

# 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 III**

June 17, 1969 to July 2, 1969

Index

**1st Special Session**

January 6, 1970 to February 7, 1970

Index

KENNEBEC JOURNAL  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

**HOUSE**

Saturday, June 28, 1969

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Robert Merrill of Gardiner.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

**Passed to Be Enacted****Emergency Measure**

An Act Providing Funds for the Official Observance of the 150th Anniversary of the Formation of the State of Maine (H. P. 590) (L. D. 732)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken, 111 voted in favor of same and 10 against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

**Constitutional Amendment****Failed of Final Passage**

Resolve proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Pledging Credit of the State for Guaranteeing Portions of Certain Home Mortgages and Housing Development (S. P. 390) (L. D. 1315)

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

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I certainly hope at at this time that you do not give this measure the necessary two thirds to insure its passage. It is well known to you that I have taken a somewhat dim view of State guaranteed loans in the past and recent events point possibly to the fact that sooner or later some of who have not agreed with me in the past may come to agree with me. I refer, as you may well infer, to the possible clouds gathering on the horizon with respect to some of our earlier ventures under the Maine Industrial Building Authority.

I had occasion only a day or two ago to talk with the head of the Maine Industrial Building Authority, the Honorable Carleton Lane, here in the corridors of this House. On that occasion he was here, probably in the usual run of his business as heading up the Maine Industrial Building Authority, considering what might be the solution of the problems that seemed to be evolving with regard to this somewhat gigantic venture which they early concurred in guaranteeing loans to. It is my understanding, and I was not able this morning because the State House offices are closed, that the Maine Industrial Building Authority either did or seriously considered reconsidering their earlier action whereby they agreed to guarantee another \$6 million loan to this same venture. If this be true then I think there are indications that the Maine Building Authority is beginning to tread more cautiously than they did in the earlier stages of their venture.

I asked Mr. Lane on this occasion if he recalled our conversation of some years ago when this matter was under consideration by the Maine Building Authority. He assured me that he did. Obviously he did not concur at that time with my suggestions. Obviously I did not, due to Mr. Lane's stature both physical and otherwise, I did not attempt to say what I might have been tempted to say—namely, I told you so. I will leave that for a later date. So much for that background.

We are now considering another step in this field of State guaranteed loans and what I am saying to you is I hope that you will consider some of the things that may be happening or may not happen to some of these earlier ventures and perhaps decide that it is better to not venture further into this field until either these clouds dissipate over the horizon or the torrent hits us in full force.

Of course there is one good thing about these boards that set up these State guaranteed loans. That is that if they make a mistake they don't have to dig down into their own pockets and make up

for their error. The bad thing about it is if they make a mistake, we, the Legislature, ultimately will have to go to the people and they will have to dig down into their meager savings to dig up the money to make up for these errors that these boards might make.

For some of these reasons I again say I hope you will take a serious look at this thing at this time. It could be that you may decide to do it now. I would hope that you would wait and let the next legislature do it if that is deemed necessary. This bill we have before us, if I understand correctly, sets up another State guaranteed loan proposition. Granted if rumor is correct and you pass it, this is to be headed by a former esteemed member of this House and a former esteemed State Treasurer who learned what he knows about finance, his home-spun finance that he refers to, such as he learned at his mother's knee. There is no question but what he would do a good job if you set this board up, which he is obviously going to head, but again, again I issue the warning and I hope that you will not give this bill the necessary two thirds to insure its passage at this time.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: From the remarks made by the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, I would attempt at this time to differentiate the two bills that he was referring about. One to which he was talking about the past Treasurer of the State is the bill creating the State Authority which we have already enacted and sent to the other body and is now on the special Appropriations table. The one that we have before us now is the Amendment to the Constitution which would pledge the credit of the State for guaranteeing portions of certain home mortgages and housing development. If you take a look at L. D. 1315 you will realize what it is for. It is exactly that. It is to guaran-

tee to insure the payment of housing loans by legislative act, which has already been enacted by this House and is now in the other body, for the purpose of fostering, encouraging and assisting the construction and rehabilitation of housing within the state. Now what we have done thus far is to create the agency which would operate this but we have not really passed the Constitutional Amendment which would make it possible.

When the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon talks about these guaranteed loans I think it is interesting to note that to this date those loans which the State has guaranteed have all proved successful. If we want to solve the problem of the low income families in rural areas and of the poor housing situations that exist, then this is the way that we can do it. If we don't want to, then obviously we should vote against this Constitutional Amendment.

If you take a look at the reports of the house trailers that come through Kittery and compare the number that has come in the last two years as compared to what came two years previous, you will find that the figure has actually doubled. And so because we do not have any low interest money for building homes, people are turning to house trailers and you well know how house trailers look in a community. They are not the answer to solve the housing problems of this state. If we want to solve housing problems and we want to help these people get loans, then this is the way it can be done cheaply, it can be done effectively, and the State of Maine would not lose money.

