

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 III

June 16 to July 8, 1967

Index

1st Special Session

October 2 and October 3, 1967

2nd Special Session

January 9 to January 26, 1968

KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Wednesday, June 28, 1967

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

Prayer by Brigadier Alfred Davey of Salvation Army in Augusta.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

Papers from the Senate

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the Secretary of the Senate shall, when the Senate is not in session, be the Executive Officer of the Senate and have custody of all Senate property and materials, arrange for necessary supplies and equipment through the State Bureau of Purchases, arrange for necessary service and make all arrangements for incoming sessions of the Senate, have general oversight of chambers and rooms occupied by the Senate, permit State Departments to use Senate property, dispose of surplus or obsolete material through the continuing property record section of the Bureau of Public Improvements, with the approval of the President of the Senate, and approve accounts for payment. The Secretary shall maintain a perpetual inventory of all Senate property of items costing over \$50. and make an accounting to the Senate upon request (S. P. 708)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

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

Conference Committee Report

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act Creating a Second Assistant County Attorney for York County" (S. P. 280) (L. D. 660)

Reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed)

JOHNSON of Somerset

LUND of Kennebec

DUQUETTE of York

— Committee on part of Senate.

DENNETT of Kittery

FULLER of York

NADEAU of Sanford

— Committee on part of House.

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act Providing for Paid Holidays for Municipal Employees of the City of Lewiston (H. P. 392) (L. D. 539)

which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 26 and passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" on April 19.

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

In the House: On motion of Mr. Gaudreau of Lewiston, the House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

The following Communication:

June 27, 1967

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the 103rd Legislature:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, Legislative Document 631, "An Act Creating County Commissioner Districts." Out of respect to the views of the members of the Legislature I wish to explain my objections.

The change proposed by this Legislature would mean that a citizen could vote for a county commissioner only once every six years. This is too long an interval to be deprived of the right to vote for an officeholder who has authority over taxes, expenditures, law enforcement, and other vital services administered through county government.

There is no compelling need for this change in the method of electing county commissioners. No improvement in county government would result from this bill. As our present system of electing county commissioners is adequate, I do not think such an institution should be changed without good reasons.

The present system is perfectly constitutional and in accordance with the "one man, one vote" principle announced by the U. S. Supreme Court. We should keep the three commissioners responsible to all areas of their county.

I therefore request that this veto be sustained.

Respectfully,

(Signed)

KENNETH M. CURTIS
Governor

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that this bill become law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor?

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

Mr. DUNN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As the sponsor of this bill, I was a little surprised that it was considered important enough to warrant a veto. I would just comment briefly on a couple of the reasons given for the veto which is a voting once in six years as we do for our United States Senators, and in the final paragraph it says we should keep the three county commissioners responsible to all areas of their county. We elect our representatives to Washington from Districts and I fully believe that they are responsible to all areas of the State. I would not ask the House at this time to try to override this veto.

The SPEAKER: In accordance with Article IV, Section 2 of the Constitution, a roll call will be ordered.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There is nothing very much that I would like to add in regards to this particular document this morning, only that the objections for the operation of county government is clearly defined in our present system and that the explanation made by the Governor will suffice any debate on my part of this document.

The SPEAKER: All those in favor of the Bill becoming law notwithstanding the objections of

the Governor will vote yes and those opposed will vote no, and the Chair opens the vote.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Benson, Berman, Birt, Bragdon, Brown, Burnham, Clark, Cookson, Crosby, Dennett, Dickinson, Drummond, Dunn, Ewer, Fuller, Hanson, B. B.; Hanson, P. K.; Harriman, Henley, Hichens, Hinds, Hodgkins, Humphrey, Immonen, Lincoln, Littlefield, Lycette, Maddox, Miliano, Mosher, Pendergast, Pike, Porter, Quimby, Richardson, G. A.; Richardson, H. L.; Rideout, Scott, C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Snowe, P.; Soulas, Susi, Thompson, Trask, Waltz, Watts, White, Wight, Williams.

NAY — Allen, Bedard, Belanger, Beliveau, Bernard, Binnette, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Brennan, Buck, Bunker, Carey, Carrier, Carroll, Carswell, Champagne, Conley, Cornell, Cote, Cottrell, Couture, Crockett, Crommett, Curran, Cushing, D'Alfonso, Danton, Drigotas, Dudley, Eustis, Farrington, Fecteau, Fortier, Fraser, Gaudreau, Gauthier, Gill, Giroux, Hall, Hanson, H. L.; Harnois, Haynes, Healy, Hennessey, Hewes, Hoover, Hunter, Jalbert, Jameson, Keyte, Kilroy, Kyes, Lebel, Levesque, Lewin, Martin, McMann, McNally, Meisner, Minkowsky, Nadeau, J. F. R.; Nadeau, N. L., Prince, Quinn, Robertson, Robinson, Rocheleau, Ross, Roy, Sawyer, Scribner, Shute, Snow, P. J.; Starbird, Sullivan, Townsend, Truman, Wheeler.

ABSENT—Baker, E. B.; Baker, R. E.; Bradstreet, Darey, Durgin, Edwards, Evans, Foster, Harvey, Hawes, Huber, Jannelle, Jewell, Lewis, Noyes, Payson, Philbrook, Rackliff, Sahagian, Tanguay, Wood.

Yes; 50; No, 78; Absent, 21.

The SPEAKER: Fifty having voted in the affirmative and seventy-eight in the negative, it is the judgment of the House that the Governor's veto will be sustained.

Orders

On request of Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor, by unanimous

consent, unless previous notice is given to the Clerk of the House by some member of his or her intention to move reconsideration, the Clerk was authorized today to send to the Senate, thirty minutes after the House recessed for lunch and also thirty minutes after the House adjourned for the day, all matters passed to be engrossed in concurrence, and all matters that required Senate concurrence; and that after such matters had been so sent to the Senate by the Clerk, no motion to reconsider shall be in order.

On motion of Mr. Hinds of South Portland, it was

ORDERED, that the minority Floor Leader and Assistant Minority Floor Leader be and hereby are authorized, during the current biennium, to attend the conferences of the National Legislative Conference and that they be reimbursed for their necessary traveling expenses.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair would request the Sergeant-at-Arms to escort the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Cote, to the rostrum to serve as Speaker pro tem.

Thereupon, Mr. Cote assumed the Chair as Speaker pro tem and Speaker Kennedy retired from the Hall.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act to Authorize Bond Issue in the Amount of Four Hundred and Fifteen Thousand Dollars for Construction of a Multi-purpose Building at Fort Kent State College" (H. P. 1232) (L. D. 1739)

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

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act to Conform the Statutes with the Amendments to the Rules of Civil Procedure (S. P. 428) (L. D. 1082)

Was 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 Until Later in Today's Session

An Act relating to Public Higher Education (S. P. 497) (L. D. 1256)

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

(On motion of Mr. Quinn of Bangor, tabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for later in the day's session.)

An Act to Amend the Maine Recreation Authority Law (S. P. 682) (L. D. 1715)

An Act relating to Economic and Recreational Development in Oxford County (H. P. 559) (L. D. 791)

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.

At this point, Speaker Kennedy returned to the rostrum.

SPEAKER KENNEDY: The Chair thanks the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Cote, for serving as Speaker pro tem, and for the information of the House, I had requested that Mr. Cote serve some day during the session as Speaker pro tem because he has a record of about ten sessions having been a pro tem Speaker and I didn't want this record broken. Therefore, this morning I hurriedly asked him if he would come to the rostrum and he graciously agreed so that record will remain intact, and the Chair thanks the gentleman. (Applause)

Thereupon, the Sergeant-at-Arms escorted the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Cote, to his seat on the Floor, amid the applause of the House, and Speaker Kennedy resumed the Chair.

Orders of the Day

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

An Act to Appropriate and Provide 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)

Tabled — June 27, by Mr. Richardson of Cumberland.

Pending — His motion to reconsider failure of passage to be enacted.

Thereupon, the motion to reconsider failure of passage to be enacted prevailed.

On motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland, the House voted to suspend the rules and to reconsider its action on June 23 whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed.

Thereupon, on request of the same gentleman, by unanimous consent, was made a special order of the day for 3:15 P. M. today pending passage to be engrossed.

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

HOUSE MAJORITY REPORT (6)—Ought to Pass—Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act relating to Trade-in Credit for Watercraft Under Sales Tax" (H. P. 47) (L. D. 66)—MINORITY REPORT (4)—Ought Not to Pass. (In House, indefinitely postponed) (In Senate, Minority Report accepted) (Recalled from legislative files by Joint Order (S. P. 707))

Tabled—June 27, by Mr. Levesque of Madawaska.

Pending—Further consideration.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I was surprised but delighted to see this bill appear on the calendar yesterday. I was surprised because it is not a revenue-producing measure, it was a bill proposed by me to help our small boat industry and to treat boats like automobiles as far as the trade-in value goes. I offered it primarily to help small businesses, and when it came out of committee, the only person in committee objecting, objected on the grounds that since we didn't have a boat tax, he didn't feel this should go until the boat tax started through. The boat tax has started through, so I am sure that he would remove his objections now.

However, at this date, I feel that this bill which would cost \$40,000 a year, although it is very worthy, should not be recalled today.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the House that it requires a two-thirds vote to suspend the rules relative to reconsidering this matter. Those in favor of suspending the rules will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

8 having voted in the affirmative and 116 having voted in the negative, 8 being less than two-thirds, the rules were not suspended.

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

Bill, "An Act Relating to Disposition of Tax on Transient Rentals under Sales Tax Law" (H. P. 1110) (L. D. 1577) (In House insisted on passage to be engrossed) (Senate adhered to its action whereby Report and Bill were indefinitely postponed) (Recalled from legislative files by Joint Order (S. P. 707))

Tabled—June 27, by Mr. Levesque of Madawaska.

Pending—Further consideration.

The SPEAKER: To suspend the rules requires a two-thirds vote for this to come up for consideration. All those in favor of suspending the rules will vote yes and those opposed will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

5 having voted in the affirmative and 111 having voted in the negative, 5 being less than two-thirds, the rules were not suspended.

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

An Act Repealing Trade-in Credit for Motor Vehicles Under Sales Tax Law (H. P. 121) (L. D. 147) (In House and Senate failed on passage to be enacted) (Recalled from legislative files by Joint Order (S. P. 707))

Tabled—June 27, by Mr. Levesque of Madawaska.

Pending—Further consideration.

The SPEAKER: A two-thirds vote is required to suspend the rules. All those in favor of suspending the rules will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

20 having voted in the affirmative and 106 having voted in the negative, 20 being less than two-thirds, the rules were not suspended.

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

HOUSE MAJORITY REPORT (6)—Ought Not to Pass as covered by other Legislation—Committee on Taxation on Bill “An Act to Increase Cigarette Tax Two Cents” (H. P. 122) (L. D. 148) — MINORITY REPORT (4)—Ought to Pass. (In House and Senate, Majority Report accepted) (Recalled from legislative files by Joint Order (S. P. 707))

Tabled—June 27, by Mr. Levesque of Madawaska.

Pending—Further consideration.

Mr. Levesque of Madawaska was granted permission to approach the rostrum.

The SPEAKER: This requires a two-thirds vote to suspend the rules. Those in favor of the rules being suspended will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

19 having voted in the affirmative and 106 having voted in the negative, 19 being less than two-thirds, the rules were not suspended.

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

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. (In House and Senate, Majority Report accepted) (Recalled from legislative files by Joint Order (S. P. 707))

Tabled—June 27, by Mr. Levesque of Madawaska.

Pending — Further consideration.

The SPEAKER: To suspend the rules requires a two-thirds vote.

Those in favor of suspending the rules will vote yes, those opposed

will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

7 having voted in the affirmative and 113 having voted in the negative, 7 being less than two-thirds, the rules were not suspended.

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

HOUSE REPORT — Leave to Withdraw — Committee on Taxation on Bill “An Act Providing for Sales Tax on Advertising” (H. P. 251) (L. D. 359) (In House and Senate, Report accepted) (Recalled from legislative files by Joint Order (S. P. 707))

Tabled—June 27, by Mr. Levesque of Madawaska.

Pending — Further consideration.

The SPEAKER: To suspend the rules requires a two-thirds vote. All those in favor of suspending the rules will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair opened the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

20 having voted in the affirmative and 97 having voted in the negative, 20 being less than two-thirds, the rules were not suspended.

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

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill “An Act relating to Taxation of Television Sets” (H. P. 287) (L. D. 407) reporting that they are unable to agree. (In House and Senate, Report accepted) (Recalled from legislative files by Joint Order (S. P. 707))

Tabled—June 27, by Mr. Levesque of Madawaska.

Pending — Further consideration.

The SPEAKER: In order to suspend the rules it requires a two-thirds vote. Those in favor of the rules being suspended will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

9 having voted in the affirmative and 109 having voted in the nega-

tive, 9 being less than two-thirds, the rules were not suspended.

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

HOUSE REPORT — Ought Not to Pass — Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Providing for a Luxury Tax on Luggage, Jewelry, Furs and Toilet Preparations" (H. P. 426) (L. D. 590) (In House and Senate, Report accepted) (Recalled from legislative files by Joint Order (S. P. 707))

Tabled—June 27, by Mr. Levesque of Madawaska.

Pending — Further consideration.

The SPEAKER: To suspend the rules requires a two-thirds vote. All those in favor of suspending the rules will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

22 having voted in the affirmative and 95 having voted in the negative, 22 being less than two-thirds, the rules were not suspended.

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

HOUSE REPORT — Ought Not to Pass — Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Establishing an Excise Tax on Livestock" (H. P. 920) (L. D. 1329) (In House and Senate, Report accepted) (Recalled from legislative files by Joint Order (S. P. 707))

Tabled—June 27, by Mr. Levesque of Madawaska.

Pending — Further consideration.

The SPEAKER: To suspend the rules requires a two-thirds vote of the House. All those desiring the rules be suspended will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

18 having voted in the affirmative and 102 having voted in the negative, 18 being less than two-thirds, the rules were not suspended.

The Chair laid before the House the following Non-Concurrent

items, numbers 11 to 40, which were tabled June 27 by Mr. Richardson of Cumberland pending further consideration, and which came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence:

An Act to Provide Funds for Blind Children's Education, Inc. (H. P. 1) (L. D. 1)

(In House, enacted.)

An Act Providing Funds to Assist the Casco Bay Island Development Association to Create an International Vacation and Conference Center on Peaks Island (S. P. 327) (L. D. 862)

(In House, enacted.)

An Act relating to Housing and Meal Expenses for Legislators (S. P. 586) (L. D. 1551)

(In House, enacted.)

Resolve in favor of the City of Augusta (H. P. 7) (L. D. 19)

(In House, finally passed.)

An Act relating to Exceptional Children (H. P. 56) (L. D. 81)

(In House, enacted.)

Resolve Providing Funds for the Narraguagus River Water Control Program (H. P. 90) (L. D. 119)

(In House, finally passed.)

An Act relating to Payment of Funeral Expenses of Recipients of Aid to the Aged, Blind or Disabled (H. P. 461) (L. D. 674)

(In House, enacted.)

