those in favor of the tabling motion will say yes, those opposed, no.

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

Thereupon, the Report was accepted in concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the tenth 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 31, by Mr. Pendergast of Kennebunkport.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed. (House Amendments "B" (H-353), "C" (H-355), "D" (H-364).

Mr. Bragdon of Perham offered House Amendment "I" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "I" to H. P. 1166, L. D. 1667, 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."

Amend said Bill by striking out all of the last paragraph of section 6 and inserting in place thereof the following:

The amounts listed after each unit in this section are to be construed as guides and any one amount listed in the above schedule may be supplemented from amounts of any other project for which matching funds are not raised or available, with the approval of the Governor and Council, as long as the total expenditures of state money do not exceed the total amount of the bond issue and construction on each unit is performed as nearly as possible to that contemplated.

Any unexpended balance remaining after the completion of all listed projects shall go into a debt service account to pay interest or principal on the issued bonds.

House Amendment "I" was adopted.

Mr. Fortier of Waterville offered House Amendment "E" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "E" to H. P. 1166, L. D. 1667, 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."

Amend said Bill in the Title by striking out the words "Two Million Eight Hundred and Fifteen Thousand Dollars" and inserting in place thereof the words "Two Million Eight Hundred and Twenty-five Thousand Dollars"

Further amend said Bill by striking out in the 5th line of section 1 (4th line of L. D. 1667) the figure "\$2,815,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure '\$2,825,000'

Further amend said Bill in section 6 by striking out in that part that relates to Waterville Airport the figure "30,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure '40,000'

Further amend said Bill by striking out at the end of section 6 the TOTAL figure and inserting in place thereof the figure '\$2,825,000'

Further amend said Bill in section 8 by striking out all of the 2nd paragraph (same in L. D. 1667) and inserting in place thereof the following:

"Shall a bond issue be ratified for the purposes set forth in 'An Act to Authorize General Fund Bond Issue in Amount of Two Million Eight Hundred and Twenty-five Thousand Dollars and to Appropriate Moneys for Construction, Extension and Improvement for Airports,' passed by the 103rd Legislature?"

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the adoption of House Amendment "E."

Mr. Pendergast of Kennebunkport requested a division.

The SPEAKER: A vote has been requested on the adoption of House Amendment "E." Is the House ready for the question? All those in favor of adopting House Amend-

ment "E" will vote yes and those opposed will vote no, and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

33 having voted in the affirmative and 78 having voted in the negative, House Amendment "E" failed of adoption.

Mr. Scribner of Portland offered House Amendment "G" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "G" to H. P. 1166, L. D. 1667, 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."

Amend said Bill in section 6 by striking out all of the paragraph relating to Augusta and inserting in place thereof the following:

*Augusta 322,000

Construct new administration building and repairs to road and auto parking areas

*These funds shall be expended only when \$107,333 is available from the City of Augusta for the same project.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that House Amendment "G" be adopted?

(Cries of "No")

Mr. Brown of Augusta requested a division.

The SPEAKER: A vote has been requested on the adoption of House Amendment "G."

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I pose a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Scribner, as to what would his amendment do?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Scribner who may answer if he so chooses and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. SCRIBNER: Mr. Speaker, House Amendment "G" will provide that all of the projects will have to provide some sort of

matching funds for whatever airport is considered in their locality.

At the present time, the airport bond issue provides matching funds for every project with the exception of Augusta, and of the total matching funds, \$2,415,000 Federal funds and \$439,000 in local funds. The only project that has no provision for this is Augusta and it is also one of the more sizeable projects. To make sure that the local communities would have more of an interest in their particular projects if they have to provide some percentage. In this particular case Augusta would have to provide one-third of the cost of their project.

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

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I would remind the members of the House that this is a State-owned airport, entirely State-owned, and that if we were to get into this feature of the City providing funds, than perhaps we might get into an awkward position where the State receives income from the airport which is diverted right back to the State, that we would have a complicated situation here.

Presently, the FAA uses this building and pays rent in the amount of \$4,000 a year occupying 1200 square feet. They require more room and consequently their rent would go up. Also, the income from—Northeast, P & M and Executive Airlines pay rental income and once again this is returned to the State. I believe that probably out of the sections of this bill that this is the only one that the State probably would receive a return on their money.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, with regards to this particular airport and some others in the list that the Appropriations Committee considered that is involved in this bond issue as reported out by the Committee, there are other airports that don't have local matching funds, and I call your attention to Rockland where there are no local matching funds. I also call

your attention to Auburn-Lewiston which have no matching funds and to Presque Isle which have no matching funds, so in this category Augusta is no exception.

I understand that the reason for the—I'll let it drop there. I want to go further though and say that also with Augusta there are no Federal matching funds and the reason there are no Federal matching funds, it is the policy of the Aeronautics Commission or the Federal matching Bureau, whoever it is, that administration buildings do not fall within the category of Federal matching funds, so that is the reason for this being left out of the Federal. The same applies to Rockland. I don't know whether that is an administration building or what the story is there, so in this category Augusta is not an exception, and your Committee felt that the funds were justified at a State level to build an administration building at the Augusta airport, that was a fairly unanimous report I believe of the Committee.

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

Mr. FORTIER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House: I hate to take issue with my good friend from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, but when he says matching funds and he says there are no matching funds available for Presque Isle and Auburn and Lewiston and he named one other airport, he is entirely in error, because there are matching funds. He did mention that there were no local matching funds but there are Federal matching funds.

Now the Augusta airport has no Federal or no local matching funds, and this is the only item on this entire bill that has no matching funds of any kind. He mentions that the—that your Committee felt that this was entirely justified. However, I call your attention to the Aeronautics Commission who and the Maine Transportation Commission who hasn't approved this expenditure and your Governor who hasn't approved this expenditure, so I wonder where

the justification comes for this particular \$322,000 expenditure. The amendment that I offered asked for \$10,000 of much needed funds for the Waterville airport which was quickly jumped on and denied. In the Waterville situation, Waterville is perfectly happy to contribute matching funds, we will make this expenditure from our local effort matching every cent that the State wants to spend. However, this was turned down. How do you turn down a \$10,000 appropriation and then justify a \$300,000 appropriation that is completely unjustified and never been approved by any authority or person who is qualified to know whether or not it should be expended, and I would like to pose a question to Mr. Bragdon from Perham, what L. D. was requesting the \$322,000 for the Augusta airport and where did this request originate from?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Fortier, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, who may answer if he chooses.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I might state that I voted for the amendment the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Fortier presented. I heard the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, distinctly say that the towns that he mentioned did not have any local matching funds, they did have Federal and State funds, but it was my understanding that he said that they did not have any local matching funds. This often arises in airport appropriations. Insofar as the Federal Government is concerned at the Auburn-Lewiston airport matching funds for a great majority of the monies are available on the Federal level. There are no local funds and we are happy about that. There is an item of \$50,000 for a localizer which we are happy about that has no local nor Federal funds, but State funds. This situation arises before.