This is the way to do it. And I certainly hope that when you vote you will vote yes for the Constitutional Amendment because if we do not pass this the alternative is only one—or two, I should say: buying house trailers, or; second, not building or buying anything.

If you go to any bank today or whether you went two years ago and you said I wanted \$30,000 or less to build a home, you know what the answer was. And then

once you looked at the interest if they told you "yes," whether it was 8% or 9½, you said, "then maybe we better wait." And then they would go into the house trailer operation and I have nothing against them. Of course they serve their purpose but they do not solve the housing problems that we have.

Please vote "yes" on the Constitutional Amendment.

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

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I will attempt briefly to give you a run-down on this bill as it was a bill along with the companion measure that was heard some time ago by the Committee on State Government. I hope my report to you at this moment is as unbiased as possible.

We had the Housing Authority bill, which I believe came out of committee with a unanimous "ought to pass" report. During the testimony that was being offered in the Committee hearing the proponents of this Housing Authority and also of this Constitutional Amendment said that they could live without this resolve, this bond issue, and as a result of the statements of the proponents at that time the bond issue came out with a Majority "Ought not to pass" Report. It went to the other body and came back here in non-concurrence. As a result there was a Committee of Conference. I was one of the members of the Committee of Conference and in this instance where they seemed to bring out the point that this Housing Authority now apparently could not function unless this bond issue was ultimately passed. I think with some reluctance I signed that we recede and concur with the Senate, but I want to make these points. First, the proponents said they could live without it; secondly, they couldn't live without it, and now it is back before us and I just, when you vote I would only ask that you use your own good judgment.

Thereupon, this being a Constitutional Amendment and a two-thirds vote of the House being

necessary, a total was taken. 66 voted in favor of same and 64 against.

Whereupon, Mr. Martin of Eagle Lake requested a roll call.

The SPEAKER: 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, and more than one fifth of the members present having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

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

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise once again apparently against motherhood. Mr. Dennett was very charitable in what he said about what happened in the Committee hearings. I omitted the parts where three bankers' associations appeared and would give no firm commitment; although they would like to be able to see these housing starts made in the State of Maine they would like to have money to loan for more mortgages. But it was finally sent out and came back in a redraft before our Committee and they didn't even bother to come back in. And we hoped that some of you folks in your good judgment do what you did in the previous vote and I hope you hold fast.

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

Mr. STARBIRD: Mr. Speaker, I might just remind you that no bond issue is being voted on here. This is a Constitutional Amendment to guarantee loans very similar to the Maine Industrial Building Authority as has been mentioned by previous speakers. We did this last fall at a special session and this is very slightly different. There is no money involved at this present moment I might add and in all likelihood no money ever will be involved, no State money and no bonds. So I hope that you will vote for this.

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

Mr. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Lest Mr. Donaghy lead you down the primrose path this has the full acquiescence of the Maine Banking Association regardless of what he says.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think it was pointed out a little earlier by a previous speaker that we authorized the State of Maine to issue bonds to help build our industry in the State of Maine. The State of Maine has also given its word in the area of recreational development, has given its word to help the farming community in their dilemma in guaranteeing loans for some of the farmers of our state. And now what is before you is the principle that what is more important to the State of Maine than to help these people that are in dire need of housing.

I think if the State of Maine is going to participate in industrial development, recreational development and help the farming community in developing their interest, what is more important than to provide somewhat a keynote for the people that are in need of housing? And I think this should be the first step, if we have been able to help in all other categories. And there are some very dire needs in housing as has been indicated in several conferences here in Augusta throughout the winter and I hope that you will support the motion for this Constitutional change.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Belgrade, Mr. Sahagian.

Mr. SAHAGIAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This item is a little bit vague to me and I wish somebody will explain to me. It was previously stated that there was no bond or that there was no guarantee by our State. Now in the event that this mortgage is advanced would the State or any of our taxpayers be involved if it was on a default?

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

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I don't know as I am going to attempt to answer all the questions. There have been somewhat apparently conflicting statements made. I think the truth of the matter is here that we are passing a Constitutional Amendment which would set up a Building Authority similar to the Maine Building Authority, and that certainly if that is set up it can only operate in the field of State guaranteed loans, and that was the point that I raised, that I felt in the light of some developments in not only one field but maybe two or three in the venture so far, that we have so far gone, that we could wisely wait another two years and see what develops out of some of these questionable areas before we advance further in this field.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Belgrade, Mr. Sahagian.

Mr. SAHAGIAN: Mr. Speaker, am I correct in my assumption that in the event this bond is defaulted or this mortgage is defaulted the State will have to pick up the tab?