Resolve Providing Funds for Fisheries Instruction and Literature Publication and Dissemination (H. P. 641) (L. D. 896)

(In House, finally passed)

An Act Appropriating Funds to Expand Services for Eye Care and Special Services Division, Department of Health and Welfare (H. P. 687) (L. D. 982)

(In House, enacted.)

Resolve relating to Retirement and Pension of Stephen A. Regina of Saco (H. P. 697) (L. D. 978)

(In House, finally passed.)

Resolve Providing for a Retirement Allowance for Lois Blackwell Goodwin (H. P. 721) (L. D. 1016)

(In House, finally passed.)

An Act relating to Law Clerks for the Judiciary (H. P. 929) (L. D. 1345)

(In House, enacted.)

An Act Providing Funds for Support of Civil Air Patrol (S. P. 295) (L. D. 734)

(In House, enacted.)

An Act Revising the Law Relating to Dealers in Securities (S.P. 389) (L. D. 1069)

(In House, enacted.)

An Act Authorizing Use of Electronic Voting Systems in Elections and Granting Rulemaking Authority (S. P. 425) (L. D. 1079)

(In House, enacted.)

An Act relating to Fallout Shelters in Public School Buildings (S. P. 607) (L. D. 1589)

(In House, enacted.)

An Act Creating the Pest Control Compact (S. P. 630) (L. D. 1631)

(In House, enacted.)

An Act Repealing the Law Requiring Assessment of Municipalities in Aid to Dependent Children Grants (H. P. 12) (L. D. 24)

(In House, enacted.)

An Act Reactivating the Governor's Committee on Children and Youth (H. P. 261) (L. D. 382)

(In House, enacted.)

An Act relating to the Reimbursement of Board for Secondary School Pupils (H. P. 303) (L. D. 437)

(In House, enacted.)

Resolve to Authorize a Professional Review and Analysis of Maine's World Trade Potential (H. P. 495) (L. D. 708)

(In House, finally passed.)

An Act Providing Funds for a Redevelopment Plan of the Portland and South Portland Waterfront (H. P. 657) (L. D. 912)

(In House, enacted.)

Resolve for Construction and Erection of Statue to "The Maine Lobsterman" in Washington, D. C. (H. P. 661) (L. D. 916)

(In House, finally passed.)

An Act relating to the Administration of the Aid to Dependent Children Program, and Authorizing Work Experience and Training for Recipients of Aid to Dependent Children (H. P. 707) (L. D. 1002)

(In House, enacted.)

An Act Providing Vocational Education Loan Funds (H. P. 882) (L. D. 1294)

(In House, enacted.)

An Act Establishing a Consumers' Council (H. P. 1004) (L. D. 1471)

(In House, enacted.)

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)

(In House, enacted)

An Act to Establish the Division of Municipal Affairs in the Executive Department (H. P. 1184) (L. D. 1686)

(In House, enacted)

An Act relating to Restoration to Service under State Retirement Law (H. P. 1187) (L. D. 1688)

(In House, enacted)

An Act Creating the Maine Ocean Science Council (H. P. 1210) (L. D. 1722)

(In House, enacted)

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland, retabled pending further consideration and assigned for later in today's session.

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

An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Sixteen Million Eight Hundred Thousand Dollars on Behalf of the State of Maine to Build State Highways (H. P. 1174) (L. D. 1673)

Tabled—June 27, by Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston.

Pending—His motion to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A" (H-449)

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I will leave my motion to indefinitely postpone the House Amendment "A" as is, because I think the cut is, in my opinion, not accurate in drafting. However, since we adjourned last evening I did a fairly good amount of research work which was relieved to a great extent by the courtesy of the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Crockett, in distributing to some of us what was on the Special Highway Appropriations Table and also the allocation and the manner of financing the program for the ensuing two years. I will have to say that certainly one would have to raise an

eyebrow when you would finance any phase of the operation of state government on a recurring basis through even using surplus, much less going to bond with it. In this instance you are restricting it to the fact that we are going to bond. The small items are not of too much concern to me; however, I would certainly state in that the—urge that the members would vote for indefinite postponement of this measure, I would certainly then urge that the bill be tabled preparatory to an amendment which in my opinion should definitely be forthcoming which would lower the amount of that bond, and to substantiate my remarks I would like to quote from the Highway, Fund, Revenues and Expenditures based on the previous years.

The estimate, current revenue, for 1967 and 1968 was pegged at \$42,200,000 for '67-'68 and \$42,850,000 for '68-'69, which is a hike in estimates there of some \$600,000. On that basis going back to the previous years, in 1961 the current revenue estimate was pegged at \$37,000,000; 1962, \$39,000,000 — back to 38 in 1963, then back to '64 at 40, '65 at 43 and '66 at 44.

I can certainly appreciate the fact that the other legislation such as the Deer Isle Bridge and the Augusta Bridge is in the mill on the Special Appropriations Table and whatever recourse they would take I do not know. But, by the same token I think that still this figure which is pegged at 42.8 for '68-'69 and at 42.2 for '67-'68 is definitely low and I should think that in defeating the amendment as submitted by the good gentleman from Waldoboro, Mr. Waltz, we should take into consideration now the fact that we could very easily raise the estimates to an amount arrived at by the Highway Committee or the parties involved. I would certainly say that on the basis of where it's been going, it should certainly be back to at least the dormant figure of 44 for '67-'68 and 44 for '68-'69, if not raised. That would certainly then call for us to, in view of the expectant revenue as projected upward over the last few years, would certainly

mean that we could amend the \$16 million bond issue downward.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would amend my remarks, I would certainly hope that my motion to indefinitely postpone the House Amendment "A" would prevail and then I would suggest that this bill be again retabled till the latter part of the day so an accurate figure of estimated revenue should be arrived at and then the lowering of the bond issue concurrently.

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

Mr. WALTZ: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have just one point that I wish to make this morning. It's really to re-emphasize a point that I have made twice previously. And, this is the point. Two years ago the legislature passed a bond issue in the amount of \$9,500,000 which was for a four year period. In other words, approximately \$2,400,000 of bonds each year. This bill here, \$16.8 million is predicated upon a three year span. In other words, the bond requirements will be \$5,600,000. Think of it — going in two years from 2.4 to 5.6. This amendment of mine which cuts it back to \$10 million which was the amount asked for in the original bill, increases from 2.4 to 3.3. I don't think that that is being miserly in any extent.

It's true that the costs have increased but we, under this amendment of mine, would increase the bond issue by approximately one third. I have this feeling and I think that many of you join with me in this, that these figures that have been coming across my desk — perhaps it hasn't reached all of you, from the Highway Department are most confusing. I admit that there are instances here where figures are printed that I personally do not understand. It has been told, I believe, in the House that the large amount of this \$16,800,000 bond issue is to go towards the retirement of highway bonds which have been issued and which apparently will mature within the next three years. That amount is approximately \$12 million. Now, it doesn't seem to me that the High-

way Department as such has a very sound fiscal policy. That is a matter, of course, for you to decide.

When the debate on this thing is ended, and I hope it won't be too prolonged, I would like a division please.

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

Mr. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am having a little trouble with figures here this morning. If I understand the Representative from Lewiston right, Mr. Jalbert, we've got about \$4 million that we're not taking into consideration on these estimated revenues. This, plus a million and a half that's in there for the building, is five and a half million dollars and if we have a surplus in '67-68 of a million and a half, I'm probably wrong but why shouldn't that same surplus be in 68-69?

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I might comment that there is no figure of a million and a half for a building in this, the building has definitely been taken out of this bond issue. Now, my only point is this, if the estimates have been going up every year, certainly it is fair to assume that they will be on the uprise for the next biennium. Based on that figure, if we only left them at the current revenue, we can still amend the measure by upgrading the revenues which would definitely be the lowering of the bond issue. I mean, it's as simple as that and that is why I urge—I figure, however, the amendment as presented by Mr. Waltz is too high and I think that possibly if we would do it in this process by killing this amendment and then tabling the bill and presenting another amendment which would project a better figure of estimated revenues than lowering the bond, I think we would be in business.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have just one short question that I would pose to any member who could answer it. What is the dollar value of unissued bonds which have already been authorized, unissued bonds already authorized?

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

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

Mr. WALTZ: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The answer to the question that has just been raised by the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, I believe that the amount of authorized but unissued bonds as of the present time is \$16 million plus.

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As some members of the House may be aware over a period of some seven years, that I personally am not too keen about spending the taxpayers money when it comes to some of these astronomical sums. Now, today, as I understand it, we're talking about a bond issue and I have tried to read quite carefully the horseblankets every day of the session, and yesterday's was no exception, and I know that there has been some talk in the horseblanket, there has been some talk in the House that some of the items proposed in this bond issue are for what I would term recurring expenses—snow removal, built in salary increases; I don't think this is proper. I don't think that we should be even thinking about bonding current services, I think this is, frankly, not very sound financing.

Now, whether my good friend from Cumberland says that this is an actuarial problem, and I think he called it yesterday an accounting nicety, I believe in calling a spade a spade. Now, over the years the good gentleman from Waldoboro and I have had quite a few conversations about financial matters and while our thinking has

not always prevailed in the House and it may not prevail this morning, I know that the gentleman from Waldoboro, Mr. Waltz, does his homework very thoroughly and he is well up on this sort of thing. Many an afternoon and evening we have spent going over the financial reports in Mr. Waltz's Wall Street Journal. Now, it may be true that this is a pretty drastic reduction from \$16,800,000 to \$10 million but I think that Mr. Waltz is correct, and for that reason I am going to strongly urge you to support Mr. Waltz's amendment and vote against the motion for indefinite postponement.

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

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to pose a question. Would I understand that this original bond issue came to the Highway Committee around \$10 million—if I'm not correct in this I'd like to be corrected, and I understand that this proposal for an extra \$6 million was presented on quite a brief notice. I would like to know just what justification there was for the acceptance of this extra \$6 million when the original bond issue, I believe, was for \$10 million or just a little in excess of it.

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

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I certainly will try to explain; however, I seem to be only confusing people, I realize, every time I get up. First of all, I'm the one let me say that presented the bond issue for \$10 million - that's a matter of fact. And at that time we thought it would cover the program. Now, my seatmate, Mr. Berman seems to be of the belief that we are mixing current services with the bond issue. Now, I'll try to tell you to what extent we're doing that.

When the cost of highway construction goes up, the cost of salaries, the cost of every

engineering job and everything that's done, which is normally done out of current revenue, so if you spend current revenue then you must have some backlog of bonds to cover construction. In other words, you have already spent your current revenue that is coming in from registrations and gasoline to cover these other things and I could mention they are numerous. To cover these, we are spending more than we should out of current services. Now let me say, that the bond issue, regardless of how big it is, we don't say to them that you must sell the bonds, they are available to match Federal money that in quite likelihood will be made available and our Department would like to match this money to the tune of some eight or ten million dollars, that might be made available anytime. Now in case it isn't, or in case the money is not needed, I assure you the bonds will not be sold. We're not saying they must be sold, we are making it available so that they can be sold and we can find matching money if it becomes necessary.

And, now, as to how this got raised from \$10 million to 16.7, this is what the Committee, the leadership and the Governor could foresee when we had this extra \$2 million come in for snowplowing unexpectedly because winter drew clear into summer—in other words we had no spring, we went from winter to summer, nearly. We, our Legislature see fit, of which I signed an "Ought not to pass" report to take the tolls from the Augusta Bridge, to take the tolls from the Beale's Island Bridge, this is another raid on highway money and for this reason, when you take away the money at hand I can better explain it by saying I have some change in my pocket and if I'm to spend it I may have to cash a ten dollar bill to put some more change in my pocket, and a bond issue is a very similar thing. When you spend the money that is now coming in from current revenue for such things as salaries and these unexpected things, increased costs of everything, then you must have a backlog or something you can match Federal money and so

forth, but I want to truly emphasize that these bond issues we're not saying that they have to be sold, we're making it so that they can sell them if they need them and this money that's upped the bill that I presented, \$10 million, to what it's now up to - 16.7, was agreed upon I must emphasize again after very careful consideration by the leadership of the minority and the majority party and the Governor and the Highway Department as being the smallest amount that they could possibly be sure to get along on.

And let me say that the Governor stands very strong that it wouldn't be more than this. I am sure that there were those that would like to have it even more than this, would like to build highways faster than we're now building them. This particular bond issue and the money available from current services, you can up the estimates, and I truly think they should be upped, but no matter how you change the figures the fact is we are not building roads as fast as they are deteriorating. As a matter of fact, this won't build any more road than we built last year; we're not building more road, we're just trying to hold our own and this will barely hold our own on what we have done in the previous years.

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

Mr. HEALY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There is nothing very simple about this thing to me. As I looked through these hallowed halls, I don't think I'm alone. Somewhere, somebody is doing a snow job on us and I would have a question to anybody, through the Chair, who would care to answer it. Will somebody please tell me, this Highway Building has been moved around so many times, tell me the status of the highway building at this time?

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

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

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a member of your Committee of Conference, the Highway Building can no longer be built. This money was to have been paid out of current revenues and the surplus of the Highway Department. At that point we have no building. However, it would appear to me we still have this \$1.5 million in surplus that will be there, which would not have been there if the building had gone. There will also be \$1 million from current revenue which will be there. I believe we have stopped the building - I know we have stopped the building of a highway building. I think we are leaving them two and a half million dollars for some other purpose.

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

Mr. SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I agree with what Representative Healy said. I think I've got my nose and head above the snow, I'm going to brush a lot of it off my shoulders. Now, we're in a highly inflationary period. But, there appears to be a strong possibility that that's going to end, possibly before the end of this year. Maybe they'll get that situation in Vietnam cleared up and that situation in the Far East, and then it's very possible that we may be, if that happens, in a deflationary period. Now, I haven't any crystal ball and I don't believe some of these people that I've heard speak have any either. I am probably as confused by some of these statements as most people in the Legislature and as far as I know we have very few accountants in this Legislature. I only know of two. Now, I'd like to ask if I may the Speaker a question. The question is this—supposing we go along, as I believe we should, with Representative Waltz, supposing that if we in my opinion from what I've heard from both parties, we're going to have a Special Session next Spring, now can't we at that time if that \$10 million bond issue isn't sufficient, then we'll know what the conditions are at that time and if it isn't sufficient then can't we add to a bond issue, Mr.

Speaker? That is the question rather lengthy.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that he may not question the Chair relative to the business of the Legislature.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Well, O.K., then let's put it another way, put it to anybody who chooses to answer then. It appears to be common sense to me. I'd like to have somebody answer that. If they will.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Sullivan, poses a question through the Chair to any member of the Legislature who may answer if they desire.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The question as to whether or not we're going to have a special session is difficult to answer. Of course, historically we have had to have special sessions in order to take care of genuine emergency situations that existed. This would seem, in my judgment, to be a very poor reason to delay action now on something if we are convinced that it's right. Now, as has been indicated by various speakers, the Governor of this State and the leadership of both Houses, both Minority and Majority, agreed that we would pursue this program. My views on bonding for current services are well known to this House. I might say that it is our refusal to bond or to spend surplus for recurring state services that has led us to the present impasse with respect to financing the next biennium in our General Fund.

