

# 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 Fourth  
Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

**Volume II**

May 9, 1969 to June 17, 1969

KENNEBEC JOURNAL  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

**HOUSE**

Wednesday, May 21, 1969

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. John W. Meisner of Dover-Foxcroft.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

**Conference Committee Report**

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on

Bill "An Act Increasing Compensation of Members of Board of Hairdressers" (H. P. 227) (L. D. 283) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed)

ROSS of Bath

CARRIER of Westbrook

SOULAS of Bangor

—Committee on part of House.

QUINN of Penobscot

GREELEY of Waldo

DUQUETTE of York

—Committee on part of Senate.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

**Papers from the Senate**

From the Senate:

Bill "An Act Creating Oxford County Commissioner Districts" (S. P. 462) (L. D. 1525)

Came from the Senate referred to the Committee on Towns and Counties.

In the House, referred to the Committee on Towns and Counties in concurrence.

**Ought to Pass in New Draft  
New Draft Printed**

Report of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to Retirement of Justices of the Supreme Judicial and Superior Courts and Judges of the District Court" (S. P. 155) (L. D. 532) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 461) (L. D. 1515) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

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

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

the New Draft read twice and tomorrow assigned.

**Ought to Pass  
Amended in Senate**

Report of the Committee on State Government reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act Creating an Administrative Assistant to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court" (S. P. 369) (L. D. 1282)

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

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence and the Bill read twice. Senate Amendment "A" (S-165) was read by the Clerk and adopted in concurrence, and tomorrow assigned for third reading of the Bill.

**Ought to Pass with  
Committee Amendment  
Tabled and Assigned**

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act Providing a Bond Issue in the Amount of One Hundred Seventy-Five Thousand Dollars for Docking Facilities at Matinicus Island" (S. P. 374) (L. D. 1284) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

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

In the House, the Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Temple of Portland, tabled pending acceptance in concurrence and specially assigned for tomorrow.)

Report of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to the Statute of Limitations for the Malpractice of Physicians" (S. P. 85) (L. D. 279) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted, Committee Amendment "A" adopted, and the Bill indefinitely postponed.

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence and the Bill read twice. Committee Amendment "A" (S-153) was read by the Clerk and adopted in concurrence, and tomorrow assigned for third reading of the Bill.

#### Divided Report

Report "A" of the Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act to Create the Mountain Resorts Airport Authority" (S. P. 368) (L. D. 1281) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. BELIVEAU of Oxford  
— of the Senate.  
Messrs. RIDEOUT of Manchester  
D'ALFONSO of Portland  
Miss WATSON of Bath  
Mr. DENNETT of Kittery  
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WYMAN of Washington  
LETOURNEAU of York  
— of the Senate.  
Messrs. MARSTALLER  
of Freeport  
DONAGHY of Lubec  
STARBIRD  
of Kingman Township  
— of the House.

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

In the House: Reports were read. On motion of Mr. Dennett of Kittery, Report "A" "Ought to pass" was accepted in concurrence.

The Bill was then given its two several readings.

Committee Amendment "A" (S-129) was read by the Clerk and adopted. Senate Amendment "B" (S-163) was read by the Clerk and adopted in concurrence and the Bill assigned for third reading tomorrow.

#### Non-Concurrent Matter Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act Revising the Maine Mining Law" (H. P. 339) (L. D.

448) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on May 16.

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

In the House: On motion of Mr. Lund of Augusta, tabled pending further consideration and specially assigned for tomorrow.

#### Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Contracts for Support" (H. P. 863) (L. D. 1105) on which the House accepted the Minority Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and passed the Bill to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" on May 13.

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

In the House: On motion of Mr. Lund of Augusta, the House voted to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

#### Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Providing a Bond Issue in the Amount of Two Hundred and Thirteen Thousand Dollars for Construction of Necessary Added Facilities at Camp Waban, York County" (H. P. 949) (L. D. 1227) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on May 16.

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

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

#### Non-Concurrent Matter

Majority Report of the Committee on Liquor Control on Bill "An Act Providing for Fines in Lieu of Suspensions under Liquor Laws" (H. P. 778) (L. D. 1011) reporting same in a new draft (H. P. 1197) (L. D. 1518) under title of "An Act relating to Application for Class A Restaurant Liquor License" and that it "Ought to pass", and Minority Report reporting "Ought not to pass" on which the House accepted the Minority Report on May 16.

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted and the Bill Passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede and concur.

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

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

Mr. HICHENS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is with a feeling of reluctance that I rise in opposition to this motion this morning, mainly because of the germaneness of this bill to the original bill. In L. D. 1011, the original bill, the title was "Providing for Fines in Lieu of Suspensions under Liquor Laws." In the redraft 1518 it was "relating to Application for Class A Restaurant Liquor License," which is not related in any sense or manner. I would move now, because of an omnibus bill which an amendment can be put on, that we adhere to our former action.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, that the House recede from its former action and concur with the Senate.

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

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think that it is only fitting and proper that the House have some explanation of what this is all about.

This bill, as reported in its new draft, would simply wipe out the 90-day waiting period for licenses for Class A restaurants. This matter was thoroughly discussed in the Legislative Research Subcommittee on Liquor Control. It was felt at the time that the law as it presently stands is a deterrent to investments of large sums in the State of Maine where it has been proposed that restaurants, motels with restaurants attached, and this sort of thing which caters to the

vast and great tourist industry of the State of Maine, that these people have been severely hurt and they have been reluctant to invest their money where they had to wait 90 days for these licenses.

So consequently in this omnibus bill to which Mr. Hichens, the gentleman from Eliot, refers, this was contained therein. But apparently the Committee on Liquor Control, or at least the majority of the Committee, felt that this should be taken out and passed as a separate item. Agreed they used a vehicle whose title really has no direct implication to this bill, but it was a vehicle and under our rules it is permissible. I think that this bill is a very necessary bill in the State of Maine to help the tourist industry, and it does nothing actually to enhance the liquor traffic.

I would hope that you might go along with my motion to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The Chair will order a vote. All in favor of receding from our former action and concurring with the Senate will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

91 having voted in the affirmative and 26 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

Thereupon, the New Draft was given its two several readings and tomorrow assigned for third reading.

#### Messages and Documents

The following Communication:

THE SENATE OF MAINE

Augusta

May 20, 1969

The Honorable Bertha W. Johnson  
Clerk of the  
House of Representatives  
104th Legislature  
Augusta, Maine  
Dear Madam Clerk:

The Senate today has voted to Insist and join in a Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two Branches of the Legislature on Resolve, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution To Provide for Temporary Assignments of Justices of the Superior Court to the Supreme Judicial Court. (S. P. 171) (L. D. 545).

Respectfully,  
 (Signed) JERROLD B. SPEERS  
 Secretary of the Senate  
 The Communication was read  
 and ordered placed on file.

The following Communication:  
 THE SENATE OF MAINE  
 Augusta

May 20, 1969

The Honorable Bertha W. Johnson  
 Clerk of the  
 House of Representatives  
 104th Legislature  
 Augusta, Maine

Dear Madam Clerk:

The Senate has voted to Insist  
 and join in a Committee of Con-  
 ference on the disagreeing action  
 of the two Branches of the Legisla-  
 ture on Bill, An Act Relating to  
 Installation of Sprinkler Systems  
 in Hotels. (H. P. 260) (L. D. 336).

Respectfully,  
 (Signed) JERROLD B. SPEERS  
 Secretary of the Senate

The Communication was read  
 and ordered placed on file.

#### Orders

On motion of Mrs. Lincoln of  
 Bethel, it was

ORDERED, that the Sergeant-at-  
 Arms, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms,  
 Pages and Doorkeeper be permitted  
 to appear on the floor of the House  
 with their coats removed, today or  
 any other day for the remainder  
 of this session.

On motion of Mrs. Boudreau of  
 Portland, it was

ORDERED, that the gentlemen  
 of the House are hereby given per-  
 mission to remove their coats if  
 they so desire, and the Speaker of  
 the House is also hereby permitted  
 to wear clothes appropriate to the  
 weather, today or any other day for  
 the remainder of this session.

On motion of Mr. Hewes of Cape  
 Elizabeth, it was

ORDERED, that William J. Bru-  
 nelle of Cape Elizabeth be ap-  
 pointed to serve as Honorary Page  
 for today.

#### House Reports of Committees Leave to Withdraw

Mr. Ross from the Committee  
 on Taxation on Bill "An Act relat-  
 ing to Property Tax Exemption of  
 Benevolent and Charitable Cor-

porations" (H. P. 125) (L. D. 141)  
 reported Leave to Withdraw.

Mr. Susi from same Committee  
 reported same on Bill "An Act  
 Providing for the Taxation and  
 Preservation of Farm, Forest and  
 Open Space Land" (H. P. 840) (L.  
 D. 1078)

Reports were read and accepted  
 and sent up for concurrence.

#### Covered by Other Legislation Tabled and Assigned

Mrs. White from the Committee  
 on Taxation on Bill "An Act to Re-  
 lieve Elderly Persons from In-  
 creases in the Property Tax" (H.  
 P. 48) (L. D. 49) reported Leave  
 to Withdraw, as covered by other  
 legislation.

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Gauthier of  
 Sanford, tabled pending accept-  
 ance of Report and specially as-  
 signed for tomorrow.)

Mr. Susi from the Committee on  
 Taxation on Bill "An Act Exempt-  
 ing Water and Air Pollution Con-  
 trol Facilities from Sales and Use  
 Taxes" (H. P. 47) (L. D. 48) re-  
 ported Leave to Withdraw, as cov-  
 ered by other legislation.

Same gentleman from same Com-  
 mittee reported same on Resolve  
 Proposing an Amendment to the  
 Constitution E x e m p t i n g S n o w  
 Traveling Vehicle Fees and Taxes  
 from Limitation on Expenditure of  
 Motor Vehicle Revenues (H. P.  
 418) (L. D. 529)

Reports were read and accepted  
 and sent up for concurrence.

#### Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Susi from the Committee on  
 Taxation on Bill "An Act to Re-  
 lieve Certain Elderly Householders  
 from Extraordinary Property Tax  
 Burdens" (H. P. 1017) (L. D. 1325)  
 reported Leave to Withdraw, as  
 covered by other legislation.

Report was read.

(On motion of Miss Watson of  
 Bath, tabled pending acceptance  
 of Report and specially assigned  
 for tomorrow.)

#### Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Quimby from the Committee  
 on Claims reported "Ought not to  
 pass" on Resolve in Favor of Al-  
 fred Sears of Pembroke (H. P.

262) (L. D. 338) which was recommended.

Mr. Burnham from the Committee on Highways reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Allocations to the Town Road Improvement Fund" (H. P. 31) (L. D. 32)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

#### Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Berman from the Committee on Judiciary reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to Provide for the Interception of Wire and Oral Communications" (H. P. 769) (L. D. 1002)

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Hewes of Cape Elizabeth, tabled pending acceptance of the Report and specially assigned for tomorrow.)

Mr. Foster from the Committee on Judiciary reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Redemption by Owner and Sales of Tax Acquired Property" (H. P. 816) (L. D. 1055)

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Dyar of Strong, tabled pending acceptance of Report and specially assigned for tomorrow.)

Mr. Foster from the Committee on Judiciary reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Firearms Control" (H. P. 865) (L. D. 1107)

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

#### Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Meisner from the Committee on Retirements and Pensions reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve relating to Retirement Allowance for Hal G. Hoyt of Augusta (H. P. 868) (L. D. 1110)

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Meisner of Dover-Foxcroft, tabled pending acceptance of Report and specially assigned for tomorrow.)

Mr. Cottrell from the Committee on Taxation reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Imposing a Poll Tax of \$5 on Male and Female Residents between the Ages of 21 and 70 Years" (H. P. 744) (L. D. 962)

Mr. Drigotas from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Repealing Law Requiring Proof of Payment of Poll Tax before Motor Vehicle Operator's License is Issued" (H. P. 616) (L. D. 804)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Exempting Sales to Incorporated Nonprofit Bible Conferences from the Sales Tax" (H. P. 646) (L. D. 834)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

#### Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Fortier from the Committee on Taxation reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Refund for Malt Liquor Excise Taxes" (H. P. 785) (L. D. 1018) which was recommitted.

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Cote of Lewiston, tabled pending acceptance of Report and specially assigned for tomorrow.)