The SPEAKER: The answer is in the affirmative.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, well I would certainly think the answer to that is obvious. I might ask another. What is the advantage of a State guaranteed loan?

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This is the problem as I see it. We have already guaranteed so many loans that if we would run into a recession we could be bankrupt. I hope we don't see fit this morning to put the State's name any further on the line. And if I was a banker I certainly would support it, I would want guaranteed loans. That

insures their collection of their cash. 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: I am not a banker obviously and I am not interested in it for that purpose. I would just remind the members of the House that were here two years ago, that we amended the Constitution at that time, to pledge the credit of the State for guaranteed loans for agricultural purposes and for those people involved in the ocean operations.

This is in addition to that and I would certainly hope that we could at least do the same for people who want houses as those people who farm and those people who fish.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. All in favor of Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Pledging Credit of the State for Guaranteeing Portions of Certain Home Mortgages and Housing Development, Senate Paper 390, L. D. 1315, receiving its final passage will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

**ROLL CALL**

YEA — Baker, Bedard, Bernier, Binnette, Birt, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Burnham, Carrier, Carter, Casey, Chandler, Chick, Coffey, Corson, Cottrell, Couture, Cox, Croteau, Cummings, Curran, Curtis, Dam, Dennett, Drigotas, Dyar, Erickson, Eustis, Fecteau, Fortier, A. J.; Fortier, M.; Fraser, Gauthier, Giroux, Good, Haskell, Heselton, Hewes, Hichens, Hunter, Jalbert, Jutras, Keyte, Kilroy, Lawry, Lebel, Leibowitz, LePage, Levesque, Lund, Marquis, Marstaller, Martin, McKinnon, McTeague, Mills, Mitchell, Moreshead, Morgan, Norris, Noyes, Ouellette, Pratt, Quimby, Richardson, H. L.; Ricker, Rideout, Ross, Sheltra, Starbird, Stillings, Susi, Temple, Vincent, Watson, Waxman, Wheeler, White, Wood.

NAY — Allen, Barnes, Berman, Bragdon, Brown, Buckley, Bunker, Carey, Clark, C. H.; Clark, H. G.; Cote, Cushing, Donaghy, Dudley,

Durgin, Evans, Farnham, Fine-moore, Gilbert, Hall, Hanson, Hardy, Harriman, Hawkens, Henley, Huber, Immonen, Johnston, Kelleher, Kelley, K. F.; Kelley, R. P.; Lee, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, MacPhail, McNally, Meisner, Millett, Mosher, Nadeau, Page, Payson, Porter, Rocheleau, Sahagian, Scott, C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Snow, Thompson, Trask, Tyndale, Wight, Williams.

ABSENT — Benson, Brennan, Crommett, Crosby, D'Alfonso, Danton, Emery, Faucher, Foster, Jameson, Laberge, Rand, Richardson, G. A.; Santoro, Soulas, Tanguay.

Yes, 79; No, 55; Absent, 16.

The SPEAKER: Seventy-nine having voted in the affirmative and fifty-five in the negative, seventy-nine not being two thirds, the Resolve fails of final passage.

Sent to the Senate.

**Passed to Be Enacted  
Bond Issue**

An Act to Amend Bond Issue Acts as to Limitations of Interest (S. P. 540) (L. D. 1614)

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. 120 voted in favor of same and 6 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 Providing for the Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act (H. P. 950) (L. D. 1229)

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.

By unanimous consent the above several matters ordered sent forthwith.

**Orders of the Day**

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

An Act Providing for Presidential Preferences in Primary Election (H. P. 1151) (L. D. 1473)

Tabled—June 27, by Mr. Ross of Bath.

Pending—Further consideration. On motion of Mr. Birt of East Millinocket, the House voted to insist.

By unanimous consent, ordered sent forthwith.

#### (Off Record Remarks)

On motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland,

Recessed for five minutes until the sounding of the gong.

#### After Recess

Called to order by the Speaker.

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

#### Passed to Be Enacted

An Act Providing for Annual Revision of State Valuation (H. P. 100) (L. D. 108)

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

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker, in support of this legislation I would request that the vote be taken by the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson moves that when the vote is taken it be taken by the yeas and nays. 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 and more than one fifth of the members present having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

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

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question

through the Chair to anyone who may answer.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may pose his question.

Mr. COTE: How much is it going to cost the State?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Cote poses a question through the Chair to any member who may answer if they choose, and the question being—how much will this bill cost the State if enacted.