Now, as I understand it, there is a possibility that there's another amendment to follow this one that will reduce the amount of the bonds authorized by this bill by the sum of \$2,500,000. I would assume that everyone will recognize the realities of this situation and not get off on a misguided economy cut in an area where the vital state function is involved and I know that you will all recognize the importance of our taking responsible action here today. The State Office Building is deferred for another Legislature to confront, and I must say to you that I am happy that

that's the case. Now, I think that we should cut back the \$2.5 million so that there won't be any question about it and go ahead with that amendment, but this amendment should be indefinitely postponed and I say this in deference to my friend the proponent of this amendment. I hope that he will understand that I am simply trying to get us into an appropriate middle ground so that we could get this business on.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The members of the Committee have brought out most all of the points that are to be discussed on this measure this morning. It is certainly my feeling in my capacity as Minority Floor Leader, that if we cut down any further the projection of the construction of our highways, where it has been pointed out that over the years we are not even keeping up with the deterioration of our highways presently, and this certainly is cutting down the total overall construction planning of the Highway Department from four year planning to a three year planning. Certainly, this is not healthy because the further ahead that you can plan it seems to me that the better planning that you will have and the end result would be better facilities. So, therefore, I am hoping this morning that you will defeat the amendment to lower this bond issue to \$10 million so that we can go on to what the feeling of the membership of this House here will be to bond our highway construction, and furthermore that this measure will have to go to the people for ratification as a bond issue.

Mr. Waltz of Waldoboro was granted permission to speak a third time.

Mr. WALTZ: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I won't debate this bill further, but I think it might be pertinent and informative to bring out a point, or develop a point a little bit more which my good friend, Mr. Berman, started on.

I have here a breakdown as of 1967 which was prepared and distributed by the Chairman of the Highway Committee. They start off with a deficit of \$6,500,000. Now to that it says: added items over the pre-legislative budget, and in this, here are some of the items; and I'm speaking now of the year 1968.

Additional troopers, \$300,000; time and a half, \$377,000; additional construction, \$1,750,000; maintenance salary plan, \$70,000; Building, \$1,000,000; Elimination of towns on the 40-mile maintenance \$135,000. State Aid valuation, \$33,000; Auto mileage, \$37,000; Arbitration Board \$15,000; Inspection stickers \$8,500. The total for the coming year of \$3,256,000, and added up to the three years there's \$10,154,000 for more or less current items. The only item in here that I can see that pertains to additional construction is for the three-year period about \$5,000,000. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sidney, Mr. Drummond.

Mr. DRUMMOND: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Due to the fact that we've heard stated on the Floor of the House this morning that there can be a reduction in this bond issue, and that if we kill this now that this amendment would be introduced later in today's session, I for one a few minutes ago was going to vote for the amendment of the Representative from Waldoboro, Mr. Waltz. After talking with some other people, I think with the amendment that might be added that I would vote against his amendment.

I wonder if we couldn't table this at the present time and perhaps have more information what this new figure would be so that we could vote more intelligently when the time comes, and I would ask somebody to table this until later in today's session.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Naples, Mr. Burnham.

Mr. BURNHAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It seems to me that we're clouding the issue, as I've been listening

to the debate here this morning, we're talking about two different bills, the allocation bill and the 1973 which is a construction bill. This is purely a bond issue to build highways and if you read the bill it states that very plainly, but we're clouding the issue with the allocation bill. Thank you.

Mr. HARRIMAN of Hollis was granted permission to speak the third time.

Mr. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bond issue is for, as everybody knows, slightly under \$17 million. It's been admitted here that our estimated revenue is \$4 million short; we're saving 2½ million dollars — a million and a half out of surplus and a million and a half out of current revenue, and we're not building an office building. This is \$6½ million. If we pass this bond issue of practically \$17 million, there's only \$12 million to be retired in the next three years according to the highway figures means we're going to have a deficit of approximately 4½ million dollars. If we don't need this bond issue, and in my estimation we don't, we could wind up with a little surplus for a change and I'm all for it.

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

Mr. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in opposition to this amendment and when the vote is taken I ask for a roll call.

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I never thought that I'd get into an extended discussion on highway financing, but I would like to end by saying this. Frankly, I'm not a person that is very easily impressed, but some three years ago I was at the University of Maine in one of these pre-legislative conferences, and it was my good fortune to become acquainted with a gentleman whose way of analyzing figures and thinking things out to my way of thinking was quite astonishing, and I am referring to

my good friend from Hollis, Mr. Harriman.

I have a great deal of confidence in his financial analysis of this proposition, and for that reason I certainly hope that you will support this amendment and vote against indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed.

A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All of those desiring a roll call will vote yes, those opposed will vote no, and the Chair opens the vote.

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

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed. All of those in favor of indefinite postponement of House Amendment "A" to L. D. 1673, will vote yes, those opposed will vote no, and the Chair opens the vote.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Allen, Baker, E. B.; Beardon, Beliveau, Benson, Bernard, Binnette, Birt, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Bragdon, Brennan, Brown, Burnham, Carroll, Champagne, Clark, Conley, Cookson, Cornell, Cote, Cottrell, Couture, Crockett, Crosby, Curran, Cushing, D'Alfonso, Danton, Darey, Dickinson, Drigotas, Drummond, Dudley, Dunn, Farrington, Fecteau, Foster, Fuller, Gaudreau, Giroux, Hanson, B. B.; Harnois, Harvey, Haynes, Healy, Henley, Hennessey, Hichens, Hoover, Humphrey, Hunter, Immonen, Jalbert, Jameson, Keyte, Kilroy, Lebel, Levesque, Lewin, Lincoln, Martin, McMan, McNally, Miliano, Nadeau, N. L.; Noyes, Pendergast, Pike, Porter, Prince, Quimby, Richardson, G. A.; Richardson, H. L.; Rideout, Robinson, Roy, Sahagian, Sawyer, Scott, C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Scribner, Shaw,

Snow, P. J.; Snowe, P.; Susi, Townsend, Truman, Watts, Wheeler, White, Wight.

NAY—Belanger, Berman, Buck, Bunker, Carey, Carrier, Carswell, Crommett, Dennett, Durgin, Eustis, Evans, Ewer, Fortier, Fraser, Gauthier, Gill, Hall, Hanson, H. L.; Hanson, P. K.; Harriman, Hewes, Hodgkins, Kyes, Littlefield, Lycette, Maddox, Meisner, Minkowsky, Mosher, Nadeau, J. F. R.; Philbrook, Quinn, Rackliff, Robertson, Rocheleau, Ross, Shute, Soulas, Starbird, Sullivan, Thompson, Trask, Waltz, Williams.

ABSENT—Baker, R. E.; Bradstreet, Edwards, Hawes, Hinds, Huber, Jannelle, Jewell, Lewis, Payson, Tanguay, Wood.

Yes, 92; No, 45; Absent, 12.

The SPEAKER: Ninety-two having voted in the affirmative and forty-five having voted in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A" does prevail.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston, tabled pending passage to be engrossed, and specially assigned for later in today's session.

The Chair laid before the House an Enactor tabled earlier in the day and assigned for later in today's session:

An Act relating to Public Higher Education, S. P. 497, L. D. 1256, tabled earlier by Mr. Quinn of Bangor pending passage to be enacted.

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

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I understand that this is an enabling Act, in the event that L. D. 1258 is enacted. I tabled it primarily to find out what the present status of L. D. 1258 is, so that if 1258 does not pass then this particular L. D. should not pass.

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

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland,

Recessed until three-fifteen o'clock in the afternoon.

After Recess

3:15 P.M.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The hour of 3:15 P.M. having arrived, the Chair now lays before the House the Special Order of the Day, Bill "An Act to Appropriate and Provide Moneys for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1968 and June 30, 1969," Senate Paper 597, L. D. 1575. The pending question is passage to be engrossed.

Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston offered House Amendment "E" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "E," being L. D. 1740, was read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the adoption of House Amendment "E" and the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I presume you have L. D. 1740 before you. I think, to facilitate my explanation, it would be best if you would provide yourself with the four-sheet copy that has been distributed under my name to you this morning. I would work from this four-sheet explanation.

At the very top of it, the L. D. 1575 would run to the amount of \$226,786,000 less the amounts of bond retirement, interest on bonds, professional credit subsidies which would be found under the surplus where it belongs. Also, it is my intention through this amendment to unlock, so to speak, the \$2 million concerning the General Subsidy Construction which now we are going to bond to the tune of \$4 million. This would take this \$2 million out of the operating budget and give us \$2 million more available. It would add to the program \$5 million for the General Purpose Subsidy Program which is a reduction from the \$9,900,000 from the Republican package. It would give

to the University of Maine \$1,500,000 more in supplement money. It would give for the second year in the biennium \$900,000 of ADC, L. D. 24, which would relieve the towns and cities of 18 per cent of the monies now contributed as their share of the Aid to Dependent Children Program.

To that end, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have here some figures alphabetically as to what it means in dollars to the towns and cities concerning ADC money. I also have what it would mean on the Foundation Program, again these are only figures. I am well aware that you have ruled, Mr. Speaker, before on matters being introduced into the record wherein it concerns editorials and speeches and one thing or another. Back in 1945 I asked that figures containing four or five pages be read into the record, merely the names of the towns and the figures concerning another measure. This was granted. This thing here, the same thing, it breaks down merely to the towns of the figures as to the present law and the redraft of the Foundation Law, also it merely would introduce into the record without reading the figures wherein it concerns the towns and cities on Aid to Dependent Children and, in the interest of time saving, I have these two copies here Mr. Speaker, and I have shown them to you, and in the interest of time saving where this is made up of about fifteen pages, I would ask unanimous consent to introduce the names of these towns and dollar figures into the record without reading.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, inasmuch as these are merely matters of towns alphabetically arranged, and sums of money pertaining thereto, requests unanimous consent that they be inserted in the record without reading. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. It is so ordered.

The following matters were ordered placed in the record by unanimous consent:

ANDROSCOGGIN COUNTY
PRESENT LAW vs. REDRAFT OF L. D. 636

General Purpose Aid by Counties

Administrative Unit	Present Law - 1968	Redraft
		L. D. 636 - 1968
Auburn	\$ 352,106.24	\$ 510,553.32
Durham	54,852.17	75,277.17
Lewiston	311,049.96	399,393.95
Lisbon	168,673.59	244,574.53
Mechanic Falls	96,141.71	139,405.47
Minot	42,470.66	54,718.32
Poland	23,896.47	34,649.88
Wales	25,591.46	32,749.38
Webster	47,425.04	68,766.30
S. A. D. #36 (Livermore Falls)	267,549.90	365,787.77
S. A. D. #52 (Turner)	273,411.31	304,437.18

AROOSTOOK COUNTY
PRESENT LAW vs. REDRAFT OF L. D. 636

General Purpose Aid by Counties

Administrative Unit	Present Law - 1968	Redraft
		L. D. 636 - 1968
Amity	\$ 10,379.42	\$ 11,518.97
Bancroft	6,408.72	7,331.82
Benedicta	12,606.07	18,278.07
Caribou	306,463.97	444,372.75
Cary Plt.	17,215.00	15,186.80
Caswell Plt.	39,523.05	57,308.42
Crystal	21,530.44	23,613.90
Dyer Brook	7,801.37	8,515.47
E Plt.	0	0
Easton	22,076.42	27,706.92
Glenwood Plt.	429.80	386.82
Haynesville	15,012.04	15,624.29
Hersey	3,718.00	2,986.20
Hodgdon	60,864.90	88,254.10
Island Falls	46,502.57	64,753.82
Limestone	52,231.67	75,735.92
Linneus	30,112.72	43,661.70
Ludlow	21,868.08	27,933.15
Macwahoc Plt.	14,999.53	16,602.33
Madawaska	115,852.91	167,986.71
Masardis	19,566.55	22,437.75
Merrill	27,551.94	26,816.14
Moro Plt.	1,554.00	1,031.70
Nashville Plt.	224.40	201.96
New Limerick	11,504.82	12,546.35
New Sweden	32,858.09	43,323.98
Oakfield	47,916.91	64,301.54
Orient	6,184.95	7,483.22
Oxbow Plt.	5,885.49	7,174.99
Reed Plt.	22,818.50	27,622.30
Smyrna	30,479.99	30,795.94
Stockholm	31,566.83	35,148.38
Westmanland Plt.	778.20	700.56
Woodland	62,074.18	90,007.56

S. A. D. #1 (Presque Isle)	558,052.51	806,405.51
S. A. D. #10 (Allagash)	40,746.69	51,597.77
S. A. D. #20 (Ft. Fairfield)	309,806.05	446,778.36
S. A. D. #24 (Van Buren)	413,319.42	599,313.15
S. A. D. #25 (Sherman)	178,365.33	249,005.48
S. A. D. #27 (Fort Kent)	592,787.31	859,541.58
S. A. D. #29 (Houlton)	365,416.76	529,852.70
S. A. D. #32 (Ashland)	178,998.19	233,084.09
S. A. D. #33 (St. Agatha)	203,273.23	294,746.18
S. A. D. #42 (Mars Hill)	228,559.65	290,229.69
S. A. D. #45 (Washburn)	151,219.95	202,613.78

CUMBERLAND COUNTY

PRESENT LAW vs. REDRAFT OF L. D. 636

General Purpose Aid by Counties

Administrative Unit	Present Law - 1968	Redraft L. D. 636 - 1968
Brunswick	\$ 347,601.95	\$ 396,515.93
Cape Elizabeth	163,867.22	237,607.45
Falmouth	126,373.22	183,238.26
Freeport	108,509.20	157,337.61
Gorham	345,535.07	482,039.12
Harpswell	46,337.13	64,591.75
Portland	852,380.60	1,229,639.05
Raymond	17,596.14	18,331.58
Scarborough	222,113.50	322,064.57
South Portland	425,271.84	616,644.16
Westbrook	200,402.16	246,835.79
Windham	208,403.48	302,185.04
Yarmouth	72,692.95	92,462.49
S. A. D. #6 (Buxton)	229,214.24	332,360.64
S. A. D. #15 (Gray)	201,302.02	291,887.13
S. A. D. #17 (Paris)	464,796.11	673,952.76
S. A. D. #51 (Cumberland)	187,704.41	260,711.39
S. A. D. #55 (Cornish)	233,659.18	273,067.86
S. A. D. #61 (Bridgton)	107,534.91	155,925.61
S. A. D. #62 (Pownal)	70,110.97	74,641.09

FRANKLIN COUNTY

PRESENT LAW vs. REDRAFT OF L. D. 636

General Purpose Aid by Counties

Administrative Unit	Present Law - 1968	Redraft L. D. 636 - 1968
Coplin Plt.	\$ 761.80	\$ 685.62
Dallas Plt.	1,659.60	1,493.64
Jay	49,215.64	62,056.45
Madrid	2,286.00	1,536.30
Rangeley Plt.	962.80	832.82
Rangeley	18,730.05	23,030.67
Sandy River Plt.	867.00	780.30
S. A. D. #9 (Farmington)	574,091.59	749,771.82
S. A. D. #21 (Dixfield)	206,639.34	291,724.08
S. A. D. #58 (Kingfield)	249,338.13	314,417.54