In answer to the question as to whether or not there was an L. D.

wherein it concerned the proposal of the administration building at the airport, this is nothing new either, because I mean on several instances and even last week the House voted unanimously on a project to have a self-liquidating bond dormitory at the Penobscot Vocational School, there was no bill for that. There was no bill for the South Portland Vocational School, and we voted that. There was a bill that was drawn and was defeated on the dormitory at the Penobscot County and Maine Vocational School. This oftentimes happens. I think that the explanation as given by the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, was sound. I think the bill as has been brought out unanimously by the Appropriations Committee is sound and I think this bill ought to be passed to be engrossed and we can be on our way.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the adoption of House Amendment "G." All those in favor of the adoption of House Amendment "G" will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

36 having voted in the affirmative and 85 having voted in the negative, House Amendment "G" failed of adoption.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Winslow, Mr. Roy.

Mr. ROY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I won't belabor this project any further. I think it has been debated thoroughly. I would like to bring out a few facts.

We have at present been faced with nine amendments, the airport bond issue, House Amendment "A" which has filing number 351 was defeated; House Amendment "B" filing 353 which was approved; House Amendment "C" filing 355 was also passed; House Amendment "D" filing number 364 was also passed; House Amendment "I" which was just presented this afternoon has also been accepted, filing 376; House Amendment "E" filing 366 which was presented by the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Fortier was defeated. On this par-

ticular amendment I just couldn't see the reasoning of the House for not allowing the Honorable Mayor from Waterville the appropriation of \$10,000 more so that the City could increase their share to have a larger administration building up there. It is a very small sum in comparison to some of the other items that you have in your programs today as compared to the appropriation for the Augusta airport of \$322,000 which is not recommended by the Aeronautics Commission, the FAA and has no Federal matching funds allocated for this expansion at all. I agree with the members of the Appropriations Committee when they point out the fact that administration buildings are not in matching fund programs, but for \$322,000 this is going to be quite an administration building gentlemen, and I think it is kind of extravagant where there isn't any Federal matching funds available for any other part of the airport up there. For them to put up \$322,000 worth of a building at the Augusta State Airport, I wish to state here that I am not opposed to the Augusta State Airport being located in Augusta, I am only opposed to the present airport in its present form, when this has been here for the past six years and it's been turned down for the past six years by the Federal Aeronautics Commission, the Federal Aviation Agency—they are the ones who can tell you whether or not you get federal matching funds. I have items here in my desk back in 1965 with a front-page issue where F.A.A. has turned down federal matching funds for Augusta.

Now I would say here again, if we're going to construct a \$322,000 administration building where there is no Federal matching funds for any other provision for the expansion of this airport up there, I think we're throwing away the taxpayers' money.

House Amendment "G" which contained the appropriation for \$322,000 which was from Mr. Scribner, Filing No. 372 — this failed passage also.

To give you a little information and a few facts as to what air-

ports have federal matching funds, and as to which ones have local and state matching funds. Presque Isle has state matching funds of \$35,000; they're asking for \$35,000. Bangor \$82,500—local \$82,500; federal \$50,000, total appropriation, total expenditure—\$215,000. Portland, a million six hundred and twenty-five thousand, state, local \$145,200; federal matching, one million four hundred ninety-eight thousand three hundred. Total expenditure of three millions, two hundred sixty-eight thousand, five hundred. The Auburn-Lewiston Airport. State appropriation, \$365,000, federal \$300,000. Total expenditures \$665,000. Rockland Airport. State \$130,000, federal \$130,000, total expenditure \$260,000. Bar Harbor, which was an emergency measure, which was passed before this Body, total expenditures for the state was \$120,000—I'll correct myself on that, state shares \$120,000, the local matching is \$50,000, the federal \$140,000, total expenditure for Bar Harbor is \$310,000.

I have felt that with all the amendments that were added to the airport bond issue, there should be some clarification, especially for some of the new members that have been here when you have three or four amendments, bills tabled and retabled again, you retain little interest that does not pertain to your particular area; but the Central Maine airport, I will not prolong this, the Federal Government's share was \$1,150,000, the appropriation from the State would have been \$1,500,000.

At this particular time, Mr. Speaker, I offer House Amendment "H" filing 375 and will speak very briefly on this. My reason for offering this House Amendment goes back from the hearing on airports where representations from Presque Isle to Kittery, Maine was here in attendance that day. If I am wrong, I will stand corrected. At that hearing I don't believe I heard an individual opposed to the Central Maine Airport. The opposition came about of having Central Maine tied into the total bond issue for the reason due to the last referendum the

bond issue was defeated and they in turn blamed the Central Maine Airport for the defeat of that bond issue. I wonder if they blamed the defeat of the State Office Building of the State Highway Commission on the Central Maine Airport as well. Most of the opposition arose as having this consolidated into one complete bond issue. This amendment that you have before you today, House Amendment "H", separates the bond issue entirely. It puts all the airports in the State in one bond issue and it lists Central Maine as a complete separate item in itself and I think that it should stand on its own legs whether it is accepted or defeated by the people of the State of Maine. I feel this is a choice that you should let them decide upon, especially the people in Central Maine which represents roughly about twelve percent of the total State population, and once and for all I feel that the people should decide on this for the last time. Thank you.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "H" to H. P. 1166, L. D. 1667, 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."

Amend said Bill in the Title by striking out the words "Two Million Eight Hundred and Fifteen Thousand Dollars" and inserting in place thereof the words "Four Million Three Hundred and Fifteen Thousand Dollars"

Further amend said Bill in section 6 by striking out all of the last 3 lines before the last paragraph (same in L. D. 1667) and inserting in place thereof the following:

'Central Maine	
Area Airport	\$1,500,000
Construction of a 6,000 foot runway, short taxiway, plane parking apron, modest terminal building, automobile parking area	

and instrument land system	
Aeronautics Commission	3,500
Discretionary Fund	

TOTAL	\$4,315,000
-------	-------------

Further amend said Bill in section 6 by adding after the last paragraph the following paragraph:

'Any project exceeding the expenditure of more than \$150,000 must be matched with Federal Funds and shall be approved by the Aeronautics Commission and the Federal Aviation Agency.'