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

Mrs. BAKER: Mr. Speaker, I don't anticipate it will cost the State anything over and above what it is costing at the present time. The bill provides for \$50 a day for the Board of Appeals and I believe that the Board of Equalization gets a like sum.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The yeas and nays have been ordered. All in favor of the enactment of this Bill will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Allen, Baker, Bedard, Benson, Berman, Bernier, Binnette, Birt, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Brennan, Brown, Burnham, Carey, Carrier, Carter, Chandler, Chick, Clark, C. H.; Coffey, Corson, Cote, Cottrell, Couture, Cox, Croteau, Cummings, Curran, Curtis, Cushing, Dam, Dennett, Donaghy, Drigotas, Durgin, Dyar, Erickson, Eustis, Farnham, Faucher, Fecteau, Fortier, A. J.; Fortier, M.; Fraser, Gauthier, Gilbert, Giroux, Hall, Harriman, Haskell, Hawkins, Henley, Hewes, Huber, Hunter, Immonen, Jalbert, Johnston, Jutras, Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Kilroy, Lawry, Lebel, Leibowitz, LePage, Levesque, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Lund, MacPhail, Marquis, Marsteller, Martin, McKinnon, McTeague, Millett, Mitchell, Moreshead, Morgan, Nadeau, Norris, Noyes, Ouellette, Page, Payson, Porter, Pratt, Richardson, H. L.; Rideout, Ross, Scott, C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Sheltra, Snow, Starbird, Stillings, Susi, Temple, Thompson, Trask, Tyndale, Vin-



cent, Waxman, Wheeler, White, Wood.

**NAY** — Barnes, Bragdon, Buckley, Clark, H. G.; Dudley, Evans, Finemore, Good, Hanson, Hardy, Heselton, Hichens, Kelleher, Kelley, K. F.; Lee, McNally, Meisner, Mills, Mosher, Quimby, Rand, Ricker, Rocheleau, Tanguay, Wight, Williams.

**ABSENT** — Bunker, Casey, Crommett, Crosby, D'Alfonso, Danton, Emery, Foster, Jameson, Laberge, Richardson, G. A.; Sahagian, Santoro, Soulas, Watson.

Yes, 109; No, 26; Absent, 15.

The **SPEAKER**: One hundred nine having voted in the affirmative and twenty-six in the negative, the Bill is passed to be enacted. It will be signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

An Act Providing for the Conservation and Rehabilitation of Land Affected in Connection with Mining (H. P. 1270) (L. D. 1598)

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

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Paris, Mr. Immonen.

Mr. **IMMONEN**: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: When we first came to the Legislature we were given a pamphlet on how a bill becomes a law. Now in following the progress of this bill on mining I have taken what you might call a course in how to create a bureaucracy. I became interested in the mining bills because of the feldspar mining in my area by small operators. I attended the hearings on several mining bills on one day a few months ago. They covered the high purpose toward the control of the use and abuse of our landscape. One bill advocated a workable plan for mining and gravel interests and another bill would have in effect scared prospectors and miners because of its advocacy of restrictive controls.

I will state that the Committee came out with a fair compromise and I can understand it was a difficult problem. My first criticism is that this bill came out just last week near the end of the session, or was this one of the steps

in a well thought out plan for development of a new bureaucratic establishment by its late introduction to the Floor of the Legislature?

The next step included the adoption of an amendment to exempt mining interests in Hancock County and then the sand and gravel interests from this bill. I believe that this took over 90% of the high purpose in its projected field of control. But still the bureau must be kept alive. Let's save the bureau for the new bureaucrats. With the adoption of these two amendments of exemptions I placed on an amendment to safeguard the interests of the small operators in the feldspar mining in my area. I am grateful for your support for this feldspar exemption.

At the other body the feldspar amendment was taken off and then three amendments of various lengths were added and then sent back to this House. Here we had a parade of amendments, emending and amending amendments and the Committee legal document at the time of engrossment. There have been at least ten amendments. That means that there have been a considerable number of lifebuoys sent out for the survival of this projected commission or bureau.

I could say other things but it would be better not to prolong your attention. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question through the Chair to any member of the Natural Resources Committee if one should care to answer about the basis on Joint Rule 12 and House Rule 46, the amount of funds necessary to keep this commission in operation on the basis of the original legal document that came from the Committee and then the funds necessary when the field of operations have been reduced by over 90%. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**: The gentleman from West Paris, Mr. Immonen poses a question through the Chair to any member who may answer if they choose. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lund.

Mr. **LUND**: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the

House: In its original form it was anticipated that this legislation would cover sand and gravel as well as the other mining operations, and on that basis a separate legislative document was drawn and has been enacted by this body and sits now on the Appropriations table, that is the bill appropriating in the order of \$80,000 for the operation. It is my best recollection that it is on the order of \$80,000 for the operation of the Mining Commission.

In view of the fact that sand and gravel has been removed I would anticipate that that amount could be reduced somewhat, but the appropriation bill is currently sitting on the Appropriations table.