HANCOCK COUNTY

PRESENT LAW vs. REDRAFT OF L. D. 636

General Purpose Aid by Counties

Administrative Unit	Present Law - 1968	Redraft L. D. 636 - 1968
Amherst	\$ 10,304.77	\$ 10,355.77
Aurora	3,286.66	3,837.06
Bar Harbor	59,542.12	86,335.92
Blue Hill	19,308.23	22,239.00
Brooklin	7,424.84	8,703.23
Brooksville	7,525.09	7,957.42
Bucksport	63,539.14	77,396.99
Castine	7,398.81	7,787.21
Cranberry Isles	3,135.73	3,439.20
Dedham	8,015.68	8,696.72
Deer Isle	27,286.92	39,566.03
Ellsworth	70,682.61	102,489.58
Franklin	32,657.86	36,689.30
Gouldsboro	38,682.60	51,289.76
Hancock	21,042.01	28,823.32
Lamoine	27,548.67	34,721.69
Long Island Plt.	2,494.10	2,786.65
Mariaville	9,015.96	8,946.21
Mt. Desert	28,430.36	33,739.22
Orland	83,328.17	105,080.43
Osborn Plt.	520.56	606.44
Otis	1,786.75	1,890.25
Penobscot	41,264.47	49,383.79
Plt. No. 33	2,129.43	3,086.22
Sedgwick	30,164.11	34,460.17
Sorrento	9,235.27	10,871.37
Southwest Harbor	20,807.45	25,562.85
Stonington	45,614.33	66,140.77
Sullivan	37,043.70	46,240.88
Surry	14,996.73	19,157.77
Swan's Island	36,023.49	37,518.99
Tremont	35,764.20	46,354.50
Trenton	5,819.14	8,437.75
Winter Harbor	19,731.93	28,611.29
S. A. D. #18 (Verona)	67,365.10	58,635.99
S. A. D. #26 (Eastbrook)	18,527.75	22,788.77

KENNEBEC COUNTY

PRESENT LAW vs. REDRAFT OF L. D. 636

General Purpose Aid by Counties

Administrative Unit	Present Law - 1968	Redraft L. D. 636 - 1968
Augusta	\$ 241,882.17	\$ 350,729.14
Chelsea	69,102.02	95,802.44
China	65,622.78	89,840.24
Litchfield	55,566.50	66,123.75
Manchester	65,560.54	80,270.41
Monmouth	93,175.01	106,943.21
Mt. Vernon	30,797.75	42,532.43
Readfield	57,660.18	73,736.93
Rome	7,179.75	7,798.54
Vassalboro	142,322.64	179,014.06

Waterville	198,030.52	286,255.54
Wayne	25,553.98	30,309.08
Windsor	32,039.88	46,127.75
Winslow	88,677.35	112,432.86
Winthrop	127,046.20	184,216.99
S. A. D. #9 (Farmington)	574,091.59	749,771.82
S. A. D. #11 (Gardiner)	611,471.48	844,691.38
S. A. D. #16 (Hallowell)	261,279.92	366,713.30
S. A. D. #36 (Livermore Falls)	267,549.90	365,787.77
S. A. D. #47 (Oakland)	255,094.00	322,972.39
S. A. D. #49 (Fairfield)	397,442.70	538,496.22

KNOX COUNTY

PRESENT LAW vs. REDRAFT OF L. D. 636

General Purpose Aid by Counties

Administrative Unit	Present Law - 1968	Redraft L. D. 636 - 1968
Appleton	\$ 43,575.98	\$ 54,415.00
Friendship	20,199.90	28,129.24
Hope	26,918.14	34,100.53
Isle au Haut	968.89	972.92
Matinicus Isle Plt.	6,388.09	7,480.69
S. A. D. #5 (Rockland)	292,977.47	424,817.33
S. A. D. #7 (North Haven)	7,122.58	8,392.45
S. A. D. #8 (Vinalhaven)	27,126.20	39,332.99
S. A. D. #28 (Camden)	91,517.52	132,700.40
S. A. D. #40 (Waldoboro)	319,920.10	415,917.78
S. A. D. #50 (Thomaston)	203,561.68	231,533.86

LINCOLN COUNTY

PRESENT LAW vs. REDRAFT OF L. D. 636

General Purpose Aid by Counties

Administrative Unit	Present Law - 1968	Redraft L. D. 636 - 1968
Alna	\$ 13,737.50	\$ 11,061.05
Boothbay	25,284.26	31,581.25
Boothbay Harbor	30,887.06	34,016.10
Bremen	6,840.69	8,613.94
Bristol	20,954.68	25,364.94
Damariscotta	21,100.52	30,106.96
Dresden	23,578.94	34,189.46
Edgecomb	8,786.05	10,621.31
Jefferson	30,883.73	41,362.56
Monhegan Plt.	324.20	291.78
Newcastle	35,906.72	44,645.93
Nobleboro	27,128.79	38,106.74
Somerville Plt.	12,295.44	17,828.38
South Bristol	10,341.74	10,881.12
Southport	7,986.11	8,395.47
Westport	2,492.00	2,242.80
Whitefield	56,555.73	77,961.08
Wiscasset	32,988.93	40,081.37
S. A. D. #40 (Waldoboro)	319,920.10	415,917.78

OXFORD COUNTY

PRESENT LAW vs. REDRAFT OF L. D. 636

General Purpose Aid by Counties

Administrative Unit	Present Law - 1968	Redraft L. D. 636 - 1968
Brownfield	\$ 34,912.41	\$ 37,435.76
Denmark	7,170.59	7,365.52
Fryeburg	89,382.56	102,266.56
Gilead	2,885.60	2,591.80
Hanover	18,385.50	15,714.60
Lincoln Plt.	2,683.96	2,874.51
Lovell	14,176.48	14,897.59
Magalloway Plt.	8,064.27	8,600.17
Peru	77,812.79	101,686.89
Rumford	125,471.03	153,817.14
Stoneham	10,420.29	12,676.51
Stow	12,429.00	10,726.10
Sweden	4,257.21	3,734.61
Upton	815.80	721.68
S. A. D. #17 (Paris)	464,796.11	673,952.76
S. A. D. #21 (Dixfield)	206,639.34	291,724.08
S. A. D. #39 (Buckfield)	157,463.84	186,815.50
S. A. D. #43 (Mexico)	326,106.34	419,721.13
S. A. D. #44 (Bethel)	368,209.71	431,172.72
S. A. D. #55 (Cornish)	233,659.18	273,067.86

PENOBSCOT COUNTY

PRESENT LAW vs. REDRAFT OF L. D. 636

General Purpose Aid by Counties

Administrative Unit	Present Law - 1968	Redraft L. D. 636 - 1968
Alton	\$ 19,403.34	\$ 21,711.37
Bangor	610,750.07	789,233.13
Bradford	56,230.42	68,732.89
Bradley	59,974.74	74,436.55
Brewer	143,032.34	207,396.89
Carroll Plt.	10,716.50	9,284.40
Charleston	49,063.90	71,141.20
Chester	21,769.46	25,566.81
Corinth	84,302.13	92,637.87
Drew Plt.	766.00	689.40
East Millinocket	52,531.28	64,987.15
Edinburg	270.10	243.00
Glenburn	72,864.16	101,102.61
Grand Falls Plt.	0	0
Greenbush	51,815.11	61,430.20
Greenfield	2,519.62	3,636.82
Hermon	109,267.11	158,435.85
Hudson	31,467.03	39,629.57
Kenduskeag	46,784.39	55,492.26
LaGrange	29,760.77	32,125.22
Lakeville Plt.	377.60	339.84
Lincoln	80,070.88	116,102.77
Mattawamkeag	25,326.71	36,723.00
Medway	138,180.96	150,994.26
Milford	106,046.91	127,396.30
Millinocket	132,456.62	162,299.52

Old Town	148,185.50	214,868.97
Orono	105,874.87	153,518.56
Orrington	165,766.41	201,598.46
Stetson	27,622.60	34,679.92
Veazie	21,770.41	21,193.54
Woodville	1,521.63	1,631.27
S. A. D. #22 (Hampden)	319,792.82	412,429.32
S. A. D. #23 (Carmel)	196,530.42	220,269.32
S. A. D. #25 (Sherman)	178,365.33	249,005.48
S. A. D. #30 (Lee)	165,353.27	182,877.37
S. A. D. #31 (Howland)	233,307.16	321,855.19
S. A. D. #38 (Dixmont)	106,289.81	113,015.46
S. A. D. #46 (Dexter)	359,014.76	456,418.99
S. A. D. #48 (Newport)	481,488.66	589,770.96
S. A. D. #63 (Eddington)	209,902.16	231,201.60

PISCATAQUIS COUNTY

PRESENT LAW vs. REDRAFT OF L. D. 636

General Purpose Aid by Counties

Administrative Unit	Present Law - 1968	Redraft L. D. 636 - 1968
Barnard Plt.	\$ 378.90	\$ 340.87
Blanchard Plt.	1,365.50	828.50
Bowerbank	447.00	402.12
Brownville	85,843.90	112,170.45
Dover-Foxcroft	243,709.29	276,376.42
Elliottsville Plt.	75.20	67.68
Kingsbury Plt.	0	0
Monson	42,610.97	50,489.52
Sebec	21,947.03	25,089.08
Willimantic	3,005.00	2,851.90
S. A. D. #2 (Greenville)	115,612.86	163,778.91
S. A. D. #4 (Guilford)	306,855.71	398,458.33
S. A. D. #41 (Milo)	163,135.44	229,229.61

SAGadahoc COUNTY

PRESENT LAW vs. REDRAFT OF L. D. 636

General Purpose Aid by Counties

Administrative Unit	Present Law - 1968	Redraft L. D. 636 - 1968
Arrowsic	\$ 10,353.00	\$ 8,796.80
Bath	138,933.32	201,453.31
Bowdoin	54,350.43	66,344.94
Bowdoinham	66,973.09	88,494.04
Georgetown	5,923.20	6,180.54
Phippsburg	52,800.98	62,704.53
Richmond	70,375.23	102,044.08
Topsham	120,708.39	175,027.16
West Bath	20,292.52	25,501.47
Woolwich	75,418.59	95,126.33

SOMERSET COUNTY

General Purpose Aid by Counties

PRESENT LAW vs. REDRAFT OF L. D. 636

Administrative Unit	Present Law - 1968	Redraft L. D. 636 - 1968
Anson	\$ 154,196.69	\$ 182,616.75
Brighton Plt.	2,619.13	3,396.08
Dennistown Plt.	358.90	322.92
Embden	7,412.95	8,074.51
Harmony	38,841.62	56,320.34
Highland Plt.	429.60	386.64
New Portland	43,238.40	49,198.37
Pleasant Ridge Plt.	7,660.97	7,315.13
Smithfield	21,118.22	27,999.04
Solon	12,226.56	17,728.51
S. A. D. #4 (Guilford)	306,855.71	398,458.33
S. A. D. #12 (Jackman)	14,856.67	21,542.17
S. A. D. #13 (Bingham)	38,577.02	55,936.67
S. A. D. #46 (Dexter)	359,014.76	456,418.99
S. A. D. #48 (Newport)	481,488.66	589,770.96
S. A. D. #49 (Fairfield)	397,442.70	538,496.22
S. A. D. #53 (Pittsfield)	384,987.35	419,842.56
S. A. D. #54 (Skowhegan)	591,372.96	679,266.58
S. A. D. #59 (Madison)	232,499.36	325,530.76

WALDO COUNTY

PRESENT LAW vs. REDRAFT OF L. D. 636

General Purpose Aid by Counties

Administrative Unit	Present Law - 1968	Redraft L. D. 636 - 1968
Islesboro	\$ 7,030.49	\$ 8,387.18
Lincolntown	26,921.95	32,437.30
Palermo	27,076.58	34,399.69
Winterport	86,469.03	125,380.09
S. A. D. #3 (Thorndike)	437,227.18	557,527.97
S. A. D. #18 (Verona)	67,365.10	58,635.99
S. A. D. #34 (Belfast)	427,752.36	605,240.92
S. A. D. #53 (Pittsfield)	384,987.35	419,842.56
S.A. D. #56 (Searsport)	172,948.54	229,067.23

WASHINGTON COUNTY

PRESENT LAW vs. REDRAFT OF L. D. 636

General Purpose Aid by Counties

Administrative Unit	Present Law - 1968	Redraft L. D. 636 - 1968
Alexander	\$ 13,685.84	\$ 16,344.36
Baileyville	35,830.12	43,230.43
Baring	8,883.50	7,362.60
Beals	27,837.63	39,894.90
Beddington	346.20	311.58
Calais	112,404.73	162,986.85
Centerville	516.30	464.58

Charlotte	12,251.06	16,093.62
Codyville Plt.	536.00	482.38
Cooper	2,186.50	1,437.48
Crawford	1,825.89	2,690.24
Cutler	24,530.14	35,568.70
Deblois	264.60	237.70
Dennysville	21,693.50	18,935.20
East Machias	62,201.84	74,486.69
Eastport	79,612.45	115,437.32
Grand Lake Stream Plt.	5,912.09	5,587.04
Jonesboro	16,548.80	23,751.22
Jonesport	55,017.72	79,774.96
Machias	40,544.04	58,788.13
Machiasport	42,576.42	61,735.80
Marshfield	25,926.00	22,813.40
Meddybemps	4,896.44	5,806.79
Northfield	945.20	850.54
No. 14 Plt.	1,134.00	1,020.56
No. 21 Plt.	755.60	680.04
Pembroke	36,172.77	52,450.51
Perry	26,961.30	30,288.10
Princeton	35,952.69	52,130.67
Robbinston	19,341.81	20,618.41
Roque Bluffs	7,826.80	11,348.86
Steuben	39,256.92	42,090.42
Talmadge	442.20	397.98
Topsfield	18,675.90	20,077.90
Vanceboro	15,535.22	21,334.12
Waite	3,894.00	3,043.40
Wesley	6,696.37	8,063.42
Whiting	22,039.97	24,098.36
Whitneyville	8,738.96	10,345.41
S. A. D. #14 (Danforth)	63,845.02	82,843.78
S. A. D. #19 (Lubec)	114,901.31	154,424.61
S. A. D. #37 (Milbridge)	203,851.02	277,457.14

YORK COUNTY

PRESENT LAW vs. REDRAFT OF L. D. 636

General Purpose Aid by Counties

Administrative Unit	Present Law - 1968	Redraft L. D. 636 - 1968
Acton	\$ 10,455.60	\$ 11,075.85
Arundel	48,033.25	65,013.09
Biddeford	117,685.27	152,948.28
Dayton	8,416.34	9,157.91
Kennebunk	85,327.16	123,724.38
Kennebunkport	35,538.59	37,631.83
Kittery	336,893.60	475,216.47
Old Orchard Beach	69,732.17	101,111.64
Saco	346,097.33	439,740.49
Sanford	224,492.78	325,514.53
Wells	59,773.06	69,008.99
York	82,474.43	92,203.75
S. A. D. #6 (Buxton)	208,377.59	332,360.64
S. A. D. #35 (Eliot)	278,836.10	404,312.34
S. A. D. #55 (Cornish)	233,659.18	273,067.86
S. A. D. #57 (Waterboro)	182,898.99	239,080.11
S. A. D. #60 (Berwick)	322,529.41	438,602.64