Mr. Ross from the Committee on Taxation reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Definition of Cigarettes under Cigarette Tax Law" (H. P. 912) (L. D. 1173)

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

#### Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Susi from the Committee on Taxation reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Excise Tax on Motor Vehicles" (H. P. 841) (L. D. 1079)

Report was read.

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

#### Covered by Other Legislation

Mr. Foster from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to Composition of Northern Cumberland Judicial District Court Division" (H. P. 436) (L. D. 560) reported "Ought not to pass," as covered by other legislation.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Permitting the Inhabitants of the Town of Jay to be Within the Jurisdiction of the Dis-

trict Court at Livermore Falls” (H. P. 895) (L. D. 1156)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

#### **Ought to Pass in New Draft New Drafts Printed**

Mr. Chick from the Committee on Education on Bill “An Act relating to Election of Trustees of Maine Central Institute” (H. P. 986) (L. D. 1270) which was re-committed, reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1202) (L. D. 1529) under title of “An Act relating to Approval of Secondary Schools” and that it “Ought to pass”

Report was read and accepted, the New Draft read twice and tomorrow assigned

#### **Tabled and Assigned**

Mr. Carrier from the Committee on Health and Institutional Services on Bill “An Act Closing the Military and Naval Children’s Home and Disposing of the Property” (H. P. 757) (L. D. 977) which was re-committed, reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1203) (L. D. 1530) under title of “An Act relating to the Military and Naval Children’s Home” and that it “Ought to pass”

Report was read.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I understand that this probably will be tabled. That is perfectly all right with the proponents, but before we take this action I would like to bring this body up to date with the latest developments that very few people know about.

During the House debate, the major deterring evidence was an insurance report listing a great many deficiencies. At the last public hearing in presence was the Chaplain of the Brunswick Naval Air Station, plus several Navy officers. Evidently they were very impressed because as of two weeks ago a team of skilled Navy personnel, on their own time, are now fixing up every deficiency noted, even the major ones, with the one exception of the sprinkler system, and this includes rehangng the

doors, making all the doors the suggested widths, making those to the outside swing out, installing fire resistant stairway protection, emergency lighting and so forth.

Now all of this will be done at no cost to the State, and it is being done no matter what the fate of this bill is. I bring it up now only to indicate that the suggested appropriation in the new draft, under capital expenditures, can be reduced substantially.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Bragdon of Perham, tabled pending acceptance of the Report and specially assigned for tomorrow.

Mr. Kelley from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill “An Act Increasing Resident Fish and Game License Fees” (H. P. 122) (L. D. 138) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1204) (L. D. 1531) under title of “An Act Increasing Certain Fish and Game Fines” and that it “Ought to pass”

Mr. Shaw from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill “An Act Amending the Charter of the City of Augusta” (H. P. 523) (L. D. 694) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1205) (L. D. 1532) under title of “An Act Increasing Compensation of Councilmen and Mayor of City of Augusta” and that it “Ought to pass”

Mr. Drigotas from the Committee on Taxation on Bill “An Act to Exempt Certain Paraplegic Veterans from Property Taxation” (H. P. 358) (L. D. 466) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1206) (L. D. 1533) under title of “An Act to Exempt Unremarried Widows of Certain Paraplegic Veterans from Property Taxation” and that it “Ought to pass”

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

#### **Ought to Pass Printed Bills**

Mr. Jalbert from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported “Ought to pass” on Bill “An Act to Make Allocations from Bond Issue for Construction and Equipment of Pollution Abatement Facilities” (H. P. 1187) (L. D. 1511)



Mr. Sahagian from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Appropriating Funds for the Operation of the Maine Mining Commission" (H. P. 882) (L. D. 1141)

Mr. Chick from the Committee on Education reported same on Bill "An Act to Validate Proceedings and Certain Action Taken by Baileyville School District" (H. P. 1194) (L. D. 1521)

Mr. Berman from the Committee on Judiciary reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Liability of Landowners to Operators of Snow Traveling Vehicles" (H. P. 285) (L. D. 361)

Mr. Brennan from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Admission to the Pineland Hospital and Training Center" (H. P. 550) (L. D. 729)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Revising the Short Form Deeds Act" (H. P. 556) (L. D. 737)

Reports were read and accepted, the Bills read twice and tomorrow assigned.

#### Passed to Be Engrossed

Mr. Hichens from the Committee on Liquor Control reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Liquor Bought from the State Liquor Commission for Use on Commercial Airlines" (H. P. 1186) (L. D. 1510)

Report was read and accepted and the Bill read twice. Under suspension of the rules, the Bill was read the third time, passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

By unanimous consent was ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

Mr. Cottrell from the Committee on Taxation reported "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Trial and Ratio Evidence in Appeals for Abatement of Property Taxes" (H. P. 449) (L. D. 572)

Report was read and accepted, the Bill read twice and tomorrow assigned.

#### Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment

Mr. Benson from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Tuberculosis Sanatoriums" (H.

P. 686) (L. D. 885) which was re-committed, reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Mr. Curtis from the Committee on Claims on Resolve to Reimburse Tilton Davis of Solon for Damage by Highway Construction (H. P. 264) (L. D. 340) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Mr. Quimby from same Committee on Resolve to Reimburse William E. Hodgdon of Embden for Well Damage by Highway Maintenance (H. P. 263) (L. D. 339) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Mr. Sheltra from same Committee on Resolve to Reimburse Irving M. Greenleaf of Rome for Well Damage by Highway Maintenance (H. P. 596) (L. D. 777) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Mr. Berman from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to Mandatory Discharge of Chattel Mortgages and Notes" (H. P. 929) (L. D. 1190) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Mr. Heselton from same Committee on Bill "An Act relating to the Men's and Women's Correctional Centers" (H. P. 934) (L. D. 1195) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Mr. Moreshead from same Committee on Bill "An Act Revising Certain Probate Laws" (H. P. 522) (L. D. 693) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Mr. Shaw from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Revising the Laws Relating to Boilers and Unfired Steam Pressure Vessels" (H. P. 424) (L. D. 548) reported that new draft (H. P. 1100) (L. D. 1417) under title of "An Act relating to Boilers and Unfired Steam Pressure Vessels", which had been recommitted, "Ought to pass" as amended by

Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Reports were read and accepted, the Bills read twice and the Resolves read once. Committee Amendment "A" to each was read and adopted, and tomorrow assigned for third reading of the Bills and second reading of the Resolves.

#### Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Business Legislation reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Providing for the Outlawing of Contests and Games by Establishments Selling Motor Vehicle Fuel" (H. P. 474) (L. D. 628)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. LEVINE of Kennebec  
LOGAN of York  
— of the Senate.  
Messrs. SCOTT of Presque Isle  
TRASK of Milo  
SCOTT of Wilton  
HARRIMAN of Hollis  
CLARK of Jefferson  
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee on same Bill reporting same in a new draft (H. P. 1207) (L. D. 1534) under title of "An Act Prohibiting the Conducting of Contests and Games by Retail Sellers" and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. BERRY of Cumberland  
— of the Senate.  
Messrs. GAUTHIER of Sanford  
FECTEAU of Biddeford  
— of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Scott of Wilton, the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence. (Later Reconsidered)

#### Divided Report

##### Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act Requiring all Municipalities to Become Members in a School Administrative District" (H. P. 510) (L. D. 681) reporting same in a new draft (H. P. 1208) (L. D. 1535) under title of "An Act Requiring the State Board of Education to Develop a Master Plan for School

District Organization to be Submitted to Local Referendum" and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. STUART of Cumberland  
KATZ of Kennebec  
KELLAM of Cumberland  
— of the Senate.  
Messrs. RICHARDSON

of Stonington  
ALLEN of Caribou  
MILLETT of Dixmont  
Mrs. CUMMINGS of Newport  
Mr. WAXMAN of Portland  
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. CHICK of Monmouth  
Mrs. KILROY of Portland  
— of the House.

Reports were read.

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

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House be in recess for ten minutes or until the sounding of the gong.

Thereupon, the House recessed for ten minutes.

#### After Recess

Called to order by the Speaker.

#### Third Reader

##### Failed of Engrossment

Bill "An Act Imposing an Individual and Corporate Income Tax" (H. P. 448) (L. D. 657)

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

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker, I now offer House Amendment "A" and move its adoption, and would like to speak on the amendment.

Thereupon, House Amendment "A", being L. D. 1520, was read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the same gentleman. He may proceed.

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This morning we are trying to have in the area of an amendment on the individual and corporate income tax, which has been commonly known for the last several weeks as a possible Part III or Part IIa or Part Ia or Ia-b, whatever you may have heard. This is what we would like to call Part III as the necessity of a vehicle to try to supplement some of the areas that were left out in Part II of the budget.

I have stated repeatedly, in support of this bill, that a personal income tax is the fairest method of taxation the State could provide. It is the only method of taxation that responds to the needs of our low income and elderly people. It is the only method of taxation that is productive enough to give our State the funds necessary to meet new demands and new challenges. It is the method of taxation which the Democratic Party has supported in its platform for years.

In the months since L. D. 657 was introduced, I have become more convinced than ever that enactment of a corporate and personal income tax offers the only responsible solution to the financial problems of our State. I have also remained convinced that the taxation percentages proposed in L. D. 657 were the right ones—a corporate income tax of 5% of the net income earned in Maine and a personal income tax of approximately 25% of the federal income tax obligation. This was part of the original bill which you will now find in the amendment as being changed to 9% to cover the cost of the package. Those percentages would have enabled the State to raise an additional \$114.5 million in new revenues to meet fully documented, top priority needs. They offered a comprehensive and rational taxation program which avoided patchwork revenue measures.

However, L. D. 657 was offered only as a recommendation. The way was left open for alternative measures that would raise the funds necessary to meet the State's overall needs. To the extent that alternative taxation

measures were pursued, the percentage of the personal income tax could be reduced. Such taxation measures are now close to enactment by this Legislature. They will yield the new revenue that is necessary to finance a Current Services budget of \$277 million. They permit a significant reduction in the percentage of the personal income tax, while still enabling the State to meet its many urgent responsibilities.

But it is still impossible to fix the exact percentage of personal income tax that will do the job. The Legislature has just begun to consider the Part II budget reported out by the Appropriations Committee. Despite the diligent and conscientious labors of that Committee, it is already obvious that there is considerable dissatisfaction with that Part II budget. As my colleague from Eagle Lake, Representative Martin, emphasized last week, that Part II budget simply does not go far enough. Clearly, under these circumstances this Legislature is still far from any final decision on the programs it wishes to support. As I stated at the hearing on L. D. 657 way back in March, any final decisions on the corporate and personal income taxes before we know the extent of our commitment to programs is simply putting the cart before the horse.

There is still another reason why any final action on L. D. 657 should be delayed. We have heard persistent statements that an alternative corporate income tax proposal is going to be introduced to fund most of the Part II recommendations of the Appropriations Committee. If this is so, the corporate income tax proposal found in L. D. 657 and the new proposal should be evaluated side by side. Such a comparison would certainly increase our understanding of both. Moreover I am now having amendments prepared to L. D. 657 which is before you today which would make some changes in the corporate income tax although the basic changes are only in the avenue of making a better tax to be administered.

Finally, I wish to restate my firm belief that the needs of our State require a personal income

tax, and that the personal income tax which will do the job now can be reduced significantly from 25% perhaps to an area of 8% to 10%. In the amendment presented this morning the figure was arrived at at 9%. I am convinced that such a tax would enable us to fund most of the programs that have been cut out of the Part II budget. Some adjustments in the recommended scope of some Part II programs would have to be made, but these adjustments would be far preferable to the wholesale elimination that now threatens so many areas of our State's growth and welfare.

We have reached the critical period of this Legislature's deliberations. We have come too far to allow our efforts to be compromised by hasty action on so fundamental a proposal as L.D. 657. Let us take a long, hard look at the programs that have been cut out of the supplemental budget. Let us give the people a chance to see the issues clearly drawn and to tell us the services they want and the price they are willing to pay for them. Then the only thing we must do, we should try to use the vehicle of a personal and corporate income tax as a possible means of arriving at an agreement in the very near future as to what the final Part II will be.

I hope that between the ranks of the Democrats and Republicans in the House this morning this will not be taken in the light that I am proposing it as a Democrat and the House Minority Floor Leader, that we would like this to be a strictly Democratic program. I think I have indicated to the members of the House from the outset of the Legislature that we were here as responsible members and we would like to see the fiscal problems of the State of Maine taken care of. I hope we can do this constructively and jointly between the House Democrats, the House Republicans, and also the same for the other branch. This is not a final or last offer. This is an offer that we hope that we can sit in the weeks to come, that we may be able to arrive at a fair compromise as to what we think

the needs are going to be and if this is going to open the door for joint discussions between the Republican leadership and the Democratic leadership, that we can put a package together and find ways and means of financing this package, then the intent of this amendment is exactly for that purpose.