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

The SPEAKER: The House will be at ease and the Assistant Majority floorleader will please approach the rostrum.

#### House at Ease

Called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will call your attention to Supplement No. 2.

#### Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act Making Supplemental Appropriations for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1970 and June 30, 1971 and Raising Revenue for Funding Thereof (H. P. 1281) (L. D. 1608) which failed passage to be enacted in the House on June 27 and which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "D" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto and House Amendments "F" and "G" on June 25.

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

In the House: On motion of Mr. Sahagian of Belgrade, the House voted to recede.

Thereupon, the House voted to recede from adoption of House Amendment "D".

Senate Amendment "A" to House Amendment "D" (S-333) was read by the Clerk.

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

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As I look over this amendment to me as usual it does the wrong thing. You see they are lowering the corporation tax 4% instead of 5. It seems to me that if they wanted to do something constructive for the people of this State they should have upped from \$1,000 to \$1,250 or \$1,500 the exemption to those who hope to pay the income tax, and probably if this had been done it would have been a little more palatable to me. But under these conditions what they have done here, they have lowered the taxable income of the corporations, those who are able to pay, and kept the little person at the same rate and I hope that somebody corrects this before we adopt the measure in its entirety.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am not so concerned with—I am concerned with the amendment which cuts the rate from 5 to 4% and I think an explanation is in order as far as what this 5 to 4% amounting to \$5 million, takes off. Now this is another area where possibly the leadership knew of, but we didn't. These monies that are cut from this, it is my understanding now, are monies that are going to be put into the wrap-up budget of the Appropriations Committee or the so-called omnibus bill. This would take out the \$702,000 which was put in there as at least we were told in caucus would avert strikes and that I listened to yesterday would avert strikes. This cut this out.

This cut out \$2,123,000 which would have allowed the physio plant at the South Campus to open. We were told it would have to close if the money was not put in.

It will stop a new building from being opened at the University of Maine in Portland. It will stop 365 students from entering in the fall of 1969 which are about to be turned away. It will stop 1,000 more students which should be accepted in the fall of 1970. It will cut out \$60,000 from the Indian Affairs fund for the second year. It will cut out advertising and keep Montreal and New York promotional offices open, and nothing could make me feel sadder. It will cut out the Human Rights Commission, L. D. 28, \$64,500; it will cut out of the L. D. 1219 on Housing \$104,000, and it will cut out all of your L. D.'s that are spread around on the table in the other branch \$1,231,000.

So that at the expense of many many worthwhile projects where we could very very well go back and do what I have wanted to do for the last three weeks, recommit this bill to study it, not recommit it with an Order that we would leave it alone, leave it as it is with everything on it, including a 6% sales tax as we did last week but just look it over to really more carefully make cuts. Although the additions to this were not my idea, I think it would be better to do this than to please again the wealthy corporations and the smaller corporations who are enjoying profits from paying 5% and pay only 4%.

It is my opinion that somewhere along the line a great many members of this body at least were not aware of this situation. Certainly somewhere along the line there is a great deal of money here for pie sweetening and I am fully aware of the fact that one must be very careful how he talks around here because he is going to be told that his pride is being hurt. As far as I am concerned I went home last night and I made a great many phone calls. I got up very early this morning and I visited quite a few areas and I am satisfied of where I stand. I am satisfied of where my people stand.

I am making no motion but I will say this right here and now by the sudden move on the other

branch with this simple amendment here as 333 which cut \$5 million from a package that I would buy a corporate income package, little do probably some of us know that it was going to make the cuts in this area.

And I forgot to say also for the benefit of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, I see \$145,881 here, I don't know whether or not what effect that is going to do on his pet project.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think Mr. Jalbert probably has made a much better explanation of this than I could. However, I would like to add to this with regard to the first two items that he mentioned, that this item of \$702,000 was added to the budget at the request of the Chief Executive. It was not in the original budget. My understanding is that in order to facilitate this cut he has now conceded that this money which he said would be necessary to adjust State employees on their take-home pay on overtime that he has now decided that he can get along without this.

The amount of \$2,123,000 which was made up of several items in the University of Maine's budget also fell in the same category. There were items which were not in the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee but were added to the cost afterwards at the request of the Chief Executive and I understand that he has now made a similar concession with regard to this, that he has now decided that in the interests of making a cut they can get along without this \$2,123,000 additional. This is in addition to the, I believe somewhat between 6 and \$7 million which the Appropriations Committee had approved for the University of Maine.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: First of all let me say

that the figures that are before you now are figures that have been discussed not only with the Chief Executive but with the members of the leadership of the Democratic Party, I discussed them with the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque, yesterday. Until the action was actually taken in the Senate I can assure you at that point we did not know in here whether or not the cut would actually be made or not. We have fully discussed this in a Republican caucus a few minutes ago but I would like to, for the benefit of all the members of the House, give you a very brief I hope run-down on the financial situation as it exists.