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of section 3 and inserting in place thereof the following:

'Sec. 8. Referendum for ratification. The aldermen of cities, the selectmen of towns and the assessors of the several plantations of this State are empowered and directed to notify the inhabitants of their respective cities, towns and plantations to meet in the manner prescribed by law for calling and holding biennial meetings of said inhabitants for the election of Senators and Representatives, at the next general or special statewide election, to give in their votes upon the acceptance or rejection of the foregoing Act, and the questions shall be:

1. "Shall a bond issue be ratified in the amount of Two Million Eight Hundred and Fifteen Thousand Dollars and to Appropriate Moneys for Construction, Extension and Improvements for Airports, except Central Maine Area Airport?"

2. "Shall a bond issue be ratified in the amount of One Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars and to Appropriate Moneys for Construction of Central Maine Area Airport?"

The inhabitants of said cities, towns and plantations shall indicate by a cross or check mark placed within a square upon their ballots their opinion of each question, those in favor of ratification voting "Yes" and those opposed to ratification voting "No" and the ballots shall be received, sorted, counted and declared in open ward, town and plantation meetings, and return made to the office of the Secretary of State in the same

manner as votes for Governor and Members of the Legislature, and the Governor and Council shall review the same and if it shall appear that a majority of the inhabitants voting on each question are in favor, the Governor shall forthwith make known the fact by his proclamation, and each question shall thereupon become effective in 30 days after the date of said proclamation.

Secretary of State shall prepare ballots. The Secretary of State shall prepare and furnish to the several cities, towns and plantations ballots and blank returns in conformity with the foregoing Act, accompanied by a copy thereof.

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

(Cries of "No")

Mr. Richardson of Cumberland requested a division.

The SPEAKER: A vote has been requested. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I'm no authority on airports, but I believe I have a little common sense and intelligence — possibly not as much intelligence as some members of this House.

You know, all these things, what they remind me of: I wonder if all these things aren't a big "pork barrel"? And, seemingly a good many people in this House want their share of the pork! I suggest they think a little about this. Some of the things they propose may be worthy of consideration at the next session or the session after that. Some of the things they propose from the standpoint of common sense and from the common sense standpoint of economics sound to me as pretty ridiculous.

Now I know that many people in this House don't agree with me, but possibly, possibly I know a little bit more about economics than at least a few of them — or think I do.

Now we went all through this the last time. Now if these people would stop and think. We can't afford to throw away right now a lot of these proposals — they're ridiculous. In the first place, what

we should take care of first is — we have got three airports in this state that will take ten planes. In the next place, you want people to come into this state — where have they got to come first? They've got to come through Portland — they have a jet airport. They have a jet airport in Bangor; they have a jet airport at Presque Isle. Now because everybody wants a little bit of the pork barrel, we get all these, what I call, ridiculous propositions.

Now — you can very well afford in this bill to drop out most of that, and those that are worthy of consideration will get it, but the taxpayers of this state just cannot afford these things, and I believe they certainly can't afford that three hundred and some odd thousand dollars for the Augusta Airport for a terminal building. They need a terminal building right now about as much as I need a hole in my head! And the same thing applies to this so-called Central Maine Airport — and some others that I might mention, but I don't want to at this particular time. I hope I have made myself clear.

Now, if they come up with some of these propositions as they should, maybe the next session we might have eventually all the airports that are necessary, not some of these extreme things. Now they always come up with reasons to me when I talk with some of them about the waste and these pork barrels down to Washington — and I agree with them! They might look into what that Democrat Mike Kerwin has got down there on that big pitch that he wants to put across.

Now I could go on and on here for an hour, and of course when I talk I am not capable of using these nice so-called diplomatic, subtle ways that some members have. I'm not a politician — I'm not trying to be one — I don't like the word "politician." I am trying to be an amateur statesman, and the main guide I have happens to be that great President — a Republican President — Abraham Lincoln!

Well, who do some of these people think they're fooling? They're not fooling anybody that's got any common sense or knows anything

about economics! I think that's about enough — I think I've made myself clear. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The pending question is the adoption of House Amendment "H" offered by Mr. Roy of Winslow. All those in favor of adopting House Amendment "H" will vote yes, those opposed will vote no, and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken. 36 having voted in the affirmative and 77 having voted in the negative, House Amendment "H" failed of adoption.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I would now move that we reconsider our action whereby we indefinitely postponed House Amendment "E" and I would speak to the motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, now moves that the House reconsider its action whereby House Amendment "E" failed of adoption. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think possibly some of us did not know too much as to what we were voting on this amendment. This would make it possible with the failure now to act upon in any way the Central Maine Airport, this would make it possible for Waterville to improve on their administration building by raising their amount that we would give them of the state's figure from \$30,000 to \$40,000. They in turn would put up \$10,000. That's \$20,000 that they would expend, \$10,000 of the State's funds and \$10,000 of their own funds in Waterville, and I think it's a paltry sum and I think my motion to reconsider our action whereby we indefinitely postponed this amendment should prevail.

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

Mr. FORTIER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to thank Representative Jalbert for asking you folks to reconsider this action.

The City of Waterville, of which I am the Mayor, is a very small city area-wise, and somehow I have been mis-associated with the Sidney Airport, and the only thing that I could possibly do to disassociate myself from this would be to get up here and publicly renounce my support of the Sidney Airport, because I spoke to a couple of members after my amendment was turned down and they said that they thought I was—this was some Sidney proposal that I was proposing, so I would like to state at this time that I am not concerned at this time on this amendment with any city except Waterville.

As long as the area airport concept was alive, we in the city felt that we had to support it and there was a very, very basic reason for this. If you look at the map of the State of Maine, you will notice that area-wise the City of Waterville is probably the smallest area in the entire Kennebec County area. Now this would necessarily mean that if it were possible to get rid of the airport in Waterville and transfer to some other location, or if the business—if the airport were in some other location, we'll put it that way, that we could make this hundred or hundred and fifty acres that our Waterville airport is using, available for some other use, such as industrial expansion or real estate development, housing development or whatever.