After I have sat down I will have a few members that have some statements to say in the areas that are covered in this document, and the areas that are covered in this document are the Department of Economic Development, the department or a new area of Housing, Human Rights, Law Enforcement, Property Tax, Tax Relief for the Aged, Welfare, ADC, Unemployed Fathers, Medicaid, Food Programs, Indians, Mental Health and Retardation, the University of Maine, State Employees' pay adjustment for a forty-hour week, Retirement and part of the Educational Subsidies. We hope that you will listen attentively and you can follow this in the legislative document or the amended 1520 and you will find out the exact amount. I will not go in detail as to what the exact amounts are but you can follow that in the amendment much closer than I would be able to explain to you in detail.

So this is primarily our part of the operation or the offering of our plan in trying to make State Government an effective and good ways and means of operating for the next two fiscal years. I might add a final note that the purpose of the amendment will be effective for the second year of the biennium and the tax measure will also become effective for the first of January 1970, thereby giving us a one and one-half year of raising this kind of money to pay for the budget. I thank you very kindly for your indulgence and now the other speakers will explain the different parts of the program. Thank you.

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

Mr. FAUCHER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: "Last Thursday I had distributed in the House and Senate copies of

a newspaper article from the Boston Herald on the stepped-up campaign Massachusetts is conducting to promote tourism there.

I am greatly concerned over the fact that \$130,000 was trimmed from the Department of Economic Development's budget by the Appropriation Committee. If this cut is allowed to stand, the Department will be forced to reduce its advertising and promotion activities, especially in the field of vacation travel.

The cut in the Part I budget is the result of an incorrect assumption that it would be possible for DED to place its own advertising. This involves a misunderstanding of the advertising business. Agency fees come out of the total advertising costs. It is not an added payment.

If these cuts remain, I have been told the DED will have to seriously consider things such as closing our Montreal promotion office, and our New York City office because the rents in both places are going up \$700 or \$800 each.

Space rates keep going up in magazines and newspapers. Last year the total number of inquiries from space advertising in magazines and newspapers was 153,892. This year, as of the end of the first week in May, we had 97,840 inquiries, and we are more than 30,000 inquiries ahead of last year at this time.

The competition for the tourist dollar increases year by year. In 1927 Maine was the first state to spend tax dollars in promoting and advertising its natural resources, its recreational assets.

Last year 49 states spent more than \$30 million in advertising, plus many more millions in promotion in an attempt to lure the vacationer to their many resort areas.

According to a national publication, Development Advertising Reports, for the same period — 27 states spent more than Maine; 38 states put more money into industrial advertising than Maine; 8 of these states spent more for advertising of industrial development than they did for vacation travel;

8 of these states spent more than half a million dollars and Texas and Hawaii each spent more than a million dollars. If the \$65,000 cut in our general operating budget is imposed on DED, this department would drop from 27th to about 38th in the nation.

It is a rule of thumb in the advertising business that for every dollar spent, \$100 is returned in revenue as a result of this advertising.

Without trying to sound too many alarm bells but wanting everyone here to recognize the importance of the recreation dollar to our State and the need for a restoration of the \$130,000 in the DED budget, I urge you members of this House to support the Part III budget proposal in its entirety.

It's common sense, it's good business, and it's going to make the difference between a good hard-hitting campaign for the tourist dollar or a watered-down effort that might just as well be forgotten. Thank you.

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

Mr. MARQUIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise to speak on behalf of the proposal to fund a State Housing Authority, a proposal which deserves the most serious and sympathetic attention of every legislator.

Maine needs new housing, in volume. In the last census 61,000 of Maine's 365,000 housing units were reported to be in deteriorating condition, and nearly 20,000 of them were termed dilapidated. Any one who has driven on Maine's back roads, or, for that matter, many of its major roads, knows what these figures mean in terms of inadequate, unsafe shelters. We in Maine must join in the effort which the Nation now realizes is necessary to remedy these dismal statistics.

The fact that only twelve of Maine's 450 municipalities have Housing Authorities indicates that the financial and human resources of our overstrained local governments cannot make this complex effort alone. They need the co-

ordinated, State-level assistance which the State Housing Authority proposed by L. D.'s 1219 and 1315 will provide.

This proposed State Housing Authority would establish a five-man commission with a fifteen member advisory board and an executive officer. The budget proposed would cover the year and a half during which the bill would be effective during the next biennium. It will also serve as a clearing house for housing information and provide technical assistance and coordination as well as additional financing where a local Housing Authority already exists. I could also sponsor housing projects. In addition, the authority will increase availability of mortgage funds by purchasing mortgages from banks.

Assuming passage of L. D. 1315 and voter ratification of the attendant constitutional provision, the Authority will begin a far-reaching program of mortgage and loan guarantees designed to assure an adequate supply of decent housing both for present Maine citizens and for those who may move, with industry or on their own, to Maine in the future.

The proposed housing legislation has the support of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Housing, a non-partisan group composed of representatives of all those concerned with housing in Maine. It has the support of representatives of the banking industry, the building industry, and, most importantly, of many citizens who would like to see the housing opportunities of the State of Maine increased.

In short, this bill deserves not merely token backing from this Legislature but financial support as well. If such support is forthcoming, I can assure my fellow legislators that they will have made a sound, urgently needed investment in the future of our state.

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

Mr. SANTORO: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise today to speak about Medicaid, a supplement to Medicare, and about the medically indigent in this State who are crying for

help. As you know, Medicare does not take care of people who have not reached the age of 65, even if such people are totally disabled and receiving Social Security. Besides, Medicare does not pay for use of drugs and other medical implements. That is where Medicaid comes in. We need Medicaid in this State and we need it badly. As of now we have from 40 to 50 thousand State Aid cases who are actually receiving all medical care from Medicaid to Medicare, and if they are over 65 they are now receiving drugs.

We have a group of families with an income of between \$1600 and \$3,000 a year, and here we found the major number of medical indigents and the group probably totals some 70 to 80 thousand people in this State who don't receive any assistance at all and are trying to get by on what they have. Another group of medical indigents is the so-called categorically related to State Assistance, such as ones receiving Aid to the Blind, Aid to the Disabled, Old Age Assistance, etc. This group forms another group totaling somewhere from 20 to 30 thousand people in this State and they need Medicaid to help themselves out.

In my own private practice I come across a lot of cases where people have to have a medical call paid either by the State or by Medicare, but doesn't have a cent to buy medicine, and often have come back to the office in worst condition than when they came in in the first place. Not from my fault that I overlooked their symptoms but just because they couldn't buy the medicine to take care of themselves.

I had one woman for instance that came in with a cold, I left the prescription for antibiotics, she went home and never spent money for the prescription because she didn't have any. She came down three days later with pneumonia, she landed in the hospital, it cost the State two weeks in the hospital which amounted to something like \$500 or \$600. Now there is another case of phlebitis. This woman could not buy the medicine, she landed up in the hospital, another two

weeks, three weeks of hospitalization paid by the State.

I can go on and on through these cases, but I don't want to bother you. The only thing I want to stress to you, the point, we cannot leave our people in need, any assistance barely gives them Medicaid. The medically indigent have worked hard when they could work and now because of disability, sickness and old age cannot fully take care of themselves. It takes only one big sickness to spend all the savings that one has put away. Many of these people are respectable citizens, living in a respectable community with a decent home and take care of themselves all the time. But one big disaster, medically speaking, strikes them and they are put out of business.

Recent survey at the Health Department shows no increase on payment on medical bills for the last three years; only there has been a rise in the cost of hospital beds and out-patient department costs. I will assure you that there will not be an increase in any medical costs if this bill is passed. If the State does not begin to face this program now, you will be faced with a vastly increased total cost in the program later. Meanwhile our medically indigent, our needy people, will suffer unnecessarily. Failure to act now at all will jeopardize all federal subsidies for welfare programs.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. McTeague.

Mr. McTEAGUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Of all the programs which will be discussed this morning, the area of human rights does not involve the most money—it only involves directly probably about one percent of our population. But I think you can truly say that it involves morality and justice more than any other program that will come before our Legislature. I had the advantage of a prepared statement before this morning, but I will try to be more brief and direct from the heart.

Although Maine has only about one percent of its citizens who are non-white and although Maine cer-

tainly suffers to a very much lesser extent from the plague of discrimination and prejudice than most other states, we are not perfect and do have needs in this area.

In testimony of the various witnesses before the State Government Committee on the Human Rights bill, the case of some of the witnesses was very moving and the case of some of the witnesses that spoke from my area in Brunswick and the surrounding area was a bit frightening to me. We do suffer to some extent from discrimination and we all suffer from it, not only the minority groups which are discriminated against.

America and the State of Maine have long been and have been proud of being described as melting pots, each man to be judged on his own merits and each man had an opportunity to advance, and where the goal of most of our people was their integration to full American life.

We have fairly well obtained these goals in the case of almost all of our citizens, except the Negro and Indian minorities. The bill follows grounds that have been laid out before in the areas of public accommodations, Fair Housing, and fair employment. The bill is definitely bipartisan in nature. There were two bills almost identically sponsored, one by Senator Mills, one by myself.

I very deeply hope that all of us in this Legislature, the majority party being the party of Abraham Lincoln and the minority party the party of Jack Kennedy, that we all can come together and pass the Human Rights bill which is suited to our State. It will cost some money; it may not cost as much as was originally requested. It is important and it is a moral issue.

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

Mr. BRENNAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I will be very brief and I won't use all my prepared remarks. In regard to the law enforcement planning and assistance agency, a bill that would cover

this matter came out of State Government just a few days ago with a unanimous "Ought to pass" Report. Mr. Levesque's amendment would provide the money to put this bill into action. There is a great deal of talk about law and order throughout the country and I think a bill like this could be helpful in resolving some of the problems.

The Federal Government has recognized this problem and has given top priority to law and order. Through the Omnibus Crime Control Act and Safe Streets Act of 1968, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968, etcetera. Basically if you want to do something about law and order instead of just talking about it, I urge you to support this amendment which would fund a bill which would provide for some comprehensive and meaningful planning so that something meaningful could be done.

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

Mr. FORTIER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I deplore very much the fact that the establishment of the Bureau of Taxation with its assessment district has to be discussed in the shadow of an appropriation bill, which of course is never a favorable position. But I feel nevertheless that the urgency of this part of the bill is such that we should at least make note of the need for this Bureau of Taxation.

Most of us here at some time or other cherish local town government. We have cherished this as truly government of the people, by the people, and for the people. I have worked most of my adult life to defend the prestige and to protect the independence of this last vestige of grass root government. But I am interceding with you ladies and gentlemen here this morning to help our town governments, to help our grass root government; not to destroy it, not to annihilate it—but to help guarantee its survival and to protect it mainly from being engulfed by paternalism and socialism.

As you all know, practically the only source of income for our municipalities today is the property tax. In this the Federal and the State have continuously eroded this tax base, through government acquired land, through exemption of charitable, benevolent, educational and religious institutions. Even this 104th Legislature has not been entirely without blame. It has already approved a situation where one citizen gets a \$55 exemption, under the same condition and in the same situation another taxpayer gets an exemption of \$14,000 as against \$55.

There has been or will be four different bills introduced in this Legislature which have to do with either the acquisition or the operation of automobiles. Of these, three affected the income to the State. One affected the income to the municipalities. The three by which the State will benefit are being reported "ought to pass." The fourth, which would benefit our municipalities, again is being reported "ought not to pass."

We know that there are hundreds of millions of dollars worth of assets in this state that are not being taxed. There are many more millions that are being undertaxed. Oh, if it were necessary I could cite you specific cases all day long, but I think you are just as aware of this situation as I am.

I am not accusing the local assessors of being remiss in their jobs. They are all hard-working, honest men and women, and they are doing a very ungrateful job; but we are asking the impossible of them. We are taking the ordinary citizens in our small communities, asking them to assess our complex industrial establishments, to assess conglomerates, we are asking laymen to do the work of professionals.

So consequently all I am asking of you today is a helping hand, that the State may help these communities to select, to train and to guide, to establish guideline for the assessment of this taxable property.

This could be done in several ways; this appropriation bill is one of them. Another one would be L. D. 1340 which will shortly be pre-



sented to you with a very well-studied amendment, which is now in the process of being written.