If you have the present program, tax revenue program without the auto trade-in the figure would be \$54,930,000. You subtract from that the auto trade-in, the loss of revenue as the result of repeal of the earlier law, that would be \$9,041,000 giving you a balance down of \$45,800,000 plus. By reducing the corporate tax from 5 to 4, you get down to a figure of \$40,889,000 of projected revenue from the tax program that is before you for consideration.

Now the total amount of the Part I and Part II budgets together with the first and second year of the school subsidies, and the following items which I am going to list for you so that you will know, comes up with a total figure of \$323,250,057. That is, you take the Part I and Part II in the first and second year of the school subsidies and add the following, and I am going to go quickly and I will be happy to examine any phase with you in detail. The additional interest and carrying charges on bond issues, including \$22 million for school construction subsidy; \$50 million pollution abatement, etcetera, \$121,500 in the first year, \$645,500 in the second; debt retirement on presently existing indebtedness of the state, \$1,280,000; leasing of office space previously referred to in the memorandum under date of June 3, 1969, \$200,000; parochial school closings—and as I pointed

out at the Republican caucus that we anticipate a cost but the cost has been substantially more than we thought it would be, parochial school closings, in the first year \$192,288, the second year, \$795,638; the staff for the administration of the tax of all the combined taxes of May 1; Bath Home \$48,217 the first year, \$97,664 in the second; the first year of the school subsidy, I alluded to earlier, \$4,937,824, and of course the second year of the school subsidy and its figure.

Now if you take this program in this form and take the presently existing tax laws without passing any new ones, we would have an imbalance of \$40,743,227. By reducing the corporate tax from 5 to 4, we generate \$40,889,000. Now we discussed in the caucus this morning the reasons for doing this as the proponent of the tax program now before you. I want you to know that the reason for the rate structure as it was originally proposed, that is 4% corporate and 1 through 6 graduated personal, but because it is important that these two taxes are kept at a level where you don't create an unfavorable tax treatment for either unincorporated businesses or corporations; in other words, you have to have a balance between these two. And the proposal which I offered to you on Tuesday was designed to maintain a proper balance. And if you start fooling around with the rates, in this case you would penalize, say at 3%, you are penalizing unincorporated businesses, assuming that 1 to 6 remains the same. At 5% you are penalizing the corporations.

Now this proposal, as in the Senate Amendment you have before you, is designed to restore the balance, but I wouldn't be so naive as to suggest to you that that is the only reason. Many of you feel that the budget is too high. You feel that you don't want it. As one of those who supported the State's assumption of the municipal 18% ADC contribution, we propose that in the Appropriations wrap-up bill we delete that and we come back here in special session; we can

then, if we wish, fund the second year of the biennium on the 18%.

Now other suggestions were made. A 2% across the board reduction in school subsidies. This didn't appeal to several of us because we feel that we have made a commitment to the communities at 4.9 and that to give it to them with one hand and take it back with the other just doesn't make good sense. The effective spending level, then, of this program, following the proposal that we ask you to adopt today, is \$38 million, not including reference to L. D.'s both those which are not recurring and those which are. But it does reduce the built-in impact in a very substantial way by taking this program out for which both parties have fought for so long, so hard. We are willing to make this concession. We are willing in a spirit of compromise to do everything we can to avoid a disaster of going home and doing nothing.

Now one of the earlier speakers made reference to the fact that this means no L. D. money. That is simply not true. The Governor has already agreed on the University of Maine question. The Governor approves this proposal, and it is crystal clear that although some of the additional things that he wanted, he feels that are absolutely necessary, he, in a spirit of compromise, for which I think he should be commended, is willing to see us go back to the effective spending level, not including L. D.'s, of \$38 million. As far as these various measures are concerned, I have one note, what is the fate of the Human Rights Commission? All of these various L. D.'s within a reasonable figure, funding would be available for them.

Now the other thing I want to mention is that by following conservative estimates of revenue, as we are doing here, we can again return—at least from the Republican point of view, to the position of not spending on the basis of grossly inflated revenue estimates, which is precisely the situation that has led us to the

present situation, where, for example, the chief medical examiner had no more money for autopsies starting in April; and we didn't have enough money in a state-wide operation involving millions of dollars, we didn't have enough money in the till to meet his legal responsibility to perform autopsies. I think that our fiscal picture should be such that we can survive these little bumps in the road. In this program, at least from the more conservative view—and believe it or not that is the one I take, is that we should have enough money so that we can operate on other than a crisis to crisis basis. I hope you will support the adoption of this amendment and I hope that I have explained, in not too lengthy a fashion, what is involved.