Now since the Sidney concept is entirely, to my way of thinking, a thing of the past, I would say that we have a responsibility in my city to do all the things at the airport that have been delayed over this last four or five years because of this Sidney concept; and so we have a problem that must be expedited. We have no administration buildings—when we talk about administration buildings in other places, whether it be Augusta, Lewiston, Auburn, Portland or some other place, you're talking about enlarging present terminal buildings. We're not talking of enlarging a present terminal building, we're talking of building one. We have none at the present time. The only thing that we have in

Waterville is a small private operation that is trying to make do. Now last February an airline negotiated with Waterville and negotiated with the people out to the airport who were running the airport, and the name of that airline as you all know is National Executive. They now provide four daily trips to Boston. We feel that we probably have the most reliable service in the State of Maine at the present time, not because we have the biggest airplanes or because we have Northeast or some other airlift, but because National Executive flies when other airlines don't fly.

This poses this administration building problem again. These people are doing the best they can to provide central Maine with reliable air service. They are landing at our airport because we have a fine airport. I want to thank the State of Maine and the Federal Government for its efforts in the past and its contributions to our airport. We have a fine airport, we have a nice long runway, good flying conditions, but we desperately need parking, a parking area in front of this administration building and a stop taxi way.

Now the appropriation that we are requesting would provide this and I don't think that the terminal building that we are asking for is a real major expenditure; it will only give us a comfortable terminal building, it wouldn't give us something expansive beyond our means. I think that we could support it and maintain it.

And for this reason—incidentally if I could back up for a step, we also have another airline that flies regularly scheduled trips from Waterville, known as Inland Air Incorporated and they fly a service direct to New York, leaving Waterville at seven o'clock in the morning and arriving in New York for executives to do a complete day's business in New York and they return from New York at five o'clock and arrive at Waterville somewhere in the vicinity of seven. I would suggest that any of you in this area who need to get to New York to do a day's business, that you come to Waterville and we'll fly you there.

Again I would like to thank Representative Jalbert for asking for this reconsideration and I would urge you to, if you could, support the motion for reconsideration. Thank you.

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

Mr. SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am very sorry that I have to take up the time of this Legislature, but I still have to do what I consider right and these things are being forced upon me. Now referring to the Mayor of Waterville, who in addition to being a fellow Democrat happens to be a cousin of mine on the French side of my family. Now the way this is going on, I am simply offering this as a tentative suggestion to my cousin from Waterville and my other friends and relatives in Waterville. I think that they should get together with those from Augusta, including a very dear friend of mine who happens to be a Senator from Augusta. They should get together and figure out what would be the best right now and decide where they want this airport and which one they want to develop, whether it's Augusta or whether it's Waterville. And if they can't decide it any other way maybe they better toss a coin.

Now if they want that airport in Waterville and one in Augusta, I think they're possibly somewhere about twenty miles apart, maybe we from Cumberland County maybe we need an airport to serve western Cumberland County. Now I wouldn't want that airport that I am going to propose for consideration, I wouldn't want that airport twenty miles from Portland — no, but maybe we should have it up there, well, somewhere about around Naples or Princeton, see? Or maybe in between Princeton and Harrison. That would be approximately forty miles.

In other words, some of these proposals that I hear, they sound to me very extreme — everybody wants to get his, his or hers, hands on part of the pork. They definitely are not giving any real consideration to the taxpayers of this state who have to provide most of the

money for some of these propositions. Now I suggest they start to use a little economic common sense, and we need in Cumberland County, an airport in western Cumberland County just about as much as they need two airports twenty miles apart — we need them more so.

Now I don't want to put in an amendment at this particular time to develop, I might say, a port up there between Bridgton and Harrison, but if I were to follow the leadership of certain people in this House of course I should put an amendment in there for them. And, well, it should be to start with probably at least \$50,000; but I won't. But I hope what I've said would cause certain people in this Legislature to use a little bit of common sense, and I again say that a lot of these propositions could very well be put off two years without hurting anyone. And certainly I don't think you really want to hurt and add more money on the backs of the taxpayers of this state, and a big portion of them are already overtaxed. I hope I have made myself clear. Thank you.

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

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, the speaker from Portland mentioned, Mr. Sullivan, that Augusta and Waterville should get together. We have gotten together, Members of the House. The Executive Airlines first started flying into Augusta; we found that the service was excellent. Their agreement was that they would not expand their facilities outside of Augusta. They approached us and asked if it was permissible to fly to Waterville. We fully concurred with this. I hope now that you will go along with the reconsideration of the motion of Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that the House reconsider its action whereby House Amendment "E" failed of adoption. Is the House ready for the question? 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. 104 having voted in the affirmative and 10 having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I now move the adoption of House Amendment "E".

House Amendment "E" was then adopted.

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

Mr. DUNN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Before this bill is passed to be engrossed I would like to correct an impression that may have been conveyed a few moments ago about the Augusta airport. There was an L. D. in front of our Committee regarding the Augusta airport, 1231, and while the amount of money and the contents of it may have been changed this bill was reported out leave to withdraw as covered by other legislation, which accounts for the item in the bond issue.

Thereupon, 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," House Paper 1166, L. D. 1667, was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendments "B", "C", "D", "E", and "I" and sent to the Senate.

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

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

Tabled—May 31, By Mr. Lebel of Van Buren.

Pending—Motion of Mr. Pendergast of Kennebunkport to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A" (H-342)

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

Mr. DANTON: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mars Hill, Mr. Dickinson, is absent and he has two amendments to offer regarding

this measure; and for that reason I request that this matter be tabled until he is given the opportunity to do so.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland, retabled pending the motion of Mr. Pendergast of Kennebunkport to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A" and specially assigned for Monday, June 5.

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

SENATE MAJORITY REPORT (8) — Ought to Pass — Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to Counsel's Argument of Monetary Value of Pain and Suffering in Personal Injury Actions" (S. P. 429) (L. D. 1083)—MINORITY REPORT (2)—Ought Not to Pass. (In Senate, Bill and Reports indefinitely postponed)

Tabled—May 31, by Mr. Beliveau of Rumford.

Pending—Motion of Mr. Hewes of Cape Elizabeth to Indefinitely Postpone Reports and Bill.

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

Mr. HEWES: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Two of the very fine gentlemen on our Committee, Mr. Berman and Mr. Brennan, have requested that an amendment be added to the pending bill, and out of courtesy to them I would like to withdraw my motion for indefinite postponement.

Thereupon, Mr. Hewes of Cape Elizabeth was granted permission to withdraw his motion to indefinitely postpone.

Mr. HEWES: By so doing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that this is no indication that after the amendment is offered that I may not speak against it at a later time.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report?

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is not my position to dispute the statement of the Honorable Speaker, but it occurs to me that the Majority Report of the Committee of

Judiciary I think was eight to two "ought to pass."

The SPEAKER: The Chair stands corrected.