Another thing that I would like you to realize is the fact that the appropriations required for the establishment of this Bureau of Property Taxation would indeed be very picayune if some day our property tax assessment broke down through a revolt of the taxpayer who is now fed up to the ears.

Ladies and gentlemen, I only ask you before the adjournment of this Legislature, please give kind consideration to giving a helping hand to our municipalities through providing for the Bureau of Property Taxation and Assessment Districts.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Bath, Miss Watson.

Miss WATSON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: One of the single most important tasks facing this Legislature is the enactment of legislation to relieve elderly householders from extraordinary property tax burdens. For too long we have asked our senior citizens living on fixed incomes to bear an inordinate share of the property tax burden.

As of July 1, 1966, the Census Bureau estimated that Maine had 111,000 persons over 65 years of age. This is 11.4 per cent of the total population. We also have 6,929 families where the head of the household is 65 or over. In all, our State has the sixth highest aged population in the nation.

We have heard talk for years about doing something to help these people, but we have seen little action. There is legislation before us and provided for in Part III which would provide a state rebate directly to the property taxpayer who has reached the age of 65 and whose household income is less than \$3,000 per year, or would provide for a tax credit against any state income tax due. The amount reimbursed would depend upon the level of income and the total property tax paid. Also, those elderly persons who rent their homes would receive some relief since they, too, feel the bite of the property tax through increased rents charged by landlords.

Local governments simply do not have the financial capability to alleviate the hardship imposed on retired persons who must pay a disproportionate share of their income for property taxes. Therefore, it is the State's responsibility. If the towns are asked to bear the cost of exemptions, the local property tax base is eroded and the assessment and rate-setting processes are interfered with.

Our retired citizens have made their contribution to society and are entitled to live out their retirement years in dignity and comfort. It is grossly unfair to ask them to abandon the homes they have worked so hard for over the years simply because their property taxes are constantly rising while their incomes remain fixed, and low.

I would like to cite just one example of the terrible burden which the property tax imposes on many of our elderly citizens. I received a letter from a woman who is 86 years old and lives alone. Her income is \$55 a month, and she is paying \$246.46 per year in property taxes. This is more than one third of her entire income and leaves her with the paltry sum of \$413.54 per year or \$7.95 a week for food, medicine, heat, utilities, etcetera \$7.95 per week—how in the name of human decency can we allow such a disgraceful situation to exist? I would note that under the property tax relief program proposed in Part III, she would be reimbursed \$181.25 by the State.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I submit to you today that we have a moral obligation to enact legislation to relieve our senior citizens of this unfair burden and to take action to provide the funds necessary to implement such a program. To do less would be a shameful abdication of our responsibilities to the elderly people of this State.

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

Mrs. WHEELER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am making a general statement on Welfare. To take a responsible look at the welfare program items that are a key part of this Part III budget, I feel we have to use two val-

ues — human and fiscal. In human terms this four-part budget request attempts to meet some disturbing and almost unbelievable inequities in our welfare commitments.

I feel that we should not ignore a serious pledge that state government has made to those unfortunate persons, who have to depend on State payments to maintain a home even under substandard conditions.

To me, and the others supporting the Part III Budget, improved health and welfare programs have our highest priority. During the last several months, we have heard a great deal concerning the excessive demands that are being made upon the overburdened property tax. But nowhere is this more apparent than in some of the unusual and curious burdens which we, in Maine, have left to the local property tax in the area of health and welfare.

We have asked our towns to pay for many long-term and expensive services which, in other states, have long ago been passed on to state agencies, services which are basically financial, such as medical care, or supplements to inadequate AFDC or Aid to the Disabled grants or payments to unemployed and unemployable fathers, services which amount to 25-35% of local health and welfare expenditures.

Let me make it clear, that I am not referring to a State "take-over" of local welfare. Rather, I am referring to those long-term and costly services over which local officials have no control and little discretion. I am referring to proposals which would eliminate an unnecessary financial and administrative burden on our towns and cities, leaving them with the kind of short term and emergency problems that they are best able to handle and which can be supported by local taxes.

The proposal included in this budget will eliminate long-term medical bills (20% of local welfare costs), payments to unemployables (5-10% of local costs) and supplemental payments to persons already receiving State aid (10-15% of local costs). The total sav-

ings to local budgets could thus amount to from 500 to \$600,000.

The combination of meeting full budget needs of dependent children, families that would cost the state \$1.1 million in 18 months of the next biennium; and providing \$145,000 in the last year of the biennium as an aid to dependent children of unemployed fathers, and providing \$4.4 million for a Medicaid program amounts to a total of a little over \$5 million. But these combined programs would relieve communities of 20 to 25% of their costs of welfare programs, and generate approximately \$11.5 million in federal matching funds. For every dollar of State money that is spent, we will generate \$2.14 in Federal money.

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

Mr. CAREY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Mine is the ADC statement on the program. In the Aid to Dependent Children program, the Appropriations Committee has said: "Fine, let's relieve the cities and towns of their 18% share of the costs of ADC." Part II has \$1 million in it for ADC, but the comment in the Part II budget is that this is for caseload increases and not increased benefits for the recipients.

The Part III plan asks that we do not remember the recipients. It asks that we do keep pace with the other New England states and at least provide these families with enough funds to enjoy a respectable life. Today the State of Maine operates its ADC program below the standards set in 1958. These standards were set eleven years ago. And all this new program asks is that we provide enough funds to meet these 1958 standards.

I will cite a few examples of the substandard conditions that exist. A mother and three children living here should receive \$344 a month to live in a low budget environment. This is according to the latest figures compiled by the Bureau of Labor statistics. The same family of four should receive \$251 a month, if they were on ADC payments that meet the standards set in 1958. Instead, this

family if it is forced by circumstances they didn't create to live on ADC, they can now receive in Maine \$127 a month, and this is their top.

Another family case. We have a mother deserted by her husband and left with five children who are all under twelve years of age. She certainly qualifies for ADC help and she gets it; and it amounts to \$191 a month. Now if we approve this portion of the Part III budget, she will be able to receive \$374 a month, the amount that is necessary for a family of six to live — again by the 1958 standards.

The next time that you or your wife try to figure out the family shopping list for the week, or whether you can buy a new suit or sign up for a car, consider how little you could do with just \$191 a month, how to feed six mouths, to clothe six bodies and keep six minds healthy. Our Aid to Dependent Children program is shamefully neglectful of the very people it is supposed to help.

Any legislator who feels that some of these statistics are wrong can certainly visit our field offices and they will get the correct information.

Now the other day the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt, told us of added employees if L. D. 918 had passed. I voted against that particular bill, but unlike that this ADC section would have the money go where it is needed, not for added employees but the people who are now on relief themselves.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Town, Mr. Binnette.

Mr. BINNETTE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Being a member of the Health and Institutional Affairs Committee I am going to speak to you today about our Unemployed Fathers.

This ADC program revision is but one part of the serious welfare problem in our State. We are also asked to supply \$145,000 in the second half of the biennium towards our ADC for unemployed fathers. And you may wonder what this is all about.

In all reality, the present Aid to Dependent Children doesn't help families with unemployed fathers too much. The last session of the legislature approved of a program to help children with unemployed fathers, but to date we have never funded it. There are some needy people who still live together, man and wife and six to ten children, because they want to keep their family together no matter what the price. If they want aid through ADC, the father will have to leave home and the mother can qualify. This is a most serious decision for a devoted and conscientious father to make.

Sitting here today it might be difficult to realize that there are two many men in our state who don't have the physical strength or the mental or physical health to hold a steady job in their communities. There are jobs for many people today, but there is a hard core of the unemployed who can't find work, who can't bring home a paycheck sufficient to meet their financial needs and whose families suffer because of this.

The ADC for unemployed fathers is designed to help these families, help them with money to exist in our ever inflating economy and train them for better opportunities for work. The price tag isn't too large, but the challenge is great.

It has been estimated by the Health and Welfare Department that families with unemployed fathers comprise about one sixth of the general assistance case load, and of the total relief grant, 69.92 cents of every dollar spent can be federal money.

I sincerely urge you members of this Legislature to give this matter your most careful consideration and I hope that you will give your whole-hearted support to this part of the amended budget. Thank you.

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

Mrs. BOUDREAU: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to speak on the Food Support Program.

What this program would do is make surplus foods available to persons throughout the state by

supporting the costs local communities have had to bear, and often found so heavy they simply dropped the program. For example, in 1959 there were 62,000 families in Maine receiving surplus foods. These are the commodities the Federal Government makes available to low income families if their communities will disburse them.

By 1968, however, dozens of Maine communities gave up the program because they felt it was too expensive and today there are less than 16,000 persons receiving these foods. This food program augments other aids to needy families and has been providing as much as \$7 per month per person in foods. As the program expands more foods have become available and by October of this year, it is expected the value of these foods will reach \$12 per person per month.

But these programs are no good to the family living in a community that can't afford the storage space and the personnel to administer the distribution.

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

Mr. STARBIRD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is too bad that in this Part II budget that no supplementary funds were provided for the second year of the biennium. I noticed that in the first year they provided \$60,000 for the Indians, for General Assistance funds. About 80% of our Passamaquoddy and about 20% of the Penobscot Tribe are on welfare of some sort or another. And the difference can be easily seen to be caused by the difference in location.

The reasoning of the Appropriations Committee in doing this is apparently that they like to see how the funds for the first year are spent before they fund the second year. The problem with this whole line of thinking in my mind is that, as has occurred time and time again over the years the budget for Indian Affairs has been and is insufficient. The so-called Indian problem was created by the white man in the first place and it is his responsibility to help solve it.

Over 130 years ago, Penobscot Lieutenant Governor John Neptune, reckoned by many as one of the most remarkable men ever produced by his tribe or by this state, often urged the Legislature that his tribe be given the materials and the education they needed and that they could then stand on their own feet. This was not done. They were treated like children, like wards of the State; and so the condition remained until a few years ago.

The Department of Indian Affairs was a giant step forward toward giving Maine's Indian tribes complete self-government and full responsibility for their own affairs. But it cannot work if it does not have enough funds.

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

Mr. VINCENT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: In recent years, there has been growing recognition in Maine, as well as throughout the nation, of the need to do something about the problem of Mental Retardation. The 103rd Legislature recognized this need by authorizing the establishment of a Bureau of Mental Retardation within the Department of Mental Health and Corrections. However, the funding of this bureau was left to we the members of the 104th.

This funding need has not been fully met. Only about one third of the necessary funds have been provided — not enough to provide for the staff to conduct a meaningful statewide program to aid the mentally retarded and to elevate the problems of the mentally retarded to the level of governmental attention that was intended by the last legislature. What has been done in an effort to cut corners is to make Dr. William Schumacher, Director of the Bureau of Mental Health, the head of the Bureau of Mental Retardation. This simply will not work. Dr. Schumacher already has sufficient responsibilities and to add those of the Bureau of Mental Retardation will act merely to short-change the mentally retarded children of the state and their burdened parents.

What the small appropriation of some \$52,000 is needed for is to

supply a full-time director and supporting staff who will establish the Bureau of Mental Retardation and provide for the programs so urgently needed.

Richard Dyke, President of the Maine Association for Retarded Children, has cited in his words, "The severe lack of meaningful direction for the mentally retarded here in the State of Maine has left us empty. If we can establish a meaningful bureau and develop programs to train the retarded to become a part of the work force of the State of Maine, we will have made a significant contribution both to our welfare programs and to new industry. These people can be helped, but first we must help them."

What is being done in the area by private citizenry for Pineland? In the primary interests in 1965, the Pineland Parents and Friends Association constructed an all-faith chapel at Pineland. The chapel will have a seating capacity of 250, will be unique in that they believe it will be the only chapel ever donated by parents' organization for retarded institution in any state. The fund began in 1956 and was continued for several years. They are currently working on a project to obtain three buses by gathering trading stamps and are nearing the goal of \$35,000. Over 29 thousand of that 35 thousand has already been raised.

There have been many contributions from private sources and institutions. The Catholic Diocese of Portland contributed a gift of \$12,000.

Why specifically was the concentration on a chapel? Philip Murphy of Portland, president of the Pineland Friends and Parents Association, summed up the general opinion in a recent meeting. "We feel that religion should play an important part in any rehabilitation." It was the general belief that the retarded have a feeling for God. And as one member put it, "They're God's children," or as another so recalled after having missed a visit to his daughter on a Sunday, continued his visit the following Sunday, and his daughter

replied, "You were sick. We prayed for you."