A. D. C. TOWNS

Total Billing from July 1, 1965 to June 30, 1966

Abbot	951.12	Calais	3,942.93
Addison	1,342.63	Cambridge	401.40
Albion	1,139.85	Camden	2,828.53
Alexander	1,213.02	Canaan	1,006.56
Alfred	179.46	Canton	1,729.28
Allagash Plt.	3,675.42	Cape Elizabeth	1,712.79
Alna	619.38	Caribou	10,307.06
Alton	222.66	Carmel	1,548.81
Amherst	171.54	Carthage	527.94
Amity	481.50	Casco	1,205.19
Andover	760.86	Castine	421.56
Anson	2,570.49	Castle Hill	1,167.47
Appleton	263.52	Caswell Plt.	1,264.68
Arrowsic	164.34	Chapman	171.54
Arundel	514.80	Charleston	1,057.86
Ashland	3,848.40	Charlotte	296.82
Athens	812.10	Chelsea	1,215.37
Atkinson	444.24	Cherryfield	1,022.04
Auburn	15,790.63	Chester	558.00
Augusta	23,052.14	Chesterville	932.58
Aurora	27.36	China	3,249.72
Avon	443.16	Clifton	419.76
Baileyville	3,317.04	Clinton	2,769.75
Baldwin	920.22	Columbia	743.13
Bancroft	244.62	Columbia Falls	294.30
Bangor	22,626.51	Cooper	236.34
Bar Harbor	1,996.86	Corinna	1,180.08
Bath	7,217.51	Corinth	1,773.63
Beals	454.32	Cornish	1,239.66
Belfast	9,598.71	Cornville	753.29
Belgrade	1,045.98	Crawford	417.78
Belmont	176.94	Crystal	489.60
Benton	1,490.37	Cumberland	2,140.38
Berwick	255.78	Cushing	747.72
Bethel	1,769.78	Cutler	139.32
Biddeford	12,806.69	Cyr Plt.	417.78
Bingham	1,952.82	Damariscotta	940.68
Blaine	872.64	Danforth	2,545.92
Blue Hill	1,887.48	Dayton	651.24
Boothbay	4,093.56	Dedham	96.48
Boothbay Harbor	2,747.70	Deer Isle	2,422.64
Bowdoin	405.72	Denmark	296.82
Bowdoinham	777.60	Dennysville	843.91
Bowerbank	272.88	Detroit	790.38
Bradford	920.16	Dexter	2,360.70
Bradley	733.14	Dixfield	1,948.86
Brewer	3,769.76	Dixmont	1,732.86
Bridgewater	1,595.88	Dover-Foxcroft	1,984.91
Bridgton	1,615.44	Dresden	1,296.18
Bristol	1,377.90	Durham	1,332.36
Brooklin	1,107.18	Eagle Lake	3,487.86
Brooks	901.26	Eastbrook	491.94
Brooksville	208.80	East Machias	2,333.16
Brownfield	266.04	East Millinocket	922.41
Brownville	710.82	Easton	1,088.46
Brunswick	9,798.33	Eastport	4,211.60
Bucksfield	802.44	Eddington	207.18
Bucksport	2,489.04	Edgecomb	216.54
Burlington	357.30	Edinburg	125.64
Burnham	1,303.02	Eliot	357.30
Buxton	3,178.14	Ellsworth	2,199.96

Enfield	1,325.79	Kenduskeag	171.54
Etna	364.14	Kennebunk	2,768.49
Eustis	548.70	Kennebunkport	603.00
Exeter	266.22	Kingfield	1,383.30
Fairfield	7,471.16	Kittery	427.86
Falmouth	3,265.68	Knox	294.66
Farmingdale	1,949.85	LaGrange	1,069.56
Farmington	4,231.98	Lamoine	592.56
Fayette	197.10	Lebanon	367.02
Fort Fairfield	6,856.49	Lee	556.20
Fort Kent	8,413.20	Leeds	545.04
Frankfort	641.16	Levant	1,509.84
Franklin	171.54	Lewiston	21,893.93
Freedom	396.90	Liberty	413.10
Freeport	2,542.73	Limerick	1,089.72
Frenchville	1,342.62	Limestone	2,260.89
Friendship	368.10	Limington	939.60
Fryeburg	403.38	Lincoln	4,433.40
Gardiner	7,473.24	Lincolntonville	1,147.32
Garland	1,353.06	Linneus	452.70
Georgetown	443.34	Lisbon	3,571.02
Gilead	550.26	Litchfield	1,515.69
Glenburn	1,538.46	Littleton	1,445.58
Gorham	3,824.37	Livermore	2,017.76
Gouldsboro	1,676.45	Livermore Falls	889.02
Grand Isle	2,467.62	Long Island Plt.	102.42
Grand Lake Stream	89.46	Lowell	90.90
Gray	694.62	Lubec	7,136.10
Greenbush	342.00	Ludlow	714.24
Greene	590.22	Lyman	655.02
Greenville	676.44	Machias	2,977.69
Greenwood	562.41	Machiasport	1,662.84
Guilford	519.48	Madawaska	3,762.39
Hallowell	1,068.48	Madison	3,854.31
Hamlin Plt.	546.66	Madrid	861.12
Hampden	3,960.42	Manchester	539.28
Hancock	1,103.76	Mapleton	569.34
Harmony	1,071.30	Mars Hill	970.56
Harpwell	2,821.86	Masardis	206.10
Harrington	1,006.02	Mattawamkeag	1,997.46
Harrison	961.92	Mechanic Falls	738.18
Hartford	428.76	Meddybemps	168.84
Hartland	2,471.04	Medway	907.74
Haynesville	464.40	Mercer	982.26
Hebron	536.04	Merrill Plt.	403.02
Hermion	1,777.68	Mexico	5,652.77
Hersey	509.40	Milbridge	1,510.23
Hiram	884.61	Milford	1,282.68
Hodgdon	844.68	Millinocket	5,985.46
Holden	595.98	Milo	2,952.08
Hollis	402.48	Minot	905.04
Hope	417.78	Monmouth	1,859.70
Houlton	9,978.24	Monson	899.28
Howland	1,515.24	Monsom	899.28
Hudson	1,373.50	Monticello	904.68
Industry	126.54	Montville	34.02
Island Falls	388.62	Moscow	1,159.74
Islesboro	1,290.60	Mount Chase	417.78
Jackman Plt.	1,053.54	Mount Desert	1,259.82
Jackson	174.24	Mount Vernon	530.10
Jay	2,698.28	Naples	1,210.14
Jefferson	1,596.42	Nashville Plt.	89.64
Jonesboro	572.67	Newburgh	1,021.32
Jonesport	1,759.23	Newcastle	1,698.30

Newfield	161.82	Rumford	6,598.44
New Gloucester	959.76	Saco	6,338.88
New Limerick	456.48	St. Agatha	1,956.60
Newport	2,593.07	St. Albans	557.46
New Portland	855.18	St. Francis Plt.	3,157.57
Newry	523.44	St. George	2,038.32
New Sharon	1,787.40	St. John	1,782.00
New Sweden	223.38	Sanford	6,472.44
New Vineyard	111.24	Sangerville	1,307.16
Nobleboro	1,130.00	Scarboro	6,023.25
Norridgewock	1,783.53	Searsmont	993.24
North Berwick	1,094.70	Searsport	1,505.88
Northfield	216.00	Sebago	704.34
North Haven	107.76	Sebec	109.62
Northport	1,108.08	Sedgwick	485.46
North Yarmouth	1,271.34	Shapleigh	288.90
Norway	1,974.60	Sherman	1,033.56
Oakfield	1,182.42	Sidney	674.82
Oakland	4,665.78	Skowhegan	8,468.10
Old Orchard Beach	2,527.38	Smithfield	482.76
Old Town	4,943.70	Smyrna	603.36
Orient	158.58	Solon	88.20
Orland	1,029.60	Sorrento	357.30
Orono	1,738.26	South Berwick	1,362.24
Orrington	2,461.41	South Bristol	335.70
Otis	498.24	Southport	961.92
Otisfield	785.52	South Portland	13,471.16
Owls Head	1,085.22	South Thomaston	466.67
Oxford	2,391.30	Southwest Harbor	613.98
Palermo	447.84	Springfield	493.56
Palmyra	1,489.14	Stacyville	1,500.48
Paris	1,654.56	Standish	2,049.84
Parsonsfield	754.02	Starks	262.26
Passadumkeag	564.84	Stetson	413.64
Patten	905.22	Steuben	982.62
Pembroke	1,772.19	Stockholm	335.25
Penobscot	13.32	Stockton Springs	980.64
Perham	836.82	Stonington	1,353.60
Perry	2,315.52	Stow	167.22
Peru	1,775.55	Strong	1,107.16
Phillips	295.65	Sullivan	1,765.41
Phippsburg	1,496.16	Sumner	334.80
Pittsfield	3,343.68	Swans Island	627.48
Pittston	2,081.97	Swansville	902.70
Plymouth	857.52	Sweden	216.18
Poland	854.10	Thomaston	2,147.22
Portage Lake	276.66	Thorndike	1,542.96
Porter	407.88	Topsfield	328.68
Portland	91,226.07	Topsham	788.22
Pownal	883.13	Tremont	57.06
Presque Isle	8,304.62	Trenton	759.78
Princeton	1,353.96	Troy	777.60
Prospect	346.14	Turner	2,393.16
Randolph	401.76	Union	773.46
Rangeley	1,147.32	Unity	1,339.74
Raymond	297.90	Van Buren	6,341.49
Readfield	816.03	Vanceboro	480.60
Richmond	2,136.60	Vassalboro	3,004.37
Ripley	496.80	Veazie	8.22
Robbinston	236.34	Vinalhaven	1,624.86
Rockland	12,721.38	Verona	127.08
Rockport	931.14	Wade	929.88
Rome	711.42	Waldo	211.68
Roxbury	366.48		

Waldoboro	3,915.18	Westport	296.82
Wales	324.54	Whitefield	860.34
Wallagrass Plt.	2,131.46	Whiting	612.90
Warren	1,113.42	Willimantic	182.88
Washburn	1,913.94	Wilton	1,207.89
Washington	1,556.10	Windham	1,352.88
Waterboro	1,061.10	Windsor	1,387.04
Waterford	525.06	Winn	1,268.64
Waterville	15,611.01	Winslow	5,061.41
Webster	840.24	Winter Harbor	232.98
Weld	260.10	Winterport	1,165.74
Wellington	345.48	Winthrop	1,629.78
Wells	2,230.74	Wiscasset	1,132.02
Wesley	162.72	Woodland	824.39
West Bath	1,002.60	Woodstock	512.64
Westbrook	8,618.86	Woodville	479.34
Westfield	467.46	Woolwich	1,521.00
West Gardiner	1,751.76	Yarmouth	3,801.42
Weston	299.88	York	1,913.58
West Paris	1,021.32		
		Total	832,652.74

Mr. JALBERT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Continuing, this would grant the \$125,000 as was introduced into the Republican package for Night Pay Differential. It would give on the pay plan for State Employees \$550,000 for the first year, \$1,100,000 for the second year which is \$550,000 more than the Republican package indicated. It would give \$5,000 for uniforms for the Ferry Service. It would reduce the amount of interest on bonds, after checking this out I find these figures are accurate, to \$700,000 making a total of \$230,-083,998.

Turning to page 2 wherein it contains the budget document, the total estimates would be \$201,537,000. The adjustments from a look see with all the various departments in the State, net would be \$1,754,000. The increase on Estimates which I understand would be sound are at \$6 million. The half a percent increase in the sales tax would be \$13,500,000. The increase of 5% on the Liquor Mark-up would be \$3,186,000 and the 2c on Cigarettes would be \$5 million giving a total of \$231,229,000 which would leave a balance for L. D.'s of \$1,145,000. The accounts on the third page can be varied but they are self explanatory and in any event this leaves a handsome cushion for L. D.'s.

Now, I'd like to talk wherein it concerns the essential services or

the bare bone budget as has been discussed. The L. D. 1565 has in it an item of \$15,200,284 to meet our legal obligations wherein it concerns the General Subsidy Program known as the Sinclair Law. This would give us a total of \$216,738,000. The total 1575 being \$226,786,000 this would leave us short of \$10 million up and over the present Current Services. The manner in which the \$15 million could be financed would be to raise the estimates \$6 million, unlock the Construction Aid Program \$2 million, the liquor markup of 5% which is going into effect in any event July 1, would give us \$3,186,000 and an adjustment net of \$1,754,000 which is \$12,940,000 leaves us \$4 million short of meeting our legal obligations on July 1 wherein it concerns the Current Services Budget.

Certainly a 2% increase on cigarettes would meet this \$5 million gap that we lack to meet the present by law current services budget if we were going to put in there also the interest on bonds which this would not affect as a current service item. This would then mean that there would be no money for anything of a recurring nature in the A and B report of the Appropriations Committee. I repeat, there would be no money at all for a Supplemental Budget. This would also mean that all L. D.'s of a recurring nature would have to find their way by the road-

side because of the fact that we have no money for them. This certainly would mean also the elimination of the Supplemental Budget. This would mean also, however it might be pleasing to some, it is certainly displeasing to a great majority of others, this would mean no money for pay increases for our state employees. It would mean absolutely no money to raise our Foundation Program from \$255 to \$320. It would mean absolutely no money wherein it concerns the 18% on the ADC Fund. I am fully aware of the fact that we could pass some taxation programs that would meet whatever expenditures we might make. I might state that on several occasions these plans and programs have been defeated on the Floor of the House. Certainly it is common knowledge now that the trade-in on automobiles has suffered a defeat three times, the tax on repairs and services the same thing, the beer tax has suffered a defeat on two occasions, the tax on soft drinks was not introduced. Several other methods of taxation have gone by the roadside, the income tax was soundly defeated on two occasions. Insofar as the sales tax is concerned, in that over the period I have voted, I voted originally against the 2% sales tax, I voted and spoke for the 2 to 3% increase as submitted by the former Governor, Senator Edmund S. Muskie, I voted against the 3 to 4% increase until at the very last day when agreements were made and when the Leader and Assistant Floor Leader of my party went along back in 1963. At this session, however, it is my concentrated opinion that nothing that can be done would make the figure 101 show on that tote board wherein it concerns the 5% sales tax. The thing that in my mind is of great importance now because that tote board and the magic number as indicated to us by the Courts would be 101.

I've distributed also to you what this 4½ percent sales tax would mean insofar as collection is concerned. Even if the sales tax as far as the merchant is concerned is a percentage tax, the tax itself insofar as the consumer is con-

cerned becomes a bracket tax as is indicated by the program as distributed to you last week.