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would now yield to my colleague from Portland, Mr. Brennan, who I now see is seated in the House.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Brennan, may speak in his own right.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Brennan of Portland, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted in non-concurrence, the Bill read twice and assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

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

An Act relating to Powers of Administrative Hearing Commissioner Concerning Minors Under the Liquor Laws (H. P. 1159) (L. D. 1656)

Tabled—May 31, by Mr. Cote of Lewiston.

Pending—Passage to be enacted.

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker, in deference to the gentleman from Eliot, Mr. Hichens, I would ask that the rules be suspended for the purpose of reconsideration so that an amendment might be offered.

Thereupon, the rules were suspended and the House voted to reconsider its action on May 16 whereby this Bill was passed to be engrossed.

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I now offer House Amendment "A" as filed by the gentleman from Eliot, Mr. Hichens, under filing number H-380 and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that amendments must be offered in their own right.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eliot, Mr. Hichens.

Thereupon, Mr. Hichens of Eliot offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1159, L. D. 1656, Bill "An Act Relating to Powers of Administrative Hearing Commissioner Concerning Minors Under the Liquor Laws."

Amend said Bill by striking out in the 5th and 6th lines (4th line of L. D. 1656) the following:

" , to punish for contempt"

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker, may I inquire through the Chair if House Amendment 380 has been distributed?

The SPEAKER: The answer is in the affirmative.

Thereupon, 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 now lays before the House, on your Supplement number one, tabled and later today assigned:

Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Clarifying the Location of Town Line Between China and Winslow" (H. P. 1118) (L. D. 1595) which Report and Bill were recommended to the Committee on Legal Affairs in the House on May 17.

Came from the Senate with the Report accepted in non-concurrence. This was tabled earlier in the day by the gentleman from China, Mr. Farrington, pending further consideration.

The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I will bring you up to date on the history of this bill. First off, the municipal officers of the Town of Winslow and the Town of China agreed to establish a line by mutual agreement. By mutual agreement they hired a surveyor. The findings of the surveyor was accepted by most municipalities. I was asked to introduce a bill in the Legislature to make a firm line, as I understand it by Statute this is one method, the only method in fact to make town lines firm.

We appeared before the Legal Affairs Committee and told them our story. I appeared before the same Committee, counsel for a person who had had some litigation over the town line. The impression left with the Committee and the result of the "ought not to pass" report, as I afterwards found out, was due primarily to the fact that some of the Committee members were given to understand that property owners along this proposed line would lose some property rights. And since that time, by study and looking into the matter, they found that establishing town lines does not by any means affect the rights of property owners.

I have met with members of the House who are on the Committee, I have met with members of the other body who are on the Committee. In the light that some members voted the way they did in reporting this bill out of committee, it was felt that it should be recommitted and further judgment should be made. This House voted to recommit. The bill went to the Senate and of course came back to us in non-concurrence and they have accepted the "ought not to pass" report.

I am assured by the members of the Committee in both branches that if we take proper action here today to allow this matter to go further that the other body will go along. I now propose a rather unusual method and procedure, by asking that the rules be suspended, this is under the House order of business rules, that further action might be taken on this matter.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from China, Mr. Farrington, moves that Rule 25 be suspended. Is there objection? The Chair hears none—the rule is suspended.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, I now move that under the suspension of the rules that we reconsider our action whereby we recommitted this to the Legal Affairs Committee.

Thereupon, the House voted to reconsider its action on May 17 whereby this matter was recommitted to the Legal Affairs Committee.

The same gentleman then moved that the House substitute the Bill for the "Ought not to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Winslow, Mr. Roy.

Mr. ROY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a municipal officer and chairman of the Board of the Town of Winslow, I regret today to say that I in turn cannot concur with the gentleman from China. I have in turn been talking with members of the Legal Affairs Committee and I asked the Members, the legal minds of the Legal Affairs, if they in turn could give me a law which in turn specifies where the individual rights, which is in question at this particular time, between the town line of Winslow and China. I have in turn have not received any information to satisfy myself where I in turn can go along with this. Until I receive such information from the Legal Affairs Committee I will have to move that we indefinitely postpone this measure.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Beliveau.

Mr. BELIVEAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a member of the Legal Affairs, I will attempt to clarify the Committee's position on this. Initially this bill came out of committee unanimous "ought not to pass," and it in effect provided — the bill provided that we would establish a line, a town line between the towns of Winslow and China. At the time of the hearing there was no objection, as we understood it, from the municipal officers by the town. In other words, the line that was established or ran by surveyors was acceptable by the officers of both towns. But there had been some objection — there was testimony at the hearing that this would affect the private rights of abutting landowners. So we made initial judgment that since this would jeopardize, and in effect penalize or may result in depriving somebody of an amount of land or some portion of a tract of land, I think we voted that it should come out "ought not to pass."

Subsequent to last week we did some additional research and conferred and reviewed the Statutes on this and there is a statutory provision whereby if a community disagrees with an adjoining community as to where the town line should be located, then this matter can be referred to a Board of Commissioners, an answer to the Superior Court and so forth, and finally a line will be determined. But in this case there appeared to be no disagreement between the two towns. The municipal officers had agreed upon it, and we further inquired and did some research and it appeared that regardless of where the town line is established by the municipalities and by the Legislature that this will in no way affect the private property owners whose land may abut or adjoin either towns.

So consequently we reviewed our position on this and at least it was the majority feeling that the bill should at that time at least have been recommitted to the Committee for further consideration. Now because of the action that the other body took we find ourselves in the position that we are today. I think at least it was the position of the majority members of the Legal Affairs Committee that regardless, even though today if we were to establish a town line between the two towns, that this would not jeopardize or affect in any way the abutting of private property owners in the area. So consequently that is why the Committee changed its position on this matter.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Winslow, Mr. Roy, that the Report and Bill be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. CAREY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Changing of town lines is a very delicate matter, and as a surveyor I can tell you that these lines are generally also property lines, and property lines in general are not too well defined in the old deeds. I ask that you not complicate lines any more than they already are. Because I work in this

area and because I could be called in to survey the lines this bill proposes to change, I have made a study in this matter.

I have in my files at home a plan of a town called Harlem. This is the present day China, and the plan is dated 1818, and it is definite in the location of the town line. The line lies to the east of Mud Pond. As I understand the present proposal, L. D. 1595, the town line would now be in the general area of the center line of the Pond, and the town of Winslow would lose about 2300 feet of shore frontage on the Pond.