Other items at random that have been donated to Pineland: \$314 for braces, \$250 for basketball court, \$385 for a pop corn machine, \$350 was donated by the Children's Benefit Fund, \$500 was donated for the Christmas and Halloween celebration; and to establish what one or two people can contribute with no cash expenditures, parents cite the efforts during the Christmas drive of Mr. and Mrs. Walter Susi of Lewiston.

Last year they collected 2500 boxes of cracker jacks, 1500 Christmas cards, 350 pounds of assorted candies, 536 pairs of new shoes and boots, 225 toothbrushes and toothpaste, 212 billfolds, 350 pipes, 155 packs of tobacco, 210 coloring books and boxes of crayons, and 75 story books, 200 pairs of rosary beads, 2 hearing aids, 15 cartons of cigarettes, 12 boxes of cigars, 80 pairs of boys' and men's trousers, 30 pairs of mittens, caps, and assorted toilet articles consisting of cosmetics, jewelry, and what have you, \$300.35 was also donated in cash.

The people at Pineland through long, hard soul searching have been able to face the problem of mental retardation in recent years. At one time it was considered improper, or out of place, to have a mentally retarded daughter or son. The people have grown up to the point where it is an acceptable fact now, and they seek meaningful direction from the state legislature in this area.

For this very small investment, we can redeem the pledge made by our predecessors and to the many Maine families afflicted by mental retardation, and we can perform a vital humane service to the state at little cost.

I strongly urge the establishment of a meaningful Bureau of Mental Retardation. Thank you.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Before we are through today, I am sure it is going to be argued that the Part III Budget

is going to increase the cost of the next biennium some \$47 million. I am sure it can be argued also that the Part I and Part II budget as it now stands, is an increase of \$30 million and I am sure it will be said that the increased cost in the next biennium of the Governor's program as a whole was \$55 million.

These are figures which have been compiled by the Legislative Finance Office and are available and they are quite possibly correct. But let me point this out to you: that what we are doing when we are picking up this tab is relieving the burden upon the local property tax holders in our cities and towns. If this is not an important concession, then I think there is something wrong with our thinking.

I would like to read to you a letter from Dr. McNeil, Chancellor of the University of Maine. It was addressed to the Members of the Appropriations and Financial Affairs Committee, and to my knowledge was not released to the press. It says:

"Gentlemen: The financial situation at the University of Maine for the next biennium appears to be as follows: The University's request to Governor Curtis was \$59.3 million; the Governor's recommendation was \$55.4 million; L. D. 1232 and 1483 recommended \$46.5 million; in effect, an unfunded request of \$12.8 million.

This unfunded 12.8 million dollars represents a need over and above the commonly accepted definition of new and expanded services. Action by the 103rd Legislature to unify the five State Colleges and the University created a new entity and a new mission for the University. Funds to carry out that new mission are assembled as one package for the first time. Total cost for the next biennium is not comparable to any previous biennium even though the sum of the parts, theoretically, could equal a total new request. For example, there is an amount of \$4 million in our new request for funds that either was appropriated to other state departments in past bienniums or is for completely new

programs as a result of the unification. Details of these funds are attached.

The University of course will continue its mission of providing the best possible education for the largest number of Maine students within its resource capability. Our ability to do this in a befitting manner depends to a great extent on the level of resources made available to us by the Legislature. About the only other major source of income to offset operating expenses is tuition and fees from students. The Board of Trustees and the administration have gone on record as favoring lower tuition costs rather than higher; however, the mission of the University as stated above will have to be the first consideration. If at the end of the 104th Legislature there remains a 12.8 million dollar gap between need for funds and appropriations, the problem of student fees and tuition will have to be re-examined.

The number of qualified students requesting entrance to the University is increasing rapidly. Even our forecast enrollments as contained in our budget have proven low for the coming year. Unless the University is to adopt some restrictions on the number of students to be enrolled, beyond the qualification restriction previously used, dollars available will have to be spread more thinly over a larger student body and the natural result will be a lowering of the quality of education.

The Board of Trustees and the administration are ever mindful of the tax dilemma facing the Legislature and your Committee. We dislike intensely adding to the basic problem by requesting restoration of the 12.8 million dollars, or at least a large portion thereof, but in the exercise of its responsibility to you and the people of the State the Board feels that it must present a sound program of higher education and must make a major effort to obtain financial support for that program. Cordially, Don McNeil, Chancellor"

A copy was sent to Senator Sewall, Members of the Board of Trustees, Members of the Administrative Council, Mr. Vose, Mr. Freeman, and Miss Wilson.

Now let me point this out to you. What this letter emphasizes is this: is that the University, by the action of its board and its chancellor, has made known to us, the Legislature, its needs. Now we can do what we want to. We can not appropriate the funds if we want to. We can if we want to. Or we can appropriate a part of it. But whatever we do will not affect us as much as it will affect the students who want to go on to higher education. This is the important concern, Dr. McNeil has done his job. Now the turn has come to us.

Now let me point this out. It will be argued that the University of Maine has received increased funds over the past year of this coming biennium as never before. Let me point out to you that in 1960 the enrollment of all the colleges was only 6,066. The enrollment today is double that figure. Now if we think that we don't need extra money, if we don't think that the cost of inflation has hit the University as much as it has hit us, then there is something wrong in the way we think.

Now one other point. The University does much more than educate students for us. It provides help for us in the cooperative extension services in every county of this state, for almost every industry, in the field of agriculture, in the field of pollution, in forestry, law, and just about any other field that you want to think about.

These monies have to come from somewhere. Granted that 50 per cent of the funds for the Extension Service come from the federal government, but the University of Maine must provide a portion of that amount; and it is matched also, as you well know, by your county budget. However, if the University cannot do its job here, then it certainly cannot do its job state-wide.

And so it is for this reason that there is five million dollars being requested in the so-called Part III. And whatever happens to the Part III in this session, the results of that will be facing us at a special or at the next regular session. Now we can argue that this is going to cost us so much more money. It may be true and it is true.

But what are the results if we don't appropriate the money? These are what we should be looking at.

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

Mr. CARTER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I wish to speak, at this point, on behalf of the proposal for a new pay plan for state employees as originally proposed in Governor Curtis' budget.

We have all become acutely aware in recent weeks of the difficult personnel situation that exists at Pineland Hospital. Because of a seriously inadequate wage scale for physical therapists, the hospital has lost three of its four physical therapists and will soon lose the other. It has found the recruitment of new people impossible. As a result, as many as seventy retarded youngsters will be without physical therapy, and the hospital might lose its accreditation, thus making the recruitment of qualified personnel even more difficult and threatening the loss of federal funds.

What has happened at Pineland is a particularly tragic development, but it is not a unique situation and it could become more prevalent if we do not act now to provide our state employees with wage scales that are competitive and that enable them to meet the rising costs of living. Maine's wage scale for state employees is, on the average, 12 to 15% below Vermont's, and it is even further behind Massachusetts' where state employees were just granted a 14% average wage increase. These are states we must compete with for qualified employees. Although our wage scale is generally comparable to New Hampshire's, Maine and New Hampshire, and often some of the southern states, regularly rank in the lowest quarter of states for wage scales in almost every job class. This is not a proud record, particularly when we are in a position to do better and when the continued high quality of vital state services depends on our will to do better.

The pay plan now before you would put the State in a much stronger recruiting position. It is

based on a lengthy survey, conducted by the Personnel Department, of wages paid in other states and in private industry for jobs comparable to those now performed in our state government. Though it involves an average 8.5 per cent wage increase, it is a highly selective pay plan which offers larger increases for job categories that are now badly underpaid and smaller ones for classifications which are now receiving a more adequate wage. In short, the pay plan is carefully constructed to strengthen those areas of state service which are now the weakest.

The recommended pay plan for state employees is of fundamental importance. We simply cannot ignore the fact that our lives have become increasingly complicated and that all of us are more dependent on high quality state services. These services will be no better than the people who administer and implement them. If we do not make state employment attractive to top quality people, we will simply not get top quality state services.

I urge my fellow legislators to recognize that the investment in the pay plan now before you is a modest investment which will return great dividends to all the people of our state.

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

Mr. LUND: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I noticed all the news media had left and perhaps it was safe to talk. I guess it isn't now. I would like to hasten to add that I am not part of the planned panel for this morning and I hope I haven't upset any of the planned speakers.

However, I am going to support passage of the measure before you and I feel that I should give my reasons for doing so. I am going to vote for it, not because I find fault with Parts I and II budgets which have received the unanimous support of the Appropriations Committee of which I am a member, not because I support all of the goodies which are being paraded before you today in the form of this Part III dissertation. As a matter of fact I think a num-

ber of the ideas embodied in this Part III are not worthy of support. I note the \$130,000 which the DED now says it needs and I can recall quite clearly that that item was deleted as the result of the conference with the DED in which the Committee was told that they could place their advertising, without this commission, to an advertising agency. If the DED finds that that is not the case now, I would hope that they would do their homework next time before they meet with the Appropriations Committee.

I also take issue with the proposal for tax relief for the elderly over 65, not because I disagree with the idea of tax relief for the elderly, but this plan makes no provision for the needy person who is 64 who is in trouble paying his taxes, or 63, 62 or 60. In other words this is legislation aimed at a particular group and because of that it leaves out other worthwhile areas. We have heard a good deal about the need for property tax relief and I think it shouldn't be funneled at any particular age group. I don't think it is particularly sound for us to be paying rent subsidies to people in whatever the age range they may be.

But I am going to vote for this measure today because I see that as a way of expressing support for what I feel is a necessary revenue measure for the State to consider. We here a great deal at election time about fiscal responsibility. It is a very popular subject for persons running for office. I would like to point out a couple of areas in which I feel this Legislature is not living up to its responsibilities on the question of fiscal responsibility.

This Legislature has under consideration the bond issue for \$22,000,000 which will be necessary if we are to be placed in a position where we can pay our local school subsidies on a year which is consistent with the municipal year. We have found it necessary to do temporary borrowing to pay these school subsidies because over the years the amount of subsidies has grown so large that our State budget does not make adequate provision to pay for these



and now when we find ourselves faced with a decision which I think is a good one, to be able to make periodic payments during the year we are going to have to borrow \$22,000,000 in order to carry this out. This \$22,000,000 I submit to you is a current need and it is unfortunate that we find ourselves having to borrow to meet a current need.

There is another measure which has received favorable action so far and I think it deserves favorable action, and that is a measure to borrow \$8,000,000 to pay the State's share of local school construction bond amortization costs. This will be the third legislative session in which we will be borrowing to pay for these school construction costs and I think this is particularly unfortunate and I would like to make a comparison for the members of this House.

As I recall it, it was two sessions ago when it was decided that rather than for the State to pay in a lump sum its share of the cost of construction of a school unit, municipality or District, that the Legislature would pay its share of the amortization cost each year as those amortization costs came due. So that if the local unit borrowed for twenty years, the State would pay for twenty years its share of the cost. The only hooker is that we have found ourselves unable to do so in cash.

So what we are now doing, when the State's share comes due to be paid on these local bond amortization costs, we are borrowing to meet that payment, and for instance, if it should be a twenty-year local bond we will find ourselves twenty years from now borrowing on another twenty-year bond to pay for our local school construction. And I submit to this Legislature that this is not sound financing; borrowing what amounts to for a forty-year period does not seem to me to meet the test of fiscal responsibility. And I don't think we are going to be in a position to meet these needs until we begin to give consideration to some new revenue measures, and I am speaking now of the income tax which is before you.

We have heard a good deal about the problems of local municipal tax burdens and both parties, I believe, have made statements to the effect, recognizing the need for easing the real estate tax burden. The Republican Legislature last session attempted to do this and was met with a remarkable lack of cooperation in its efforts. This session again the topic comes up. I would suggest to you all that we will be unable to do anything realistic by way of easing real estate tax burdens until we look for a new and substantial tax source for the State of Maine.

I indicated earlier that I joined in the Part I and II budget reports of the Appropriations Committee because I believe, as many of us do here, that it is at times necessary to cut the pattern to fit the cloth. I also think that there comes a time when it is necessary to look for more cloth and I think that time has come now.