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

Mr. STARBIRD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question to the gentleman from Cumberland. Unfortunately when the previous speaker was talking I was out in the corridor. I did catch a note of some of the items that were to be cut, and I am wondering if some money is to be cut from the Department of Indian Affairs?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, who may answer if he chooses, and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The question was answered by me before, but I will be glad to repeat it. The answer is no, there is no thought of cutting out all of these various programs that were listed by the gentleman from Lewiston. What we suggest doing is that we cut the effective spending level back to \$38 million, that we leave this additional for L. D.'s that we not grossly overspend in any of these areas, and these things that have been read off, in my opinion, will not be cut. And I believe that this proposal will allow us to fund the second year of the

Indian Affairs Department which, as you know, was not the case under the earlier proposal.

So I don't think that this really effects any net change in the whole situation except that we are willing, in a spirit of compromise, to defer until the special session of the Legislature, with a clear understanding that we are going to consider at that time the question of the municipal contribution of the ADC program, and that understanding is a definite one that we are going to review this, and if we have the money available then, we will again make the effort to, in this form of direct help to communities, abolish the 18% contribution.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There seems to be an area of some confusion here, and I am not prepared to stand 100 percent behind this paper that I have. However, it was handed to me by the Senate Chairman of the Appropriations Committee this morning, and in the items which he pointed out are marked off on this sheet for me, is included an item deleted, Indian Affairs fund, second year, \$60,000. Now I am not going to attempt to furnish any further explanation.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: To further supplement the remarks of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, as it stands now, with the passage of this amendment it means that we will have less for L. D.'s, in the entire package here, the sum of \$145,000.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have sat here for three days listening to the remarks by the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, about the budget. The gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson explained where the extra money would come from for

L. D.'s while the gentleman from Lewiston was out in the hall.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have been discriminated against. I don't have a copy of whatever it is that the gentleman from Perham refers to. The only thing I am trying to indicate is the gentleman from Eagle Lake has just pointed out, I have indicated that our proposal is to cut down the committed spending to the \$38 million level, leaving the additional money for L. D.'s, and in my opinion there is no reason why these L. D.'s, a reasonable number of them, not a great galaxy of goodies, but a reasonable number of these L. D.'s can't be funded, and there is ample money to do that. And as far as the second year is concerned, my understanding is that we intend to fund it.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson has indicated to you pretty well what the package is down to presently with the removal of the ADC 18% from the package, as was indicated, that in some areas they were not too proud of it. And as he also indicated, that this may come at a later special session of the Legislature to see just what the Legislature wanted to do with it at a future date. And as also indicated by the same gentleman, there will be approximately a million and a half or better to fund the L. D.'s that will be necessary before we go home.

Now I don't know just how much more we can stand here and split page after page and find out just exactly whether it affects one or the other. Somehow or other these numbers are cropping up in the air; one gives one sheet, the other one gives another sheet.

I hope that the members of the House understand what is going to be done. The amendment that was put in the Senate this morning was to reduce the corporate

income tax from 5 to 4 and the removal of the ADC 18% from the community to the State and hoping that maybe at a later date it may become more acceptable or better acceptable or better understanding. So now that the amendment has been put on in the Senate I saw no particular need of trying to explain to our caucus something that may not even become a reality.

Now as explained by the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, the amendment was put in the Senate and the budget has been reduced to approximately 38 point something million dollars and I hope that the members of this House will realize that the end of the line has just about caught up with us; and in so doing many of the members may not be wholly satisfied or completely satisfied. As was indicated earlier, some would have rather seen that we increase the reduction of the exemption or increasing the exemption instead of the corporate tax and as the gentleman from Cumberland has indicated this would have created a further imbalance between the corporate and the personal. And I personally agree and the Chief Executive agrees that by this imbalance we would have created more inequities which we probably would have been faced with at a later date.

So I hope that the members of the House will understand this posture that we have taken with the sincere hope that the members of this House, both Republicans and Democrats, will see fit to accept this package so that we may be able to go home. The ulterior motive behind the not accepting this package, as I have indicated before, is that we are going to go home with nothing and there will be no action taken on any other reduced, cut, added, splintered, fractured budget proposal that may come before this House. There will be none. If we cannot agree on this package this means you are going home with nothing as well as we are.

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

Mr. STARBIRD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I asked what I thought was a simple question and I got two answers, as far as I can see. I never was never too much good in arithmetic in school but I did get a passing mark. Now to me it is quite obvious that if you are going to reduce a tax you are going to reduce the amount available for a budget. The gentleman from Cumberland says that we are going down to approximately \$38 million. Very well. Now it seems to me that if we are going down to \$38 million, we are going to cut out something like \$5 million here somewhere.