Title 30, Section 2000-1 of the Revised Statutes dictates that boundary lines shall be run once every five years excepting those municipalities which have stone bounds at the town corners and angle points at the line, and these bounds must protrude two feet above the surface of the surrounding ground and even then these towns have to rerun their lines every ten years.

I checked with the Town Clerk in Winslow and found that the last time the lines were run, until this present survey, was in 1898. I have in my possession a map which was drawn in 1917 by the engineering firm of Green and Wilson, which shows the location of the line in question, and this line is shown at the same location as the older plan that I have.

During the recess today I went to the Registry of Deeds and in looking over some deeds I found one, from Milligan to Ashman, dated April 6, 1943, which said in part—"bounded westerly by Mud Pond according to our deed, but to the best of our knowledge it goes only to the town line." Now this tells us that the line is to the east of the Pond. The Registry also had an atlas for the year 1879 and the China town lines were the same as before mentioned.

I also checked with the Clerk of Courts for decisions in the area and one was of great interest and in the area in question. This was the case 'Vigue vs Johnson,' and a Superior Court Justice handed down its decision which I will in part quote—"The Court takes judicial knowledge of the fact that

stone monuments on town lines very often carry the initials of the towns which they service, even though the monument may have been of recent origin, under the Crane Survey, the testimony is sufficient to indicate a previous monument at that point for many years prior thereto. The evidence positively establishes the Winslow-China town line." This decision handed down in 1962 and it placed the line where other plans had it.

So now we have a history of the line in question for years 1818, 1879, 1898, 1917, 1943 and 1962. All place the line to the east of the east shore of Mud Pond. It certainly would appear to me that this bill is intended to enrich the Town of China with still more shore frontage.

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

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: At this point to say the least I am somewhat dismayed about some of the action that has taken place here today. As I stated to you before and I will state again, there was a mutual agreement, as I understood it, between the municipal officers. I introduced the bill in their behalf. If there is certainly any question, at this point I have no more to say. I will simply let this bill die in peace, that I introduced this bill on the assumption and with the purpose of helping the municipalities, and I understood firmly and completely and sincerely that the two municipal groups had agreed; from here in I have no concern.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Winslow, Mr. Roy.

Mr. ROY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I arise in defense of the honorable gentleman from China, Mr. Farrington. As one of the municipal officers of one of these towns in question the agreement was never concurred as far as the municipalities agreed to one particular line. It was kind of left open as to the case that was pending as to what would happen to the individual's rights, if the line was established at this particular point, we in the Town of

Winslow as well as the Town of China have spent probably a thousand to fifteen hundred dollars apiece to establish this particular line in question whereas it was decided by the courts as not being the correct line. And in turn this was the main problem as to the line of Winslow. I also move for indefinite postponement.

Thereupon, on a viva voce vote, the Report and Bill were indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item two, tabled and later today assigned:

HOUSE JOINT ORDER Relating to Expenses of Indian Representatives.

Tabled — Earlier in the day, by Mrs. Carswell of Portland.

Pending — Passage. (Ordered reproduced)

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Since I introduced this order this morning a little confusion arose as to perhaps it might not be legal, and Mr. West in the Attorney General's Office thought that maybe it might not be. But after discussion with him this afternoon he was interpreting this part from a section of the Constitution which said, "The Senators and Representatives," it's Section 7 on page 12 of our little book here and it says, — the Senators and Representatives shall receive compensation but they shall not be able to increase their own compensation during the session.

However, after discussion this afternoon with him he did say that he wasn't sure about the whole thing now because he didn't think the Indian representatives would be concerned with the Senators and Representatives although they carried that title. So now I — I was going to withdraw this order, but now I have decided since he doesn't wish to make any statement unless we request a ruling of them I now decided that I will move the passage of this order and I move that the order be accepted.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I was opposed to this order this morning and I am more opposed to it now after being down to the Attorney General's department myself. The Attorney General, let me remind you, was not in his office today and only some of his assistants, namely Mr. West, which has some question and seems quite sure that if it went to court the courts would be opposed to it and I hate to see the courts burdened with a small item that only involves a small amount of money like this. And I think it seems—there is a question and I already made some statements this morning which you probably still remember. I hope you will go along and indefinitely postpone this order; and I understand we have a bill coming before us this morning that will take care of this situation. But anyhow, this is a questionable order, and by any stretch of your imagination it is questionable, and I could point out further why it is questionable, and I am sure if the Attorney General was here he would be more specific in his statements than his assistant.

So I do hope that you will go along and indefinitely postpone this order and we will start on the right foot by someone presenting a bill and trying to do it the right way.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman so move?

Mr. DUDLEY: I so move.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, now moves that this House Joint Order relating to expenses of Indian Representatives be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mrs. CARSWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This just seems to be another case where the Indians find themselves between Scylla and Charybdis, or the "Devil and the Deep Blue Sea." I contacted the Attorney General, the Assistant Attorney General on the telephone and he thought perhaps that the order was no consti-

tutional. I had a bill drawn up and I went down to see the Attorney General and he couldn't make up — the Assistant Attorney General I mean, and he really couldn't make up his mind about this either because there truly isn't anything definite in the Statutes as what the Indians are. Are they Representatives to the Legislature or at the Legislature, and if they are one or the other what does it mean? And as I said before, I will repeat myself, they just seem to be between the "Devil and the Deep Blue Sea," and when problems come up we just don't know how to solve them for them.

Now I do hope that this order presented by the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hinds, is not indefinitely postponed. Now as early — well as late as last week I talked with Speaker Kennedy and I explained to him that I had received a letter signed by both representatives of the Indian tribes and I have the letter in my hand here — it was written to me May the 17th. "We the two Indian representatives have run out of our mileage checks. We had ten trips. We got our last check today," which was May 17. "One of us has to stay overnight in Bangor." Now this is the representative who comes from Eastport. He goes as far as Bangor by bus. He hires a room at Bangor. He waits for the representative from Old Town. He picks the representative from the Passamaquoddy Tribe up at Bangor; they both travel to Augusta. Then they both travel back to Bangor; the representative from Eastport who is with the Passamaquoddy Tribe stays overnight again at Bangor, has to wait for a bus to go to Eastport. Now this sounds a little bit confusing and it certainly is. I will say that perhaps most of his pay checks for his trips has been spent staying at hotels. Now we know that they are not getting money for food, and I won't go into that any further.