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

Mr. WAXMAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise this morning in support of House Amendment "A", the so-called Part III of the budget in general, and in particular to address the attention of this House to the need for increased support for our school subsidy program which this document recognizes. As you know, in his budget message in January, Governor Curtis recommended an appropriation for general education subsidy for our towns and our school districts of \$45.5 million in 1969 and \$54.5 million in 1970. The Appropriations Committee returned with a recommendation of only \$38.6 million for 1969 and only \$45.0 million for 1970. The pending unfinanced supplemental 1969 appropriation close to \$5 million is found in L. D. 1379 which at present is on the Senate Appropriations table and there it awaits funding.

In effect this means, ladies and gentlemen, that we are increasing our school subsidy program for 1970 by only \$1.5 million. I feel this is, frankly, inadequate and it represents the failure of this Leg-

islature to keep aid in line with rising local school costs. I might point out that the Governor's proposal was based on a comprehensive study of finance needs of Maine's elementary, secondary and special education programs conducted by the Maine Education Council and by the State Board of Education.

Further, it should be noted that over the next two years the total cost of public schools in Maine, just to maintain them at their present educational level, is going to rise from about \$138 million to approximately \$162 million. I think the result of our faltering State Aid is going to mean one of two things, either skyrocketing local property taxes or inferior quality of education with many vital programs being cut back or eliminated altogether.

I therefore believe we cannot accept the present proposal of \$1.5 million additional subsidy in 1970. I don't believe we can be content with the small amount of help we now give property owners, taxpayers, in running our schools. We certainly owe it to the children of the State of Maine not to abandon our responsibility to public education. Our choice is clear. We must pick up a more realistic portion of the educational tab. The \$6.5 million in this particular document will help the State honor its obligation. I urge you to support House Amendment "A".

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the adoption of House Amendment "A". Is it the pleasure of the House that House Amendment "A" be adopted?

Thereupon, House Amendment "A" was adopted.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the engrossment of item 1, L. D. 657, Bill "An Act Imposing an Individual and Corporate Income Tax" as amended by House Amendment "A".

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In opposing the engrossment — have we adopted House Amendment "A," Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: The Chair's Information is House Amendment "A" has been adopted.

Mr. JALBERT: We're now speaking on engrossment?

The SPEAKER: We are speaking on engrossment.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In opposing engrossment of this measure, which means both the Part III spending and also the income tax program, I would like to make my position very clear.

I spoke only three days after we got into session and gave my feeling wherein it concerned a personal income tax and anything further than 5% on the sales tax.

There are those who might feel possibly that my position is a personal one. Nothing could be further from the truth. As a matter of fact, wherein it concerned the Murphy bill, I respected in caucus, by making a motion to uphold the veto, I respected His Excellency, the Governor of the State of Maine's wishes, even though it was a personal blow to me.

I just about an hour ago returned from the Council chambers to praise His Excellency for his farsightedness in having a youth on the University of Maine Board of Trustees.

Possibly my opposition to it might be given more impetus by today's headline, which says that the federal tax, surtax, will have to remain on, and certainly that is not a democratic sponsored program, because I remember the present administration hollering loud and long all through the last campaign that one of the number one things would be the removal of the surtax. As a matter of fact I'm not a bit surprised, I took it from whence it came, and the result is right here now.

However, it has been my practice, and I would like to have you follow with the four-paged document that I have had distributed to you. I would like to explain it. It has been a practice for me to attempt to project a "keep the store open," which in effect is the Current Services budget for an ensuing biennium. I am aware that to do this at this time for the years

1971-72 and 1972-73 could be termed premature, but having applied the same formula that I do over the previous years, it can give some degree of accuracy to this projection.

This does not include, in either projection, additional funds needed for subsequent special legislative sessions, debt retirement and interest nor mandatory additional expenses for new buildings to be completed. Neither does it project any monies for any new or added to programs in any area of state government. Repeating, this is only an estimated Current Services budget for the biennium 1971 to 1973.

The estimated cost for 1971-72 and 1972-73 biennium based on Part I and Part II are:

Health and Welfare recommended Part II Programs has some of these starting January 1. This causes a built-in cost of an additional \$840,000 to cover the full biennium.

The general purpose subsidies to cities and towns, estimated to be \$50 million for the first year and \$55 million for the second year, or a total of \$105 million. This is an increase of approximately \$15.5 million over the recommended Part I and II and the recommended L. D. for educational subsidy.

Other normal increases, conservatively, the normal increases for all other departments based on 5% would total \$11,800,000, based on a \$321 million total budget of Parts I and II, less school subsidies. So that the summary of these estimated increases would be: Health and Welfare, \$840,000; General Purpose subsidies to cities and towns, \$15,500,000; and other normal increases at 5% for all other governmental operations, \$11,800,000; totaling \$28,140,000.

The estimated costs for the 1971-72 and 1972-73 biennium, based on Part I and Part II and Part III:

Intergovernmental Welfare program, Part III proposes most of these programs starting in the second year of the biennium. This will cause a built-in cost of \$5 million additional, with no changes in programs for the next biennium.

A tax relief for the aged, Part III starts this in the second year, so it would increase a built-in cost of \$1,500,000 for the next biennium.

General Purpose subsidies to cities and towns estimate to be \$60 million for 1971-72 and \$65 million for 1972-73, or a total of \$125 million for the biennium Part I and Part II, plus Part III, amount therefore to \$96.2 million. This would project an increase of \$28.8 million for the next biennium.

Other normal increases conservatively, the normal increases for all other departments, based on 5% would total \$12,800,000, based on a total of \$346 million total budget of Part I, Part II and Part III, less school subsidies.

So that the summary of estimated increases would be: Intergovernmental Welfare Program, \$5 million; tax relief for the aged, \$1,500,000; General Purpose subsidies to cities and towns, \$28,800,000; other normal increases at 5% for all other governmental operations, \$12,800,000; giving a grand total of \$48,100,000.

In short resume, the passage of a Part I and Part II Budget means a built-in increase of a \$28 million Current Services budget for the next Legislature.

The passage of Part I, II and III Budget means a built-in increase of a \$48 million Current Services budget for the next Legislature.

It can be concluded, therefore, that we must exercise, through hard looks, economies in government. We must also hope for gains in recreation and industrial programs.

Realistically, a \$28 million gap strongly indicates a major tax for the 105th. A \$48 million gap would indicate a double major tax for the 105th.

It is to be borne in mind that these projections do not include debt retirement and interest, new building expenses, special session programs, or new additions to existing programs.

Now there are those who would say that I do not project here revenues for the next biennium. My reason is very obvious, is that I cannot foresee into the future what we are going to take in. I

can, however, as I have predicted now, foresee, to a certain degree of accuracy, what we are going to spend, what we are going to obligate ourselves to. And these figures here that I gave you this morning are to be borne out by the Legislative Finance office, and also the Finance office in the other side of the building, headed by Commissioner Williams. And I gave these people, two days ago, the handwritten program as I have read to you today.

Now if we were to go in and attempt to look into the future insofar as revenue is concerned, we would find ourselves with this. Certainly if we estimate a 5% normal rise in governmental operations, we should, by the same token, go into a 5% estimate on additional revenue. So that I have done this. It indicates that the 1969 and '70, based on the 5% on the sales tax, and also the trade-in on automobiles, where the major bulk of our profits would come from, it would indicate an \$85,740,000 program, and stepping that up 5% for the years '69-70, projecting it to '70-71, it would give us a figure of \$89,821,000 which would give us a figure for the biennium of \$175,561,000 for the biennium.

Now the estimated increase of sales tax revenue, due to economic increases at 5%, would indicate to us, using that figure of \$175 million, and using the figures as I previously quoted, an increase of 5% for the biennium on this would give us a total of \$94,312,000, and \$99,027,000 for the second year, giving us a grand total of \$193,339,000, which gives us the total estimated increase in revenues at \$17,778,000.

Now naturally, if we go into the adjusted debt retirement, we would wipe out a goodly part of this program, and any funding of any new building operations would wipe it out completely. It has to be borne in mind that the figures that I have given to you does not give one penny further than Current Services, or "keep the store open" item.

It might be well also, in passing, to make comment, that I just spoke a few minutes ago to the

head of the Lewiston-Auburn Shoe Workers Protective Association, who tells me that he is somewhat chagrined at the fact that we have got quite a layoff going on in our shoe shops, and this is not the summer traditional layoff. It is a definite cutback, and one would only go in to look at the employment lines to see just what we are faced with. I hope that it picks up, and I'm sure that with the programs that we are starting that it will in the State of Maine.

Now my feeling is simply this. My feeling is that these figures holding up, in spite of the estimated gain in revenue, which will be wiped out in only two areas without stepping up anything at all, that we are faced with a \$50 million plus Current Services program for the ensuing year. And that in itself, if we pass Part II, with the taxes that I would support, and I would support in Part II the corporate income tax at even 7%, and certainly taking issue with the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, when he said that there might be some feeling, a great feeling on the opposition party concerning a tax on intangibles, I say that I stand to vote here for it. It might affect me a little bit; it is sure to affect a great many of my people. However, this idea that this would take away from the poor savings is a myth, because all we have to do is start a \$1,000 program, and I mean you would have to have upwards of \$20,000 in the bank before it would affect you anyway.

For my money, I'd call this a "Robin Hood" tax, and I'm all for it. There is really where you come down to the ability to pay.

Mr. Speaker and members of the House, it is not my intention to shirk my responsibility now or in the future. I have asked more than once, what are we building in for the future? I got no answer. I give you the answer today. The answer is clear; it means this, simply this. We engross this bill today, and it winds up in final enactment, and what we are doing in effect is waltzing ourselves in to either a 5 to 7 percent sales tax two years from now, or a 1 cent more on the sales tax more and 10% more on the income tax. And I

am sure that we do not want to face that hideous responsibility.

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

Mr. JUTRAS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wish that the following remarks could be construed as the voice of the silent majority. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, it is fiscal irresponsibility to appropriate public funds to a bureaucracy that is unconcerned about the social ills which surround it.

Once again we should be reminded of our responsibility as a legislative body toward the Commonwealth of the State of Maine. The day has arrived when we cannot any longer dodge issues and pass the buck and fail to accept this responsibility. Resentment to further increases in taxes has brought a hue and cry across the State of Maine. Pleas from the taxpayers must not fall on deaf ears. Pleas for expanded state-level and state-controlled programs have not — repeat not, been made by the poor people who need the help. In fact, we would be doing the deserving people a favor by denying the present bureaucrats additional funds during this biennium in an endeavor to have them do a lot of soul searching to put their budgets in a more realistic perspective the next time around.

Another factor to remember is that most federal money-matching programs are similar to decreasing term insurance. They have a time limitation running like this — for the federal pay 75% of the cost for the first 15 months, it pays 60% for the next 12 months, 50% for the following 12 months, and 30% for the last 12 months. As time passes on, the more it costs. Then the state is on its own and takes over its fiscal burden of responsibility. It must tote the bagful of carrots that it has gotten from Washington.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am not one of those who had prepared statements and so forth but I do

have a few pertinent remarks in relation to more taxes. I must tell you first of all that I come from an area in the State of Maine where they want less government and not more government. I am not going to tell you how long I have been a member of this House, only to say that when I came here all the government was run from this one building. It was before that monstrosity next door had been built and before we purchased another building across the street and many others. My people at that time were content and they are very much discontent at the present time.

Now all we are doing each time we meet here so far as my people are concerned is making more jobs for more people and more people that they have to support. And I would also like to say while I am standing here that we always considered in this House when we passed a Current Services budget that that meant Current Services, what we now have today. And let me tell you if you've ever noticed it that the Current Services budget we have already passed, and it has the Governor's signature, included a lot of things that we didn't have before like extra personnel. That certainly wasn't Current Services so we have already gone farther than we probably should have so far as I am concerned. However, I voted for Current Services budget with these built-in items, knowing that this was all I was going to support, that I was not going to support Part II, Part III, Part VI, or IX or X of any budget. I find it very unnecessary.

I find also that it is amusing to see people cry about the welfare cases because in many instances where I come from people on welfare are living better than the people next door, to this extent, they have automobiles, and colored TV, where the poor souls who are working every day next door have neither colored TV nor automobiles. And it is an unfortunate thing that we are not doing enough for these people that are trying so hard to earn a living, trying so hard to support the State of Maine

and don't want to see it become a welfare state.

Now I see where the Federal Court recently has said that you might say paupers or whatever you want to call them, some fancy word, they can move from one state to the other freely and this is what they are doing from some of the southern states where their welfare programs are not so socialistic as others, they are moving into these states like Detroit, Chicago and New York and causing great trouble because they want to get where there is the most welfare. If we keep moving in this direction we are going to have a lot of people that I just soon wouldn't be here because we are having a hard time to support the ones we have now and if we make this too attractive under this new Federal law then we are going to have a lot more than we have now that we are having a hard time to support.