I now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, would like briefly to make comment on the fact that we have arrived at the crossroads in my opinion. It isn't my intention at all to have come up with a program merely to either hear myself think or possibly feel that I am trying to beat somebody down. I have offered this program to anyone who would want to take it. I have offered that it not even be introduced here, but could well be introduced even in the other branch.

I would comment to both parties that the thought of adjourning with a bare bones budget is something that we should definitely perish from our minds. I think it would indicate certainly lack of leadership on our minds and people could well ask what we came here for. I'm not in any way trying to impress you with my own importance which is nil. I'm merely trying in my humble way to submit a program to you that you could work from. Even this program could very easily be amended to include another five percent markup in liquor which certainly couldn't be distasteful to too, too many and this could bring about another \$3 million for the Foundation Program which certainly could well satisfy the parties involved.

I would like to state that throughout the months there are some in my own Party who have felt that at times I would be playing with the Republican Party. I was even criticized because I would go into the office of the Speaker. Whether it be yesterday or today or tomorrow, and I seek no favors from the Speaker, and he wouldn't give me if they weren't deserving, any more than he would certainly take issue with me—and he has—over the many years when he felt that I was not right, but I assure you of this much here—that ever since this gentleman who has been a friend of mine for many, many years has become the Speaker of the House I have left on Friday with a handshake in his

office, and on every day, my first port of call is his office. And criticism or not, just as long as David J. Kennedy is Speaker of this branch, that is exactly what I am going to do and it is nobody's business but my own! I don't choose anybody else's friends; I don't choose anybody else's enemies.

I think that besides the issue as we have it before us, I think possibly if at times we had sat down and analyzed programs and problems, instead of possibly being to a degree ruled by groups that possibly did not bring all the facts to us, we might have been better off.

My submission of this amendment to you is merely based on the honest fact in sincerity of wanting to do the right thing. Insofar as tacking a referendum on such a measure of taxation and sending it back to the people, I assure you that my answer to that would be a very loud "no." I was not sent down here to send back to the people measures of taxation. That's our business right here, and I think we would be very remiss and very weak if we ever entertained such thinking.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, with all the sincerity and honesty at my command and because of the fact that all avenues sideways, frontways and backwards are concerned on patchwork taxation, these have gone down the drain. The income tax has gone down the drain. In my opinion it would be useless to bring back the five cents sales tax because the magic figure 101 would never appear, and I cannot help but comment on the program as submitted by my very good friend the capable gentleman from Portland, Joe D'Alfonso, when in his program he would have the five dollar head tax. According to the pundits that I would be a two-bit politician, somewhere along the line someone would be short \$4.75 on that program.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move the adoption of House Amendment "E", and thank you for the patience of listening to me and I cannot help but thank personally, regardless of the fact

that I may be criticized—certainly not by the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque, because I wholeheartedly supported him as the leader, and I think he has done a very, very fine and commendable job, but I cannot help but personally thank also the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, the Floor Leader of the Republican Party, for the courtesies extended to me back five weeks ago because I was unable to be here because of illness, and again for the last two days in delaying this measure and allowing me to introduce this program at my rightful time.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is with somewhat some reluctance this afternoon that I get up to make any remarks regarding the amendment that is being offered by the devoted and sincere Representative from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert.

I think every member of this House, if not every member of this Legislature, should appreciate the amount of work, the amount of hours, and the amount of devotion that Representative Jalbert has put in not only in this present document or amendment, but also in the tremendous amount of work that he does while he is here in the Legislature. Certainly I have very high regards for the amendment as presented by the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, and it could have possibly have received its due consideration as I am sure that it will receive today. However, this points out the fact that we have been unable through all our sincere efforts of trying to come up with a fair compromise that would be presented to this Legislature, and would receive the tally of 101 votes on the board in front of you. As a matter of fact, yesterday noon we met with the Majority leadership in the Speaker's office in trying to pursue other avenues or completely new avenues as to how best to settle these differences, and as a result of that meeting yesterday

noon, a very cordial meeting, the total and end result of that meeting is that if the Minority leadership could come up with a financial package that would equal the same amount as the sales tax or bring it to a total of \$240,000,000, that the Republican leadership would give it very serious consideration.

I think possibly every member of this House and every member of the other unmentionable branch would agree with me this afternoon that that is almost impossible. It is impossible because first of all it is not a compromise—it is only an offer that if it is a compromise that the document totals \$240,000,000 and unless there are any dollars taken off from this \$240,000,000 we cannot sell it. So I am assuming this afternoon, based on those remarks that I have just made, based on the meeting we had yesterday afternoon in the Speaker's office, that the half a cent is as objectionable to this House as a one cent increase in the sales tax, because it ultimately reduces the amount of the Foundation Program that is included in L. D. 1575.

So in all due respect to the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalburt, and into the tremendous amount of effort and work and dedication that he has given this Legislature, it is with a very sincere feeling that I cannot support the amendment with the one half cent increase in the sales tax in support of the amendment. Thank you.

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

Mr. D'ALFONSO: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: You have distributed on your desk, a revenue plan which I have worked out. I am not thoroughly informed in detail on appropriation matters and I am not adept at quoting appropriation figures. So, it was my intent to draw something up that would be very, very simple to follow, and in doing so to reveal that a reasonable, adequate compromise could be achieved.

In Education, there are three broad categories that must be un-

folded in order for someone to learn, they are that there must be a felt need to learn, that this felt need must be supported by appropriate activity, and this appropriate activity should cause a change in behavior. And my desire is to submit something that I think would be appropriate and something that I think would bring about a change in behavior between the two parties.

In a previous speech I mentioned that the time does come when both parties must exercise the capacity to act. My revenue plan I consider to be a reasonable compromise for the simple fact that it equals the GOP package program and yet avoids any increase in the sales tax; it avoids all of those taxes that would supposedly hurt "the poor people". The revenue plan has ten items to it. Most of the items have been and I freely admit plagiarized from other documents. The two important items in this revenue plan has to do with the tax on intangible income at the rate of 4½%. This item has been checked out with the Taxation Department and tangible income is being taxed presently in the State of Tennessee and New Hampshire at the rate of 4¼% and it is generating approximately \$3 million per year with an exemption up to \$600. The second important item in this revenue plan is the head tax which would be imposed at the rate of \$5 for every man and woman between the ages of 21 and 70 with all mentally retarded people being exempt, and if you total up all ten items you come up with a grand total of approximately \$241 million which would provide everything that the Republican Leadership has asked for and yet avoid any kind of an increase in the sales tax, would avoid the automobile trade-in tax, the tax on repairs to sales and services, any kind of a tax on beer; in other words, those taxes that would supposedly hurt the poor people.

I believe this to be a reasonable compromise. I believe the best compromise is one that satisfies the elimination of an increase in the sales tax and at the same time gives us enough money to restore to the people as proposed in

the Republican Program, the Foundation Program as proposed, the amount of money that would be included for A. D. C., the other items such as the University of Maine, Oceanography, everything that has been proposed, and in this revenue plan nobody would be hurt. Intangible income is on unanticipated earned income, you do not expect to earn this income, if you own stocks, bonds or securities and you anticipate earning money and it is presumptuous and if you do earn that money you would be happy to pay the $4\frac{1}{2}\%$ tax, it would become a deductible item under your federal income tax, it would not hurt anyone and the head tax would cost those people between the ages of 21 and 70 a meager 10c per week. So, I submit, and although none of this has been worked out in detail, that this is a reasonable compromise that it is not impossible to come up with a reasonable, adequate compromise and that this program here, without hurting anyone and in keeping with the wishes of the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, would satisfy everyone and would facilitate the business of this Legislature, make the people happy, make us happy and send everyone home feeling a little bit better.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: First of all with respect to the actual amendment under consideration, House Amendment "E" offered by the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, there are three specific points with respect to the proposal that I would like to comment on. First of all, we take specific exception to certain of the items within the program. This reduces the General Purpose Subsidy to a level of \$5 million which we think is inadequate. This includes an additional \$550,000 for the Maine State Employees. Now, while there is certainly no one here in the House who is unsympathetic to the interests and needs of the Maine State Employees, it is also certainly true that in working out any legislative program we have an

obligation which we cannot and must not ignore to review and assess all of the needs of all of the people in the State of Maine and spend within that framework proportionate to those needs as we determine them after public hearing, a good deal of thought and careful examination. I single out these two; I might also say that the \$700,000 figure on bonds I'm not sure of, I haven't checked that out.

Secondly, I object to the plan because it seems to me to be an unwise action for us to take. Now everybody, and we have been told, everybody, seems to agree that really there is nothing radically wrong with the spending which we propose. I think everyone, or at least the indication seems to be, that we are headed in the right direction by trying to ease the terrible burden of education on towns and cities and on our taxpayers, but there is some question about how we get there. Now, ladies and gentlemen, we can get there with one of two routes; we can either go with a sales tax, an increase of one penny on an already existing tax which will provide the necessary revenue to fund this program and avert a financial disaster in the 69-71 biennium, or we can go a patchwork program. Now there's been a lot of discussion in the papers and I'm not going to go into great length about this, but there has been discussion in the paper and it was brought up again today by the Minority Leader as to the conference that we had yesterday which as he points out was very cordial and, I thought originally, productive. I pointed out to them and I point out to you that if we have no quarrel as to the total dollar level that we are trying to get to, to do the things that we think need to be done, then we have two alternatives, we can either go a penny on an already existing tax or we can go patchwork taxes.

I indicated to the Minority Leadership that the Republican caucus held earlier that same day had rejected the soft drink tax as a specific tax and that there was serious reservations among Republican Members of this House as

to the beer tax. The question then became, well, what would you do, what will you do? I said to them and I say to you, if the Democratic Leadership in this House puts together a patchwork tax program that meets the essential needs which we say exist and we are talking of an expenditure level of the \$240 million area, then I am perfectly willing to bring that before the members of this House, the Republican Members of this House and ask for their judgment, but, I as a person believe beyond any doubt that a patchwork program is dishonest, it's a fraud on the taxpayers of this State and that the correct and right and true thing to do is for us to face up to reality and put the penny on the sales tax.

Now, feeling that as strongly as I do and having bored you so many hours with my version of what we should be doing, I certainly am not going to stand before this House today and suggest to you that we go to a wholesale patchwork tax program to meet Maine's needs. I made that statement to the members of the Minority Leadership. Whether they choose to come up with a patchwork program that will arrive at that conclusion or not is their judgment and their judgment alone to make. The Republican Leadership is not going to offer such a plan, having decided some months ago that if we're going to face up to the needs and face up to the crisis that confronts us, we've got to be ready to spend at the level we're talking about and we've got to have the guts to pass this tax to pay for it. The half cent on the sales tax I fail to see in the present form it's offered here and the way it is set up is a reasonable alternative to the crisis that confronts us.

If this is a regressive tax on the Maine business at 5% is there anyone here who seriously suggests that it wouldn't be at 4½%? Is there any suggestion that the Maine Merchants Association is going to abandon its objections at 4½% that it professes to have at 5%? Of course not, neither objection is valid. The 5% sales tax, a penny on the existing tax,

wouldn't be regressive, but if you're offering this as an alternative and I look to the Minority Leadership to come forward with the alternative to reach this funding level, then I fail to see the 4½% as the answer to that problem. Now we have, as has been pointed out, sat here for six months, there has been acrimony and bitterness, but fortunately there have been sound friendships, good friendships, that I have had and am pleased to still have, with members of both parties.

Now, we can sit here and talk about studies of a 3% sales tax across the board which has not been introduced, we can talk about alternates one and two, neither of which have been introduced. We can talk about a patchwork tax program, which as I have indicated to you I think is a dishonest and shameful thing, and nobody has introduced that, and it is for this reason that I say to you that I reject this because it does not meet the needs that we have to meet.

You must not damn us for inaction, if you persist in withholding that handful of votes that will bring this session to a meaningful conclusion. I don't hesitate for a moment to advance the Republican Program or this program for meeting Maine's needs before any group any time under any circumstances, but I insist that it be properly financed.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to thank the gentleman from Madawaska for his kind remarks. I would like to suggest that the same gentleman spoke very, very briefly wherein it concerned this package that I have submitted to you in amendment form. Then the gentleman went into a dissertation concerning meetings with the members of the opposition party, conferences and what-not. The gentleman from Portland, Mr. D'Alfonso, arose to present a package of his own not discussing the present program

then before us. The gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, comments that the Republican Party would be more than happy to sit down if a proper patchwork program could be arrived at to meet the money set forth in amount by them, which is somewhere in the vicinity of 242 or 3 million dollars. Then the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, goes on and I would use the word meekly condemns such a patchwork program and then goes into a dissertation wherein it concerns the 5% sales tax. There was comment made also on the short amount on the Foundation Program. I have already submitted to you that very harmlessly the liquor markup could be raised which could bring about the amount almost to what was asked for originally from the 255 to 320 dollars.

The comment as made by the two leaders is exactly what I have been talking about quietly to some members of both parties and also with any interested parties who would care to discuss it, that we do not and we have not given an alternate program an honest serious run for its money. Now, I am not talking today about patchwork legislation. Wherein it concerns a tax on intangibles which I submitted way back weeks ago to my own Floor leader and the first time this type of taxation was ever submitted back I believe in the latter part of March, I found to my satisfaction that that was not acceptable. Wherein it concerns the tax on repairs and services, it drew 39 votes, 39 votes, now bearing in mind that all Democrats would have voted for it, there being — and all Democrats would be present, there being 55 of us somewhere along the line, there were 16 defectors, but the record will show that several Democrats voted against it as well as 17 Democrats being absent.

This was reintroduced by me by Order and it was killed, the tax on trade-ins was defeated when the — not as soundly as some of the others, when the friendly opposition were kind enough to temporarily loan the proponents of the tax 45 votes. I say us because

I'd be in error because that is the one tax that I opposed very strenuously from the very beginning. The same situation has been brought about wherein it concerns the tax on raising the licenses of stores and clubs and hotels and restaurants and also with the beer tax, this program was soundly defeated.

The gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, talks about the handful of members of my party who could loan themselves to the Majority Party wherein it concerns the 1c sales tax. It is certainly common knowledge of the many, many conferences I have had and not certainly—I did it certainly unashamed, I mean it is my prerogative to discuss programs, to be called in to discuss programs, but these votes are not forthcoming. The patchwork taxation has long gone by the boards in all phases; the one cent on the sales tax, it would be futile in my opinion to bring that back in hopes of getting 101 votes. We are now talking about this program and no matter how it is sliced, the truth of the matter is that beginning July 1, beyond their present current services, no vocational school, no teachers college, the University of Maine, the Mental Health and Correction Institutions, the Health and Welfare Programs, these programs must be at status quo. These are the hard, cold turkey facts. Now, we talk about, getting away today, I believe, we have gotten away from the bare bones budget. We are now going into the essential budget. If you go into essential needs, you go into supplemental; if you go into supplemental, you go into taxes. You can't get patchwork taxation, you can't get an income tax, you can't get a sales tax of 5%. Somewhere along the line some of us thought we were striking the happy medium. This has been done. We are talking about this program now. We are talking about meeting our obligations to the best of our ability. This is what we are talking about. This is sound. This program is sound and with due respect to both Leaders of both parties, they certainly in my opinion and I say it humbly, regardless

of my personal feelings, they certainly have not torn this apart in my humble opinion to anybody's satisfaction in this House.

Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor requested a yea and nay vote on the adoption of House Amendment "E."

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I will be very brief. I have only a few points to bring up before you and it is my sincere belief and that of the Minority Party and that of the Governor's office that the same amount of money could very well be raised by other means than providing a one-half cent increase in the sales tax. However, I must say this on the Floor of this House that we have been unable to agree to meet on common grounds and discuss a compromise package and to come up with an honest compromise. That any and at all times that we have offered to compromise we have been informed, introduce it on the Floor of the House but the Leadership cannot support it. Then pass it on the Floor of the House on its merits.

Now to me, ladies and gentlemen, this only indicates one thing. Every honest and able legislator in this House and in the other branch has got a financial package. Should we ask all of these Legislators in this House this afternoon that all they that have a package should bring it up on the Floor of the House and it will receive consideration and will be voted on its merits but cannot receive support of the Leadership? Now, in order to have a compromise, in order to have a fair compromise, we have got to have a meeting of the minds of this body and the other body and also to have some assurance from the Leadership of this Legislature that they will be able to support it. So at this time, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I certainly want to leave the door open to the Majority Party that we in the loyal opposition are still leaving that door open of being able to sit down, write a compromise that

all the Leadership will be able to say to its members, we will try to sell this in all honesty and not only by saying so, but by actually doing. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All 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 having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

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

ROLL CALL

YEA — Allen, Brown, Cote, Cottrell, Durgin, Eustis, Farrington, Gaudreau, Gill, Hanson, H. L.; Harriman, Hewes, Jalbert, Roy, Shute, Snowe, P; Tanguay.

NAY — Baker, E. B.; Baker, R. E.; Bedard, Belanger, Beliveau, Benson, Berman, Bernard, Binnette, Birt, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Bradstreet, Bragdon, Brennan, Buck, Bunker, Burnham, Carey, Carrier, Carroll, Carswell, Champagne, Clark, Conley, Cookson, Cornell, Couture, Crockett, Crommett, Crosby, Curran, Cushing, D'Alfonso, Danton, Darey, Dennett, Dickinson, Drigotas, Drummond, Dudley, Dunn, Edwards, Evans, Ewer, Fecteau, Fortier, Foster, Fraser, Fuller, Gauthier, Giroux, Hall, Hanson, B. B.; Hanson, P. K.; Harnois, Harvey, Hawes, Haynes, Healy, Henley, Hennessey, Hichens, Hinds, Hodgkins, Hoover, Huber, Humphrey, Hunter, Immonen, Jameson, Jannelle, Keyte, Kilroy, Kyes, Label, Levesque, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Littlefield, Lycette, Maddox, Martin, McMann, McNally, Meisner, Miliano, Minkowsky, Mosher, Nadeau, J. F. R.; Nadeau, N. L.; Noyes, Pendergast, Philbrook, Pike, Porter, Prince, Quimby, Quinn, Rackliff, Richardson, G. A.; Richardson, H. L.;

Rideout, Robertson, Robinson, Rochelleau, Ross, Sahagian, Sawyer, Scott, C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Scribner, Shaw, Snow, P. J.; Soulas, Starbird, Sullivan, Susi, Thompson, Townsend, Trask, Truman, Waltz, Watts, Wheeler, White, Wight, Williams, Wood.

ABSENT — Jewell, Payson.

Yes, 17; No, 130; Absent, 2.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will announce the vote. Seventeen having voted in the affirmative and one hundred and thirty having voted in the negative, House Amendment "E" fails of adoption.

Are there any further amendments to be offered?

Is it now the pleasure of the House that this Bill be passed to be engrossed?

The motion prevailed and the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto and Conference Committee Amendment "A" thereto, and House Amendment "B" as amended by Conference Committee Amendment "A" thereto, and Conference Committee Amendment "A" in concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The pending question now is the enactment of L. D. 1575. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque.

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill again comes up before us like the old chestnut — like the old horse last week, to be defeated again. I don't know how many times or how often a measure has to be defeated in any one branch that one can actually and truly say — let's try to do something else or something different.

As I have indicated a few moments ago, we have left the door open with all sincerity. We hope that the invitation to come in that door will be well received and with sincere motives.

This afternoon I find myself as leader of the loyal opposition that we are unable to support this document any more than we have been able to support it for the last

four votes. The objections have not been removed, the objections that were in the bill from the inception are still there, so therefore, we cannot support it and I ask that when the vote is taken that it be taken by the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wouldn't concede that it's an old dog or an old chestnut or however it's just been described. I would only remind every member of this House that it is the only program that has been advanced since the Governor's program was advanced. It is, I believe, beyond any question at all the only soundly financed way of meeting Maine's needs. It is late in the session — it's June 28th — but it is also the day of decision for the people of the State of Maine and I would ask every member of this House regardless of his Party to vote in favor of this bill. Thank you.

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

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise simply as an individual representative of the State of Maine. I have been here since January along with the rest of you — you may be aware of that. I voted for the full purchase price of trade-in on cars which was the Governor's proposal — I am a Republican. I voted for the sales tax on labor and service — I am a Republican. I voted for Representative Cottrell's state tax on the amount you make — income tax. I am a Republican. I voted for Representative Jalbert's proposal — I am a Republican. I voted for the five percent sales tax — I am a Republican. But what I'd like you to consider for a moment is this Party versus Party is good stuff in politics, but some people in this State of Maine are not concerned with the political aspects quite so much as some of us who are more closely related to it.

I would simply ask you if you fail — that we have a good pro-

gram — to vote to support it in this manner, because this is a program that is going to benefit a lot of people in the State of Maine, and I can say this truthfully and sincerely. I remember in the 100th session they had an increase in for the sales tax, and there was a tremendous amount of opposition through the people themselves, and I am in contact with them every day of the week in my business, and it was defeated. In the 101st there was a lot more of opposition from the rank and file people than there is now. At that time it was passed. And at this time — I don't mean these people are clamoring for this tax increase, but they realize that we need the money and I feel that most people feel that we have a sales tax division that is all prepared, and I feel that they want us to enact this and come home, and I mean this sincerely and not as a Republican.

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

Mr. STARBIRD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I agree in part with what Representative Gill has just said. However, working in the plant that I do I come in contact daily with some two hundred people that work and live in the general area where I live. In talking with other people in that general area who do not work in the plant, I also come in contact with a large number of people and I find no support for this tax. The program—yes you can find people that wish the school subsidy increased—no question about it, but they don't want the sales tax to do it. The only people that are asking for a sales tax are as I said last week, the Maine Municipal Association and the Maine Teachers Association, and I will not go into a tirade like I did then, but these are the two people that want it—these are the two groups that want it. Somehow they have made the Republican leadership see things in the light that they have, that it is good—and I believe that the Republican leadership from their actions sincerely believes that this is a good thing to do; I do not question that—but I

as a person believe it is wrong. The majority of the people that I represent believe it is wrong, so therefore, I have no option but to vote against this bill as long as there is a sales tax attached to it.

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

Mr. McMANN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question to the gentleman, Mr. Starbird, who just spoke. If he's opposed to this, does he and the great many people he represents have any alternate program?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. McMann, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird, who may answer if he desires.

The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. STARBIRD: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman—yes, there is one program that I supported all through—the Governor's program. There was only one item in that whole program that I heard any objection to and that was the automobile trade-in tax. I voted for it because there were a majority of the people in my area that would favor this tax in opposition to a five percent increase—to a one percent increase over what we have now. I mean they would take the lesser of two evils in other words, and there are plenty of alternatives. I suggested a corporate tax on the Floor of this House. I haven't had the time to research it—I'm no mathematician. If someone wants me to I'll see to it that the figures are drawn up and how much this will bring in, but I do not feel as if I am qualified; and there are gentlemen here this afternoon that have offered alternatives, one of them included a half a cent sales tax. I voted against it because it was still a sales tax. I don't believe in the sales tax on principle. There are hundreds of people who don't believe in the sales tax on principle. This is the long and the short of it—as long as there is a sales tax in this bill I'm not going to vote for it.

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

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The remarks of the gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird, have prompted me to ask through the Chair a question of Mr. Starbird. It was my understanding—he reiterated several times that as long as the sales tax was attached that he would be opposed. I would pose this question. Is not the proposed trade-in tax on motor vehicles—I was under the impression—isn't that a sales tax?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Solon, Mr. Hanson, poses a question to the gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird, who may answer if he desires, and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. STARBIRD: Mr. Speaker, this tax is a sales tax. It was once in the original two percent version of the sales tax—it was included in 1951. I believe it was taken off in 1953. I believe I did say that people did not like it; I do not like it, but I would take it as the lesser of two evils.

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

Mr. CONLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Two years ago I spent my first term in the Legislature, and at that time the Governor, John H. Reed, presented to the 102nd Legislature a patchwork tax program to carry on the needs of the state over the following two years. Now I ask you in sincerity—was this a fraud imposed upon the people of the State? If my recollection serves me correctly the people of the state were richly rewarded by those tax programs, and they can be served as well in this session of the Legislature, if the Majority Party today wanted to sit down and talk turkey with the Minority leadership.

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Like many of you in this House I was taught

a rugged school of history, and those people believed this country was founded by individualists and not the converse; that the growth of this Nation was due to individualism, and that its survival depends upon people who can think for themselves.

Now just a hundred years ago a bloody flag was waved and this Country had its extreme partisans. There was acrimony when there should be harmony, and there is acrimony here today where there should be harmony.

I say there's no need for this type of internecine strife. I deplore this state of affairs and this afternoon I shall not vote for this five cents sales tax.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I shall be very brief. I have often wondered during the long journey of this document that if the two associations that have devoted so much work and attention towards this program, that if they might not have had some form of small vested interest in having the Legislature carry on the burden of this type of taxation, only to find out that it may be that they were afraid themselves to face their own people on the municipal level; of the possibility of raising taxes on the local level. It seems to be an ideal position for them to take where the Maine Municipal Association and the Maine Teachers Association have gone down the line for this type of program—that the owners might not be put back on the municipal officers for their failure to be able to meet the needs through local taxation. And further to add prior to the Committee report on the Foundation Program allowance or prior to the hearing, there seems to have been very little support either through the Department of Education or to the Governor's Office by recommendation or otherwise that the municipalities, the towns and the cities were clamoring for an additional ten million dollars in subsidies for the school program, or that we should increase the Sinclair Law and the Foundation Program by

a jump of six per cent in one year of a biennium whereby it had been increased since the adoption of the Sinclair Act on the average or the vicinity of two per cent. It leaves me to wonder just where the municipal officers have been in support of this type of program if they are or have been so interested.

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

Mr. HEALY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: When the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, spoke here a few moments ago he suggested that this five per cent sales tax was the best program since the Governor's program. Now, it has been said here that the items included in the Governor's program were dead. I have seen things picked up, revived, reconsidered and so on several times. As a matter of fact the five per cent sales tax has been reconsidered; I think we're up to the fourth time on it now.

Let's go back and figure up the patchwork, so-called, program as offered by the Governor and pay the bills and go home.

The SPEAKER: The yeas and nays have been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All of those desiring a roll call will vote yes; those opposed will vote no, and the Chair opens the vote.

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

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the enactment of Senate Paper 597, L. D. 1575, An Act to Appropriate and Provide Moneys for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1968 and June 30, 1969. All of those in favor of the enactment of this bill will vote yes and those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Allen, Baker, E. B.; Baker, R. E.; Benson, Birt, Brag-

don, Brown, Buck, Bunker, Clark, Cookson, Cornell, Cote, Crockett, Crosby, Cushing, Darey, Dennett, Dickinson, Drummond, Dunn, Durgin, Edwards, Evans, Ewer, Farrington, Foster, Fuller, Gill, Hall, Hanson, B. B.; Hanson, H. L.; Hanson, P. K.; Harriman, Hawes, Haynes, Henley, Hewes, Hichens, Hinds, Hodgkins, Hoover, Humphrey, Immonen, Jannelle, Kyes, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Littlefield, Lycette, Maddox, McMan, McNally, Meisner, Miliano, Mosher, Noyes, Pendergast, Philbrook, Pike, Porter, Prince, Quimby, Quinn, Rackliff, Richardson, G. A.; Richardson, H. L.; Rideout, Robertson, Robinson, Ross, Sahagian, Scott, C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Shute, Snow P. J.; Snowe, P.; Soulas, Susi, Tanguay, Thompson, Townsend, Trask, Waltz, Watts, White, Wight, Williams, Wood, The Speaker.

NAY — Bedard, Belanger, Beliveau, Berman, Bernard, Binnette, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Bradstreet, Brennan, Burnham, Carey, Carrier, Carroll, Carswell, Champagne, Conley, Cottrell, Couture, Crommett, Curran, D'Alfonso, Danton, Drigotas, Dudley, Eustis, Fecteau, Fortier, Fraser, Gaudreau, Gauthier, Giroux, Harnois, Harvey, Healy, Hennessey, Huber, Hunter, Jalbert, Jameson, Keyte, Kilroy, Lebel, Levesque, Martin, Minkowsky, Nadeau, J. F. R.; Nadeau, N. L.; Rocheleau, Sawyer, Scribner, Starbird, Sullivan, Truman, Wheeler.

ABSENT — Jewell, Payson, Roy.

Yes, 92; No, 55; Absent, 3.

The SPEAKER: Ninety-two having voted in the affirmative and fifty-five in the negative, the Bill fails of enactment.

Sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will now call your attention to Supplement No. 3.

Committee of Conference Report

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act Providing for a Tax on Real Estate Transfers" (H. P. 1143) (L. D. 1627) reporting that the House recede

from passage to be engrossed and recede from adoption of House Amendment "A"; that the House indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A", adopt Conference Committee Amendment "A", submitted herewith, and pass the Bill to be engrossed as amended by Conference Committee Amendment "A"; that the Senate recede from passage to be engrossed, adopt Conference Committee Amendment "A" and pass the Bill to be engrossed as amended by Conference Committee Amendment "A" (Signed)

HANSON of Gardiner
BELIVEAU of Rumford
QUINN of Bangor

—Committee on part of House

MILLS of Franklin
YOUNG of Hancock

GIRARD of Androscoggin

—Committee on part of Senate.

Report was read and accepted.

Thereupon, the House voted to recede from passage to be engrossed and from adoption of House Amendment "A". House Amendment "A" was indefinitely postponed.

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

CONFERENCE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1143, L. D. 1627, Bill, "An Act Providing for a Tax on Real Estate Transfers."

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

'Sec. 1. R. S., T. 36, c. 12, additional. Title 36 of the Revised Statutes is amended by adding a new chapter 712, to read as follows:

CHAPTER 712

REAL ESTATE TRANSFERS

§ 4641. Definitions

1. Consideration. "Consideration" means the total price or amount paid, or required to be paid, for real property valued in money, whether received in money or otherwise; and shall include the amount of any mortgages, liens or encumbrances thereon.