But I do hope that you will pass this order to give the Indians additional mileage money so that they can finish with their legislation just as we are able to do, and there are some important pieces of

legislation — some of them are on the table. One in specific is a bill which asks for \$10,000 to improve the housing and this is for the elderly Indians who cannot get loans. So I hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail, because they do have important legislation before this body. Thank you.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I hope briefly — I would like to point out to you that L. D. 186 is now in the other body and this will involve increases in the allowances granted to the travel representatives in the Legislature, but that L. D. cannot take effect until the next session. It is for this reason that we support the order introduced by the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hinds, and supported by the gentle lady from Portland, Mrs. Carswell.

I would urge every member of the House to vote in favor of this order which will permit the Indian representatives to attend here during these closing days in an attempt to make their views known on the legislation which so vitally affects their welfare. I ask every member of the House to vote in favor of the order and against indefinite postponement and when the vote is taken I request a division.

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

Mr. STARBIRD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am the co-sponsor of L. D. 186, as you know, and I have made every attempt in my power to do what I can for the Indian representatives during this session. But I think there is still a question in my mind at least as to possibly the constitutionality of this order, and I would hope that someone might table this matter until the Attorney General Mr. Erwin might personally look into it himself.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, that House Joint Order

relating to Expenses of Indian Representatives be indefinitely postponed. A vote has been requested. All those in favor of indefinite postponement will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

11 having voted in the affirmative and 104 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Joint Order received passage and was sent up for concurrence. (H. P. 1189)

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item three, tabled and today assigned:

HOUSE MAJORITY REPORT (7)—Ought Not to Pass—Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act to Remove Sales Tax Exemptions on Rentals, Repairs, Installation and Servicing of Tangible Personal Property" (H. P. 123) (L. D. 149)—MINORITY REPORT (3)—Ought to Pass.

Tabled—Earlier in the day, by Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor.

Pending—Motion of Mr. Hanson of Gardiner to accept Majority Report.

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

Mr. SCRIBNER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Before we vote on this measure I would like to explain it briefly. There have been quite a few questions as to just what this does cover. Regardless of what happens this session—and I still think it's a good idea, and I would like to explain it in a little bit of detail and see what happens.

L.D. 149 proposes that we consider extending the sales tax to renting, repairing, installing and servicing tangible personal property. To some degree all of these items are already taxed by the sales tax. We tax the parts on a good many repair jobs. Some of these areas such as rentals, they are taxed depending upon the type of lease that is issued; they are in the minority. The majority of equipment, which is primarily what this would cover, will be rental of equipment, tractors, any

type of equipment; boats are non-taxable.

We have a choice I think in the long run. We can broaden the sales tax in some other logical manner and I believe this is one. We can continue to raise the rates. I personally feel that we've got to broaden it in those areas that show continued economic growth so that in the future the greater percentage of our increased taxed revenue will come from natural economic growth.

All of these items that are covered in L. D. 149 contain some of the elements of ownership. Now if we tax somebody on the sale of personal property, to that extent we're taxing the ownership of the property. For example, someone rents a piece of equipment, he receives the same benefits from it as he does as if he owned it. It is not regressive. It has been mentioned, for example, that this would tax somebody that has his shoes repaired. Well that would be a very small portion of this income from this type of tax and I believe that the people who do have their shoes repaired and if you pay a dollar for it the four cent tax in that case is not regressive.

The majority of the income would come from such items as rental of equipment. This is something that is growing very rapidly. Between the last two business censuses, there is one every five years—they took one in '58, one in 1963. Here in Maine the gross dollar volume was up seventy percent between these two business censuses. I believe that's an indication that this is rapidly growing, it is a source to which we should look for tax revenue in the future.

The other areas are repair and other services, they are also growing rapidly, although not quite as dramatically as rental income. This should be significant in the future and this is the type of thing which I feel we should logically look to as sound progressive taxation. If we are going to continue to rely on, and we are going to have to, on the sales tax, we have got to broaden it in some of these areas.

There are some loopholes, for example, that exist in the current type of business transactions, that this would close. For example, under the present taxation laws and individual new major rebuilding, major renovations of large pieces of equipment, you may put \$10,000 into renovating a large machine. He winds up with one that's just as good as new but he has to pay a tax on it, he pays a tax on the parts, that's all. In some industries it is more economical and feasible due to the taxation policies to rebuild equipment than it is to buy new equipment. I feel that as long as the end result is there and a man winds up with something that he can use in his business, there should not be a tax differential.

This is a relatively easy type of tax to administer. Most of the people are already registered; there will be a few people in the rental business that are not registered. They would have to register under this and report their source of revenue to pay the use tax. People who are not registered don't file, so they don't pay a use tax. I believe this would be a significant step to take so that some of these areas would increase their collections from the use taxes, so a few more people would register. Overall this would simplify the vast number of regulation bulletins and court cases that the tax assessor is involved in. He has to work in this area. Some of these things are drawing the line under the present law, which this would broaden it enough so that the line would no longer exist and some of the problems of administration will be eliminated.

I had a memo from the State Tax Assessor back in February saying that there would be no additional cost of collection of this particular tax in the yield of the next biennium, which I feel is somewhat conservative if it is based on the census which is the best part of, would amount to \$2,540,000. At the present time some of our consumers are being taxed somewhat arbitrarily, which is another — they may call it a loophole of some sort in our tax laws in that installation and serv-

ice costs are not taxable under the present sales tax law, but there are a few words that bear quite importantly on that, that is if these items are separately stated.

This leaves it up to the merchant — it depends on how he makes out your bill. If you buy a TV set and he is going to install it and he puts down a separate item on the bill, which is a \$200 TV set and a \$20 installation service charge is separately stated and the amount is \$180, you pay four percent on \$180. And he puts down one TV set, installed, \$200, you pay \$8 sales tax. This to me leaves a little too much discretion to the merchants. This is the type of thing that would be eliminated. Some merchants don't make out their bills in this manner because it's too much bother — why should I bother with my bookkeeping just to save the purchaser a little tax?

A lot of people are not aware of these fine points, so it is often overlooked, and if the merchant makes out a bill that way, you have no recourse.

This is a stable measure in a period of rising prices which we are faced with. I think it is going to continue and it would bring out a substantial amount of increased revenue in the future and it is, as I said earlier, it's the type of taxation measure which is sound and more economically feasible than others. A portion of this would be paid by people who are visiting the state, and some of the arguments that are given in favor of other taxation measures I believe the people who come here and rent boats, automobiles and that type of thing, they have the use of it as if they paid for it. This is sound that they should pay a reasonable percentage to the state under the all encompassing tax laws.