And so for this reason I hope that this bill will be indefinitely postponed and that we will try to move on and continue the services that we had last year with a few built-in costs of which we have already passed in the Part I budget and if you will bear in mind, if you will stop and think, the people who have contacted you, in most cases—this may not be true in some cities, but I'm sure this is true in the areas like where I came from, the districts which I represent, the people that are coming to you for these services is less than 1% and generally this is a college professor or his wife that sees in an income tax or these built-in things where he can make more money, or it may be a recipient of welfare that thinks that this would probably put them in a little better automobile or they will be able to have something a little nicer than the people next door.

But let me tell you there's conditions in the country in Maine that are much different apparently than they are in the cities of Maine and for this reason I can't go along with increasing the income tax and I would say that the present tax only does this, opens the door. I was around here when we had a

sales tax of a penny, two cents, three cents, four cents and there is no end to the needs and there won't be as long as you pass money on to these departments and they go out and try to sell services. They're almost like salesmen out in the field, trying to sell services to some of the people who really don't desire, they'd like to try to be a little self-supporting on their selves, with their own Maine ingenuity.

Now if we pass an income tax, I don't care if it is 1 per cent or 2 per cent or 9 or any figure you want to use or pick out of the sky, you are going to end up in ten years from now with a burden that these people cannot carry on with and they'll end up more people going out of State.

I would only say one thing in closing, I don't want to sound too windy here this morning, is this, that during this long tenure that I have served in this House the population of Maine has remained about the same. However government has grown out of proportion in my opinion with the people, the population of Maine and the needs of the people in Maine only because of the people in these departments trying to expand their department, trying to sell services that many of the people do not desire. So I hope that someone will move that this bill be indefinitely postponed and I will certainly support it.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hope that no one does move indefinite postponement so we can have the issue squarely cast between those who favor the adoption of this program, those who do not; and I for one shall vote against the program and I would like to very briefly tell you why.

Those of you who were here the last session will recall that a program was proposed and five times we attempted to get the necessary votes to pass this program. This program would have relieved the municipalities of the responsibility to contribute to the ADC program. It would have provided funds for

the expansion of already existing oceanographic research facility at the Darling Center in Walpole. It would have provided for the necessary funds to allow the University of Maine to meet projected student increases. It would have increased the School Subsidy Program to \$320 per pupil and it would have involved the imposition of an increase in the sales tax from 4 to 5 per cent. And this program was described as a reckless raid on the taxpayers' pocketbooks. And I certainly don't want to be accused of parroting, but I believe that the phrase might well be applied to this program.

If you adopt this Part III budget you will place Maine in the unenviable position of being one of the front runners in the race to have the highest per capita tax rate in the nation. It is for this reason that I will vote against engrossment and it is for this reason that I support the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, who I believe has given you a thoughtful and accurate analysis of the consequences of your action should you adopt this program. I think his figures are correct and I think every one of you as responsible legislators should think very seriously about the cost of this program.

Throughout this session, unlike the last session, there has been a close working relationship, indeed a rapport between the Floor Leaders of the respective parties in this and the other branch and by taking issue with the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque, on this issue I don't mean to imply that the doors are closed. They have not been and they will not be. We will continue to work together and I am hopeful that we can together bring out a program for funding Part II which can include perhaps some of the additional programs that our recent experience and recent events have indicated we have got to do a little better job in.

Just for example, one of the earlier speakers who supported this program talked about the Human Rights Commission. Now the Human Rights Commission I suggest to you does not need the amount of money to operate effectively

that this bill gives it. As a member of the Republican Party I am proud, and I mean that, I am proud to have as a member of our Party the first negro elected to the United States Senate since Reconstruction, Senator Brooke of Massachusetts, and I personally am very pleased that the group that is most involved with this Human Rights Commission has asked me to serve as the honorary chairman of the day which they have scheduled for May 25. But I believe that this program can be operated without a massive amount of money and that we must think of the built in costs of all of these programs.

Mr. Speaker, I request that when the vote is taken it be taken by the yeas and nays. Unlike the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lund, I don't believe that this is the appropriate time to cast a vote in favor of the concept of a personal income tax, admitting as he admits, that the Part III budget proposed today contains programs of which he personally disapproves.

I, for one, will vote no, and I urge every other member of the House to join me in doing so.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. McTeague.

Mr. McTEAGUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The gentleman from Cumberland discussed the financing of Part II of the budget which we have not yet come to, we're on Part III, I guess, today and financing that, and yet the gentleman I believe properly discussed it because it is part of the background certainly in considering Part III or any parts of Part III that may turn up in Part II.

I ask a question because this is the type question that I am asked at home. I would genuinely like to have some information. Is it the thinking of the gentleman from Cumberland that it is likely that the Part II budget will be financed out of a corporate income tax and an intangibles tax, or if not, what other measures are being considered?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. McTeague, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Cumber-

land, Mr. Richardson, who may answer if he chooses.

The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I don't want to prolong this debate. I simply want to say, as I indicated earlier, the members of both parties, your elected leadership, will continue to make every effort to find a mutually accepted program of taxation to fund the Part II Budget, and I think we are going to be successful.

Yesterday I tried to indicate, but got buried in an avalanche of funny press comment about editorial writers, that the Republican Party has taken a position, unanimously here in the House, in opposition to an intangibles tax of an unrestricted nature—that is without a very very substantial exemption, since such a tax would impose a tremendous burden and unfairly single out those people who through prudent investment have provided for their retirement years by selecting an investment program as opposed to some other form of program.

The answer to the question is that we shall continue to work together to put together the kind of program that we can support and that we can look back on as providing prudent, moderate, responsible progress for Maine. This is the kind of program I want and am working on, and I know that the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque, joins.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Dam.

Mr. DAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise to state my position and to support Mr. Jalbert from Lewiston. We have all heard the pleas for the Part III budget. Now there's no doubt that maybe there are some worthy items in this, and there may be some needs in certain areas. But to support any part of this budget, in essence, means supporting the income tax proposal.

I feel, as do the people that I represent in the Town of Skowhegan, I polled a very large cross section of these, and the concensus that was arrived at was that

they cannot stand an income tax at this time. We are a poor community.

We do feel that there are other avenues of taxation that should be explored that could fund these proposals in whole, or at least in part, and not affect those who cannot afford to pay. We feel strongly that if we have a genuine feeling of compassion for the poor, the elderly, the retarded, and want to straighten the educational system in the state, then we should go after those agencies and societies that are hiding behind our archaic laws of taxation in this state. And until I'm instructed by the people of my community to vote otherwise, I shall continually vote against an income tax proposal.

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

Mr. EMERY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: At the Battle of Hastings in the year 1066 A.D., the invading Normans defeated the Saxons of England. William the First, the Conqueror, the Norman King, ordered a survey and record of all English property for the purpose of taxation. The Saxons called this record "The Domesday Book" because it spelled ruin for every taxpayer in England. It spelled ruin in England, and unless we put a stop to some of these proposed taxes, I feel that we may face the same ruination in Maine. Many of our own economic troubles are due to high government spending and taxes.

I feel that a State income tax would only broaden the base of bureaucracy from which there seems to be no relief anywhere in sight for the already tax-burdened Maine taxpayer.

Many of our citizens say that Maine is unique. Let us be unique and keep Maine from following the trend toward state income taxes. I feel that if this bill is passed, it will go a long way towards killing personal initiative and will penalize the struggling worker, his hard-working wife, the small businessman, and tend to take food out of the mouths of hungry children.



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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think the sentiments have fairly well been expressed along the individual lines this morning as to what they feel should be done or what they feel must be done. It has been my personal contention that the avenue of a personal and corporate income tax is the best and most feasible way of providing the funds to pay for the needs that are going to be arrived at.

Now in that I feel that the personal income tax and the corporate income tax, if and when they are adopted, will be a matter of personal judgment. In our democratic society, this is just about as best we can expect—personal judgment as to the ability to pay for these services.

In the amendment I have presented this morning, the total that would have to be raised for the amendment is \$25.2 million. This would be paid for by a 9% personal income tax of the federal return. If you break it down into percentages of gross income, this would be at the most, 1.1 percent of the gross income of the people of our state. I think this is a fair sum to assume and would be a good starting point if we are going to provide the services.

You have probably heard in New Hampshire they are within the process of trying to adopt also a personal income tax which would provide for at least 5% of their gross income tax. So I don't think Maine would be going out of its way or out of the way of the trend of trying to pay services by asking for a gross income adjustment of 1.1% of that income to pay for these services.

So this is my personal feeling; that I think that this is the best way of meeting our commitments to the state. It is not final as the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, has pointed out—there may be some areas that we will be able to get together—and I hope that this morning, when the vote is taken, that you will keep this document alive so that

we can promptly arrive at a future better settlement than what is presently before us. Thank you.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: For the information of the House and for the information of Mr. Levesque, my very good friend from Madawaska, I was in New Hampshire the last couple of days—this is where I have been, attending a very interesting education conference. And the lead editorial on the front page of the Manchester Union Leader yesterday morning was "Congratulations, Legislators", and number one, the reason for the congratulations was that they had turned down an income tax. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The pending question is the engrossment of L. D. 657 as amended, Bill "An Act Imposing an Individual and Corporate Income Tax." The yeas and nays have been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call vote it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All members desiring a roll call vote will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

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

The SPEAKER: The pending question is House Paper 448, L. D. 657, on passage to be engrossed as amended. If you are in favor of passing this Bill to be engrossed as amended, you will vote yes; if you are opposed, you will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA—Bedard, Bernier, Binnette, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Brennan, Burnham, Carter, Casey, Chandler, Coffey, Cottrell, Croteau, D'Alfonso, Danton, Drigotas, Fortier, A. J.; Fraser, Keyte, Kilroy, Lebel, Levesque, Lund, Martin, McKinnon, McTeague, Mitchell, Morgan, Starbird, Temple, Vincent, Watson, Waxman, Wheeler.  
NAY — Allen, Baker, Barnes, Benson, Berman, Birt, Bragdon,

Brown, Buckley, Carey, Carrier, Chick, Clark, C. H.; Clark, H. G.; Corson, Cote, Couture, Crommett, Crosby, Cummings, Curran, Curtis, Cushing, Dam, Dennett, Donaghy, Durgin, Dyar, Emery, Erickson, Eustis, Evans, Farnham, Fecteau, Finemore, Fortier, M.; Foster, Gauthier, Gilbert, Giroux, Good, Hall, Hanson, Hardy, Harriman, Haskell, Hawkens, Henley, Heselton, Hewes, Hichens, Huber, Hunter, Immonen, Jalbert, Jameson, Johnston, Jutras, Kelleher, Kelley, K. F.; Kelley, R. P.; Laberge, Lawry, Lee, Leibowitz, LePage, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, MacPhail, Marquis, Marstaller, McNally, Meisner, Millett, Mills, Moreshead, Mosher, Nadeau, Norris, Noyes, Ouellette, Page, Payson, Porter, Pratt, Quimby, Rand, Richardson, G. A.; Richardson, H. L.; Ricker, Rideout, Rocheleau, Ross, Sahagian, Scott, C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Sheltra, Snow, Stilings, Susi, Tanguay, Thompson, Trask, Tyndale, White, Wight, Williams, Wood.

**ABSENT**—Bunker, Cox, Dudley, Faucher, Santoro, Soulas.

Yes, 34; No, 110; Absent 6.

The **SPEAKER**: Thirty-four having voted in the affirmative and one hundred ten in the negative, the Bill falls of engrossment.

Sent to the Senate.

**Passed to Be Engrossed**  
**Third Reader**  
**Amended**

Bill "An Act to Authorize Municipalities to Incorporate by Reference the Provisions of Nationally Known Technical Codes Prepared by State or Regional Agencies" (H. P. 607) (L. D. 788)

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

Mr. Heselton of Gardiner offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" (H-347) was read by the Clerk and adopted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended and sent to the Senate.

**Third Reader**  
**Indefinitely Postponed**

Bill "An Act Providing for a State Income Tax" (H. P. 615) (L. D. 803)

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

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

Mr. **RICHARDSON**: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The sentiment of the House having been very clearly expressed with reference to Item 1, I now move the indefinite postponement of L. D. 803.