2. Deed. "Deed" means a written instrument whereby the grantor conveys to the grantee title in whole or in part to real property.

§ 4642. Rate of tax

There is imposed a tax upon the transfer of title to real property, at the rate of \$1 for consideration between \$251 and \$500 and 55c for each \$500 or fraction thereof above \$500. The grantee shall be liable for payment of such tax.

§ 4643. Collection

When any deed is offered for recordation, the register of deeds shall ascertain and compute the amount of tax due thereon and shall collect such amount as prerequisite to the acceptance of the deed for recordation.

The amount of tax shall be computed on the consideration for the deed and shall be stamped by the register on the deed.

Each register of deeds shall, on or before the 10th day of each month, pay over to the Treasurer of State 90% of tax collected during the previous month. The remaining 10% shall be retained for the county by the register of deeds and accounted for to the county treasurer as reimbursement for services rendered by the county in collecting the tax.

§ 4644. Exemptions

1. Exemptions. The following deeds shall be exempt from the tax imposed by this chapter:

A. Deeds to property acquired by or from the United States of America, the State of Maine or any of their instrumentalities, agencies or subdivisions;

B. Mortgage deeds and discharges of mortgage deeds;

C. Deeds of partition;

D. Deeds made pursuant to mergers of corporations;

E. Deeds made by a subsidiary corporation to its parent corporation for no consideration other than the cancellation or surrender of the subsidiary's stock.

Sec. 2. Effective date. This Act shall become effective on January 1, 1968 except as to deeds acknowl-

edged or recorded prior to that date.'

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

The following paper from the Senate appearing on Supplement No. 2:

The following Communication:

THE SENATE OF MAINE
Augusta, Maine

June 28, 1967

Honorable Bertha W. Johnson
Clerk of the House
103rd Legislature
Madam:

The Governor having returned to the Senate: Bill, "An Act relating to Election of School Board of City of Old Town" (S. P. 352) (L. D. 936) together with his objections to the same, the Senate proceeded to vote on the question:

"Shall the Bill become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor?"

A yea and nay vote was taken; six members voting in the affirmative and twenty-seven in the negative, the Bill accordingly failed to become law, and the veto was sustained.

Respectfully,

(Signed)

JERROLD B. SPEERS
Secretary of the Senate

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am sorry that certain actions of this House last Friday stopped the reconsideration of this bill and thus forced a gubernatorial veto on this local issue. The sponsor had agreed to try to find a method of compromise and still have a referendum question. I also am sorry that in the very beginning, partisanship cropped up on this issue; at no

time did this color my reasoning. I sincerely believe that School Boards should be elected at large rather than by wards, and in only five of our twenty-one cities in the State of Maine are they elected by wards. However, since we couldn't reconsider last Friday in the normal course of events and since the Governor has now seen fit to veto this bill, I feel that it is only fair and in the spirit of good sportsmanship that when this question is put, "Shall this bill become law notwithstanding the Governor's veto?" that the members of my party vote no and that we do sustain the Governor's veto.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that this matter has already been taken care of by the upper body.

Mr. Levesque of Madawaska was then granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In regards to this document that has now been placed on file, having been sustained by the other branch, it has been the feeling of the Minority Party that this could very well have been done as had been indicated to us that the amendment was to be offered in the other branch prior to its final enactment. Somehow or other, something happened at the last moment that there was either a change of mind or a change of heart or that those that were in opposition to this bill had gone too far and could not backtrack enough to see fit to put the amendment before its final enactment. It's quite unfortunate that last Friday when the motion was for recalling this document, that because of the implication of other matters that came along with this same document that it was not recalled, although this is probably academic at this time. But the . . . were still on the sponsors to try by partisan means of getting this document on the Governor's desk before having the availability of offering a referendum on this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now calls your attention to your Supplement No. 1, tabled and later to-

day assigned items numbers 11 through 40, on pages five through ten of today's House Advance Journal and Calendar.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland, items 11 through 40 were tabled until later in today's session.

The Chair then laid before the House item 41, tabled and later today assigned by Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston pending passage to be engrossed:

Bill "An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Sixteen Million Eight Hundred Thousand Dollars on Behalf of the State of Maine to Build State Highways," House Paper 1174, L. D. 1673.

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

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "B" to H. P. 1174, L. D. 1673, Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Sixteen Million Eight Hundred Thousand Dollars on Behalf of the State of Maine to Build State Highways."

Amend said Bill in the Title by striking out the words "Sixteen Million Eight Hundred Thousand Dollars" and inserting in place thereof the words "Twelve Million Eight Hundred Thousand Dollars"

Further amend said Bill in section 1 by striking out in the first line (same in L. D. 1673) the underlined figure "\$16,800,000" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure '\$12,800,000' and by striking out in the 6th line (5th line in L. D. 1673) the figure "\$16,800,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure '\$12,800,000'

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of the 2nd paragraph of the referendum (same in L. D. 1673) and inserting in place thereof the following:

"(Shall a bond issue be ratified for the purposes set forth in 'An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Twelve Million Eight Hundred Thousand Dollars on Behalf of the State of Maine to Build State Highways', passed by the 103rd Legislature?")

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

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

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: On L. D. 1673, a bill calling for \$16,800,000 bond issue, this Amendment "B" that is before us now which I am talking on, will certainly deduct it by \$4 million, which is a shame. When you cut down 33% off the original amount that was asked for, it is going to cripple the Highway Department in carrying out their obligation to the people of the State of Maine.

Now, as I said before, you can't do business out of an empty cart. You can't expect to get the same treatment you are getting now from the Highway Department in regards to building our roads and taking care of them in general by a reduction of \$4 million, and I hope that you defeat this amendment.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have before us this afternoon an amendment that calls for a reduction of \$4,000,000 from a bond issue of \$16.8 million. This was arrived at by a means that they call in this game—the art of compromise. Granted, it may not do all that will be necessary or all that the Highway Commission could do, but in a democratic society such as we have the possibility of getting the complete and whole \$16.8 million is something that might not have been received by this House.

So therefore this amendment that is before us was arrived at as something that could be lived with until such time as there is a special session of the Legislature, or until such time as the next Legislature. And I only want to remind you ladies and gentlemen of this House that this is not the last legislature and it is nice to see that in some areas there is still a democratic avenue called Compromise.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would certainly wholeheartedly agree with the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque, and looking upon my extreme right I notice that the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson was listening to his remarks very intently. I hope that both will now give me their ears.

This is what you call a quick and sound and solid compromise. Some of us who feel that the estimates were not proper could easily raise the estimates—they will be raised. There are those who wanted to have \$16.8 million dollars; some of us told them, diplomatically of course as usual, that we wanted very definitely to cut this \$4,000,000, or else six million eight—just as clear as that. Just as clear as that board showed 92 and just as clear as that one and that one showed nothing for patchwork legislation.

That is why I offered my compromise. It was just as good, it still is as good a compromise, the amendment as presented by the gentleman from Waldoboro, Mr. Waitz, and I hope that his amendment has passage.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The Chair will order a vote. All those in favor of the adoption of House Amendment "B" will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

106 having voted in the affirmative and 23 having voted in the negative, House Amendment "B" was adopted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

On request of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland, Senate Paper 542, L. D. 1443, appearing on page ten of the House Advance Calendar under Recalled Matters was laid before the House:

Bill "An Act relating to Highway Advertising Control" (S. P. 542) (L. D. 1443) On which the

Ought Not to Pass Report of the Committee on Judiciary was accepted in both branches, and recalled from the legislative files by Joint Order (H. P. 1224)

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland, the House voted to suspend the rules and to reconsider its action of May 11 whereby it accepted the "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee on Judiciary.

Thereupon, on further motion of the same gentleman, the Bill was substituted for the "Ought not to pass" Report in non-concurrence and the Bill was read twice.

Mr. Richardson of Cumberland then offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 542, L. D. 1443, Bill, "An Act Relating to Highway Advertising Control."

Amend said Bill by striking out all of the Title and inserting in place thereof the following: 'An Act to Prohibit the Erection of Certain Advertising Devices.'

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

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

Whereas, the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, Public Law 89-285, declares the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays and devices in areas adjacent to the Interstate and Primary Highway Systems should be controlled to protect public investment, promote safety and preserve natural beauty; and

Whereas, the Act provides that each state shall have effective control on or before January 1, 1968 or be penalized by loss of federal aid; and

Whereas, Congress is considering revision of the Federal Act and has temporarily suspended the penalty clause in the Act; and

Whereas, any legislation we now enact for effective control may create hardship; and

Whereas, erection of an increased number of new advertising devices may create hardship and excessive public expense if said devices are subsequently removed; and

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

R. S., T. 32, § 2765, additional. Title 32 of the Revised Statutes is amended by adding a new section 2765, to read as follows:

§ 2765. **Moratorium on new outdoor advertising signs**

1. Legislative purpose. It is declared to be the purpose of the Legislature to place the State in a position to receive its full and just share of Federal-Aid Highway Funds to be apportioned by Congress and to this end control the existing and future use and maintenance of advertising devices in areas adjacent to the Interstate and Primary Highways in order to promote the public investment; to promote the safety and recreational value of public travel; to broaden the economic well-being and general welfare; to preserve and enhance the natural scenic beauty; and to afford the Legislature the opportunity to consider legislation to control advertising devices at its next special session or next regular session, whichever comes first, which will comply with national criteria without incurring additional and unnecessary expense to the State by prohibiting the erection of new advertising devices in the interim, since compensation may have to be paid for the removal of such advertising in order to comply with said national criteria.

2. Advertising devices prohibited. No outdoor advertising structure, device or display, authorized under sections 2751 to 2764 shall be erected and maintained within 660 feet of the nearest right-of-way boundary line of any portion of the primary highway system, except as follows:

A. Those lawfully in existence and erected on the effective date of this Act.

B. Directional and other official signs or notices erected and maintained by the State Highway Commission for the purpose of directing the movement of or control of traffic or intended to provide for the safety of persons using such highways.

C. On-premise signs as described or defined in section 2762, subsection 2.

D. Advertising signs located in areas zoned industrial or commercial under authority of and in accordance with applicable laws.

E. Advertising signs located in the compact or built-up section of any town or city.

3. Penalty. Any person, firm or corporation violating this Act shall be subject to the penalty provided in section 2764.

4. Expiration of Act. This Act shall be and remain in force and effect until September 1, 1969 unless repealed. Any portion of sections 2751 to 2762 as they apply to the erection of new advertising devices described in subsection 2 which are inconsistent with this Act shall be temporarily suspended for the duration of this Act. Upon the expiration of this Act, all such provisions shall again become of full force and effect unless repealed or amended prior to said date.

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

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In 1965 the Congress passed the Highway Beautification Act, which had been sponsored very enthusiastically by Mrs. Johnson, the wife of the President. The purpose of this bill was to control outdoor advertising and regulate junkyards. The State of Maine in the last session of the Legislature attempted to comply with the federal law which I can assure you is the most confusing maze of legal

intricacy I have ever waddled into. After wrestling with this problem, the Judiciary Committee of the 102nd Legislature decided that this would be the appropriate subject of a study. A committee was appointed including interests from the billboard industry, the general public, garden clubs and so forth.

We studied and worked on this program, trying to figure out legislation that would bring Maine in line with the federal law. We were unsuccessful in doing so because the law itself is in a state of flux, its funding is an uncertain debt at best—there is a full scale review going on or has been suggested, certainly it has been started in Washington under the chairmanship of Congressman Kluczynski of Illinois.

Our problem at the present time, ladies and gentlemen, is that while we don't want to try to bring our law into compliance with the federal law because we really don't know what the federal law is finally going to require, and neither does any other state. I believe in your committee, this committee's membership was non-partisan, or bipartisan I should say, and which worked very hard, we believe that we should declare a moratorium on billboard construction in certain areas. Now the representatives of the billboard interests are here, their lobbyists are here. I told them that I would be happy to sit down with them and discuss this, prior to the time of bringing this up. Now since I've not had an opportunity to do so, I am going to ask some member of the House to table this at this point. I would commend to your attention the idea of a moratorium. I hope that regardless of your political affiliation and the many battles that have separated us, you will in the last analysis join in an effort to enact a moratorium on billboard construction, which if we fail to do could well involve the State of Maine in hundreds of thousands of dollars of condemnation costs for billboards built during the interim period. Thank you.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Ross of Bath, tabled pending the

adoption of House Amendment "A" and tomorrow assigned.

(Off Record Remarks)

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

Mr. HENNESSEY: Mr. Speaker, I would inquire if the House is in possession of Senate Paper 371, L. D. 984?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would answer in the affirmative.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Hennessey of Bath, the House voted to suspend the rules and to reconsider its action of June 1 whereby the Leave to Withdraw Report was accepted.

On further motion of the same gentleman, the Bill was substituted for the Report in non-concurrence and the Bill read twice.

Mr. Hennessey of West Bath offered House Amendment "B" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "B" to S. P. 371, L. D. 984, Bill, "An Act to Authorize Bond Issue in Amount of One Million One Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars for Construction at Pineland Hospital and Training Center and of Regional Care Facilities for the Severely Mentally Retarded at Bangor."

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

'An Act to Authorize Bond Issue in Amount of Three Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars for Construction of a Regional Care Facility for the Severely Mentally Retarded at Bangor.'

Further amend said Bill in the 4th and 5th lines (same in L. D. 984) by striking out the words "at Pineland Hospital and Training Center and of Regional Care Facilities" and inserting in place thereof the words 'of a Regional Care Facility'

Further amend said Bill in section 1 by striking out in the 5th line (4th line in L. D. 984) the figure "\$1,150,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure '\$350,000'

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of section 6 (same

in L. D. 984) and inserting in place thereof the following:

'Sec. 6. Allocations from General Fund Bond Issue.

Department 1967-68
MENTAL HEALTH
AND CORRECTIONS,
DEPARTMENT OF

Construction of a regional care facility for severely mentally retarded persons at Bangor on state-property controlled by the Department of Mental Health and Corrections, said facility to be under the administration of said department and to be used primarily for the care of mentally retarded children of any age, including children under the age of 5 years, and to be open to any severely mentally retarded person regardless of the cause of his mental retardation. Any federal funds now available or becoming available for the purpose of matching funds, such as the funds allocated by this section, may be accepted, received and utilized by the State in connection with the funds allocated by this section and for the

purpose for which funds are allocated by this section. \$350,000'

Further amend said Bill by striking out in section 8 all of the 2nd paragraph (same in L. D. 984) and inserting in place thereof the following:

' "Shall a bond issue be ratified for the purposes set forth in 'An Act to Authorize Bond Issue in Amount of Three Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars for the Construction of a Regional Care Facility for the Severely Mentally Retarded at Bangor,' passed by the 103rd Legislature?"'

House Amendment "B" was adopted.

Under suspension of the rules, the Bill was given its third reading, passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "B" in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

On motion of Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor,

Adjourned until nine-thirty o'clock tomorrow morning.