Those are my comments on it. There have been many questions about the bill. I believe a careful reading of it would answer most of the questions. It is not an ogre — the bill doesn't have pointed ears. It is a sound measure and I believe if you better understood it it would be more acceptable, and I have tried to do some of that today, and I feel that this

is a type of thing that I hope it keeps coming back until eventually we do shift to amendment whereby the economics of the situation will determine what the taxation measures are going to be for the people of the State of Maine. I do hope and I would request at this time that when the vote is taken it be taken by the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As a member of the Taxation Committee, many of us found this to be a most confusing tax. No one seemed to know exactly what was going to be covered. The hearing at the time was very well attended. Aside from the sponsor of the legislation there was only one other proponent, but the opposition was numerous — representing individuals themselves, small businesses, large businesses, hospitals, and so forth. But even they found it difficult to attack specific points because the whole idea was just too big.

The questions raised have really produced no answers; they only left the whole situation a little more up in the air. For instance, they were never able to get exact definitions of services, rental features, contract businesses, fabrications, and so forth. There were specific examples given us. The sponsor has mentioned shoes. Right now there is no tax on shoes, but if shoes were taken in to be repaired they would then be taxed. Machinery repaired by an electrician would be taxed, yet painting a building would not be taxed. Certain fabrications would be taxed and others would not be taxed. Hospital equipment—some of it is owned by the hospital and some of it is rented. How would they differentiate between this and what items would be taxed and what items would not be taxed?

In certain rentals you would be taxing twice because the owner is now paying a tax and the person renting would then be paying a tax under this. In short, the entire proposed tax area was extremely complicated. Now the bill suggested

that this might bring in a revenue of some \$1,270,000 a year, but persons at the hearing said that this might go as high as six or eight million dollars a year according to the interpretation, because they had not reduced it to the basic elements.

Now for those who oppose either a sales tax increase or a moderate income tax, they ought to certainly view this with fear and trepidation. Certainly none of us like to support or propose any tax increases, but it is one thing to propose a specific tax. But this certainly is stepping off completely into the unknown, and I think that we would have great difficulty in justifying to persons back home when they found that they were paying certain taxes, by saying that we didn't realize the implications at the time.

It is for these reasons that I strongly oppose the imposition of such an uncertain tax, and I support the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report. 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. 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 on the motion of the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report on House Paper 123, L. D. 149, Bill "An Act to Remove Sales Tax Exemptions on Rentals, Repairs, Installation and Servicing of Tangible Personal Property." All those in favor of accepting the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Allen, Baker, E. B.; Bedard, Belanger, Benson, Berman, Bragdon, Brown, Buck, Carey, Carrier, Clark, Cookson, Cornell, Cote, Crockett, Crosby, Cushing, Dennett, Dunn, Durgin, Edwards, Evans, Ewer, Farrington, Foster, Fuller, Hall, Hanson, B. B.; Hanson, H. L.; Hanson, P. K.; Harnois, Harriman, Hawes, Haynes, Henley, Hewes, Hichens, Hinds, Hodgkins, Hoover, Huber, Humphrey, Immonen, Jewell, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Lycette, McMann, McNally, Meisner, Miliano, Mosher, Nadeau, N. L.; Pendergast, Philbrook, Pike Porter, Prince, Quinn, Rackliff, Richardson, G. A.; Richardson, H. L.; Rideout, Ross, Sahagian, Scott, C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Shute, Susi, Trask, Waltz, Wight, Wood, The Speaker.

NAY — Believeau, Bernard, Binnette, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Brennan, Carroll, Carswell, Champagne, Cottrell, Crommett, D'Alfonso, Danton, Drigotas, Dudley, Eustis, Fecteau, Fortier, Fraser, Gill, Giroux, Healy, Hennessey, Kilroy, Levesque, Littlefield, Martin, Minkowsky, Nadeau, J. F. R.; Rocheleau, Roy, Sawyer, Scribner, Starbird, Sullivan, Tanguay, Truman, Watts, Wheeler.

ABSENT — Baker, R. E.; Birt, Bradstreet, Bunker, Burnham, Conley, Couture, Curran, Darey, Dickinson, Drummond, Gaudreau, Gauthier, Harvey, Hunter, Jalbert, Jameson, Jannelle, Keyte, Kyes, Lebel, Maddox, Noyes, Payson, Quimby, Robertson, Robinson, Snow, P. J.; Snowe, P.; Soulas, Thompson, Townsend, White, Williams.

Yes, 77; No, 39; Absent, 34.

The SPEAKER: Seventy-seven having voted in the affirmative and thirty-nine in the negative, the motion to accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report does prevail. It will be sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item 4, which was earlier tabled until later in the day:

Bill "An Act Providing for a Tax on Real Estate Transfers" (H. P. 1143) (L. D. 1627)

Tabled — Earlier in the day, by Mr. Richardson of Stonington. Pending — Motion of Mr. Pendergast of Kennebunkport to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A" (H-307)

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Frankly I would rise in opposition to the motion to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A". I would much rather see the entire bill indefinitely postponed than I would House Amendment "A". I don't feel that the arguments which have been used against this are valid. I think, as I said the other day in speaking on this question, that under the present Federal law the stamps do not have to be put on a document until after it has gone to the Registry of Deeds and therefore I would certainly hope that the House would oppose the motion to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A".

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

Mr. PENDERGAST: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Earlier today I moved reconsideration of L. D. 1627, but my worthy opponent the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Beliveau, was absent, and I apologize to this gentleman. I would like to say at this time that I have discovered in the redraft of my original bill, L. D. 900, which came from the Committee on Taxation under L.D. 1627, dated May 3, 1967, was

incorrectly printed. Another draft of 1627 dated the same date May 3, 1967 in this one the error was corrected. Under Section 4643, the following sentence was deleted in the latter reprint. And starting after the word offers "which shall mark the instrument as it appears in the Registry records so that the amount of tax paid on the transaction shall be a matter of record in the Registry." Now as a result I am not sure which of these two same dated, same numbered L. D.s my worthy opponent is referring to. Therefore I would suggest or hope that somebody would table this measure until we can straighten this out. Thank you.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Harriman of Hollis, tabled pending the motion of the gentleman from Kennebunkport, Mr. Pendergast, to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A" and specially assigned for tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes in the rear of the Hall of the House a very good friend of the Speaker and a former member of this body, a former citizen of Washington County, a former colonel in the United States Army, and a man who in 1963 by his foresight, his aptness, saved the life of a young child while coming to this Maine Legislature. and I refer to the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Noel MacGregor. It's nice to see you here, Noel. (Applause)

On motion of Mr. Cumberland of Richardson,

Adjourned until nine-thirty o'clock tomorrow morning.