The **SPEAKER**: The gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, now moves the indefinite postponement of Bill "An Act Providing for a State Income Tax", L. D. 803.

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

Mr. **COTTRELL**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am making up my mind here what to do. This has been a very fine, informative seminar on appropriations. But it is our constitutional duty, 151 members of the House of Representatives, to initiate all taxation bills. I am very sympathetic with the desire and purposes of the leadership of both parties to work out a taxation program for us. But since this is one of our most definite constitutional responsibilities, the problem of taxation, which is the power to build or destroy, which is the medium for civilization, I think that we should also have a seminar on taxation.

Many of you voted against an income tax without knowing some of the fundamental ingredients of taxation. I said to my friends and I will say on the Floor of the House that a coach and his squad spends more time in getting ready for next Saturday's game, in mimeograph sheets, in studying the habits of each opposing player, in studying the habits of call playing from different positions of the field, from different emer-

gencies of the game, than this body as a whole has studied taxation. Now I could have hoped that we would have had a seminar on taxation for general information.

I should not be tabbed as an income tax devotee simply because this is the third time I have introduced a graduated income tax, because, even though I did it in my first session, there were eighteen others Democrats who voted for a raise in the sales tax from three to four per cent to break one of these taxation deadlocks that we get into.

And last year I introduced a sales tax bill and was hoping that we could compromise in the regular session at a half a per cent in the sales tax.

Now I haven't spent more than maybe twenty-five minutes on my feet on the Floor of this House this session, and so I pray and hope that you will grant me the indulgence for just a few moments here. It's against all pedagogy, all teaching principles, to continue a class longer than 40 or 50 minutes. I know you must be bored—you're tired—but it seems to me that this is an important subject, a most important subject, and I am just going to suggest a few considerations here. I would like to have at least everybody know what we are dealing with.

The first thing is our general budget. The 99th Legislature started out with \$110 million of General Fund appropriations, and then it has gone up 25% a year to last session's appropriation of \$235,600,000. This year the Appropriations Committee in Part I and Part II has increased last session's budget by 30%, \$80 million which brings the figure to about \$316 million.

Our General Fund appropriation was consumed mostly by Health and Welfare and Education; 70% of our General Fund was spent in the fiscal year, 1968, for Education and Health and Welfare.

I'm sorry if I'm a Democrat something like Wilbur Mills — I am weak, I have no power; he was great power—but Wilbur Mills is probably one of the most powerful men in the Congress of the United States because he is on the com-

mittee that appoints committees, and he rules his own committee, because he has appointed them. He can stand up against the President and say to Mr. Nixon today, "If you want to continue your 10% surtax, you have got to cut your budget six billion dollars." And that's on the fire, and I know we will hear a lot more about.

But I thought this year, with Education and Welfare taking so much of our General Fund expenditures, 70%, that with the climate in education today, that we could have a moratorium on education. And as one who has been teaching on the high school level for four decades, I think that it is time for a moratorium.

I would just like to hold this up to the House. This is last week's issue of Life. It is a poll done by Louis Harris on a middle-class high school, white, in North Philadelphia. Louis Harris is a very accurate pollster. "Collision Course in High School."

In last week's Newsweek, a documentary has just been reported out on high schools, and our high schools are not in good shape. They can be reformed from within, with the same personnel, with better administration, and get us more production in education without any further cost. And I will stand on that and talk with any administrator in the country.

But we are so worried about our college administrations and the things that are going on. And I think we should have a moratorium there too. We do not agree with the violent extremists, but we know and it is known by people who are informed that our colleges need reconstruction.

Last December John Galbraith, a great economist, a great philosopher, warned Harvard, "You are going to have the same thing at Harvard that you had at Columbia." The administration of our colleges is backward. And a lot of the kids have a great deal of reason for showing their resentment. So I say it is time maybe for a little moratorium in education.

If I don't speak my mind I won't be able to sleep, and I'm not known as a pliant conformist, and I never have been. I think I have always

been a rebel, and that is one reason I joined the Democratic Party, not because I wanted to be on the majority side.

I'm going to go to our population now. That is a very pertinent subject when it comes to talking about taxation. Maybe some of you have looked up population. But Maine must have been a wonderful place to live in in 1860. We had 628,000 people here in 1860. We lost a few in the next decade, a couple of thousand. I think that is because of the Maine Regiment at Little Round Top at the Battle of Gettysburg, plus the fact that Lincoln had passed the Homestead Act which gave anybody that wanted to go West a quarter section of land for nothing, no taxes.

Well to get along to the turn of the century, we have 694,000. In 40 years we go from 626 to 694,000. Now since 1900 we have been gaining about 50,000 people a year, at a rate of a little less than 4%. California, of course, in the last decade had a 33% increase in population. Connecticut had a 20% increase. New Hampshire had 11%. New York State had a 12%. We are not growing in population.

In 1968, last year, we had 17,000 births and 11,000 deaths. Now some of those births I know are destined to become ADC people, and they are not going to be too productive.

Now how many leave our state? We are told that 80% of our college graduates leave our state. How many industries come in and how many industries go out?

We know, nationally, that for the first time in our history less than 50% of our people are working in production. The other 50% or what is left are working in personal services, working for the government, or are on relief, on welfare. Employment state-wide, I'm afraid this increase has been in the government category. Our paper industry, the greatest industry in the country, in our state, has only increased about 200 employees.

Now I am discouraged about this ever-increasing budgetary deal. When is it going to stop? When are we going to reach — not a plateau — but sort of a gentle slope upwards instead of needing 25 to 30% increase every biennium? How long can we stand it? How

long can the Federal Government or our country stand 5% inflation? How long can we have great problems and we don't have them discussed on the Floor of this House. How can we go along quietly and make our own budget without taking into consideration the national economic posture? And our taxpayers have just had a 5% inflationary increase last year. We have got a 10% surtax. Where are we going here?

This is not the ideal year. I can't see it. This is not the ideal year for raising taxes. Many of our states are on the verge of bankruptcy. Governor Ogilvie of Illinois is going to end up this year with many millions in the red. North Carolina, the great industrial state of the South, for the first time in its history is so bad off that it is putting a tax on tobacco. It has never had a tax on tobacco. And there are other states that are faced with these certain problems just like ourselves.

Now I am not going to talk about — forget our national problems, the fact that the world monetary system is all askew, and we don't know whether our dollar is going to be devalued or not, and Europe doesn't know. It's a strange paradox. The only two countries that are really sailing along today economically, budget-wise and everything else, are the two nations we defeated—Japan and West Germany—the most solid economic nations in the world today. We are involved in monetary problems today. We are involved in our balance of payment problem. We are involved in this war which has no foreseeable end at the moment.

Now as to the sources of our taxation. The latest report we have is on the 1966 internal revenue income tax returns of the State of Maine. We had in Maine 266,511 returns. Out of those 266,000 returns 127,000 were below the income of \$5,000. 114,000 of that 266,000 were between \$5,000 and \$10,000. There were 26,000 between \$10,000 and \$15,000, 5,000 between \$15,000 and \$20,000, 4,000 between \$20,000 and \$50,000, and lo and behold we had four income returns between \$500,000 and \$1,000,000 in the state.

So why do I even think of an income tax? I think at this time that is the big question. And I certainly wouldn't be embarrassed to go back to my constituency and say instead of going to the bottom of the barrel and grabbing all these little taxes here and there and punching them with a two cent cigarette tax, a two cent gasoline tax, and property taxes which they already have, and more, and then punching them with automobile taxes, registration taxes, and so forth. I think we should do a neat, clean job in the way a graduated income tax could operate.

Now you have got some information there, but it is out of date in a way. There is only a \$2,000 exemption beyond your federal exemptions on that schedule that you had, but I have another schedule that has \$3,000 exemptions. Now taxation is not an interesting subject, and my only excuse for going on like this is to get some information broadcast, and in this L. D. 803, a graduated income tax, the rates run from two to six per cent. It doesn't put a surtax on the man who is only earning \$4,000 or \$5,000, or \$6,000. With a \$3,000 exemption, the man under \$6,000 or \$7,000 is exempt, he pays hardly any tax.

Now when I say a two or three thousand dollar exemption, what does that mean? It means that you make out your federal income tax, you take all your deductions and exemptions, and before you pay a state income tax, you add \$3,000 more exemption to it.

Now some of these people have said things that are not right. They don't understand the working of the bill.

Bill Dennett—I can see him, he is back there—would say, "sit down Jack, you are taking more than five minutes," and I know that and I agree, if you can't save them, as the old ministers used to say, in the first twenty minutes, you are not going to save them at all. But I do present this, and I am sorry if I have bored you. I have gotten out the salient facts, and I wish—I'll say it again—I wish we could have a committee of the whole, a joint discussion of taxation, a joint meeting, of our responsibility,

which is our constitutional responsibility, right here in this House and get a lot of these things ironed out and at least get better informed. Thank you.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Very briefly, I think probably it would be erroneous on our part to indefinitely postpone any of the revenue measures that are before us in view of the fact that we have not, at least to this day, been indicated as to what revenues will be available to pay for the supplemental budget or any agreement to the supplemental budget that may be forthcoming. So I think it might be wrong at this time to indefinitely postpone a possible avenue that we might be able to arrive at. This may not be the answer, but I don't think that it's necessary that we should indefinitely postpone at this time.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque very well knows, the indefinite postponement of item 3, L. D. 803, will not militate against our reconsidering of this matter at some later point, if we wish to, through the vehicle of amendments offered on the Floor of the House, which is the body in which taxation measures originate, as you know.

I think that we have had a long and tiring morning discussing the income tax and the various related programs. I suggest to you that at some later point we want to amend existing legislation to put an income tax amendment on it, then that can be done. I think we should lay the issue to rest this morning and get on with the business of the House.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The Chair will order a vote. All in favor of indefinite postponement of Bill "An Act Providing for a State Income Tax", House Paper 615, L. D. 803, will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken. 78 having voted in the affirmative and 43 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail. Sent up for concurrence.

Bill "An Act relating to Retail Sale of Wine" (H. P. 1181) (L. D. 1502)

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

### Third Reader

#### Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act Transferring Arson Investigation Authority from Insurance Department to the Department of the Attorney General" (H. P. 1190) (L. D. 1509)

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

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

### Amended Bills

Bill "An Act Appropriating Funds to Aid in Constructing a School Building in Danforth" (S. P. 310) (L. D. 1025)

Bill "An Act Providing for Area Directional Signs on Maine Turnpike for Hancock and Washington County Areas" (S. P. 375) (L. D. 1285)

Bill "An Act relating to Compensation of Councilmen of City of Biddeford and Prohibiting Contracts of Councilmen and Mayor with the City" (H. P. 1055) (L. D. 1387)

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

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

Mr. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I move that we reconsider our action of earlier in the day on item 42, page eight, whereby we accepted the Majority Report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Wight, moves that the House reconsider

its action whereby it accepted the Majority "Ought Not to Pass" Report, and this item is Bill "An Act Providing for the Outlawing of Contests and Games by Establishments Selling Motor Vehicle Fuel," House Paper 474, L. D. 628. Is it the pleasure of the House to reconsider its action?

Whereupon, on motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland, tabled pending the motion of Mr. Scott of Presque Isle to reconsider and specially assigned for tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will call your attention to Supplement No. 1

### Passed to Be Enacted Emergency Measure

An Act relating to Liquor Bought from the State Liquor Commission for Use on Commercial Airlines (H. P. 1186) (L. D. 1510)

This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 125 voted in favor of same and 2 against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

### Bond Issue

An Act to Authorize Bond Issue in the Amount of \$7,540,000 for the Construction and Renovation of Higher Education Facilities at the University of Maine (H. P. 319) (L. D. 406)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. In accordance with the provisions of Section 14 of Article IX of the Constitution a two-thirds vote of the House being necessary, a total was taken. 107 voted in favor of same and 17 against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

### Passed to Be Enacted

An Act relating to Limited-User Highway (S. P. 403) (L. D. 1355)

An Act relating to Homestead Exemption (S. P. 407) (L. D. 1369)

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

**Enactor  
Tabled and Assigned**

An Act Amending the Municipal, Industrial and Recreational Obligations Act (H. P. 599) (L. D. 780)

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

(On motion of Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor, tabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for tomorrow.)

An Act to Provide Controlled Sale of Alcoholic Beverages by

Catering at Events and Gatherings (H. P. 1189) (L. D. 1508)

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.

(Off Record Remarks)

On motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland,

Adjourned until nine - thirty o'clock tomorrow morning.