Now he tells me apparently that there is nothing—there is no cut in Indian Affairs. This was something that is rather close to me and I—it was a question that I overheard out here in the corridor on the loud speaker and I thought I would come in and ask about it because I didn't hear the thing quoted completely.

Now Mr. Bragdon tells me that apparently \$60,000 are to be cut, among a lot of other things. I am not going through these other matters here. Now it is quite obvious that if you are going to lower a tax you have got to cut somewhere in the budget.

Now I might not object too much to this particular cut—I had the paper handed to me a few minutes ago, I might not object too much to this cut but I see another one here that I and some others, among them the gentleman from Lincoln, Mr. Porter who offered an amendment here a week or so ago to cut out something else that I considered was fluff and amounted to about \$50,000 and that is the Arts and Humanities Commission.

Now what I am wondering, if \$60,000 is coming out of the Indian Affairs Department like it says on this sheet, okay, well and good. But why isn't \$50,000 of frosting coming out on the first part of this document? That is what I want to know.

Now I am willing and I did go along with this thing yesterday, but I am wondering if we are going to make cuts, let's make priority cuts. Let's not cut out the

welfare of people for a department that as near as I can tell is running around the State doing next to nothing but talking about art and culture. This is all well and good if you can afford it, but I don't think we can afford it. And when we have to place art and culture before people, I will take people.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker I will make some attempt to answer the gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird. First of all referring to the Arts and Humanities. This amendment was adopted in the House, was rejected by the other body, and then we receded and concurred, which means in effect that we went back to what was originally in the Part II budget. Now in reference to the remarks made by the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon and the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, in reference to the Part II relating to the Indian Department, if you take a look on Page 12 of L. D. 1608 you will find no money for the second year of the Indian Department, no money. I repeat, no monies are there. If you take a look at the amendments that thus far have been adopted by the House and the other body you will find that none relate to cuts relating to that department. It was agreed by the Appropriations Committee that the second year of the Indian Affairs will be handled in the special session, that there has been—I repeat—no cuts in the Indian Affairs Department.

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

Mr. TYNDALE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: After listening to the debate here this morning and in the other body, it certainly becomes increasingly clear to me that our present method of approaching the appropriations of the state requirements is not a good one nor a complete one and I would certainly hope that this will be a signal for all future legislators to take into hand some method whereby we can come to a proper ap-

propriation to specific cuts in the various departments over the period of a year and I certainly would concur with the thinking of several gentlemen in this House that this should be done through the Legislative Research Committee during the off year of our sessions.

I also feel certain that this amendment is an honest and sincere effort to meet the requirements of a certain gentleman in this House who believes that this budget is too high. Therefore I shall vote for the amendment. But I was a little bit and mildly surprised that they were able to find this cut so quickly.

Thank you.

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

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: A question I would like to ask — and it has probably been partially answered — just for the record, I would like to ask this question to the leadership. How much consideration was given, really given, to upping the exemptions of the individuals to \$1200, \$1500 and leaving the corporation tax as it was originally in the bill?

Now we have heard something about balancing. Maybe I am a little numb here but I don't know what you mean by balancing the tax. It seems to me they are going to tax a corporation at say five percent; that's going to be it. If you are going to tax the individual with a thousand dollar exemption; that is going to be it. What is the difference of this balancing business? I don't understand that.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The consideration was given to increasing the exemption to a higher rate rather than reducing the corporate tax and that did not seem to be logical nor feasible for the simple reason it was creating an improper imbalance between these corporations that are incorporated and those that are not incorporated. And I wish that the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr.



Cote, would have given as much consideration to the package as we have to all the consideration of adjustment of packages.

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

Mr. McNALLY: I probably don't have the proper information, I only have this long sheet that was put on our desk, and this long sheet says Part II of the budget \$34,129,972. Now we were told in caucus that the Part II budget is \$36,721,790. And adding up on the white sheet different things that has been listed separately down the line here given to you a few moments ago, I am all confused now how they arrive at the figure \$36 million plus.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: If I may respond to the question, first of all with respect to the question of the tax. The tax as I originally proposed it was four percent corporate and one through six percent graduated with a thousand dollar exemption.

Now the reason that I am talking about balance is that if you have an unbalanced rate, either the unincorporated business or the incorporated business is going to be penalized. If you destroy this balance you are going to give unfair tax treatment to one or the other. Now the program was designed with this in mind to meet the objections of those of you who said that it is unfair to impose a tax on corporations alone when the unincorporated business across the street is not going to have to pay the tax. Now this was a question that was raised time and again on the Floor of this House.

Now you might ask, at this level, at four percent corporate, and one through six percent personal, how is the tax divided? Each one percent of the corporate tax generates \$5 million in the biennium. It doesn't take any great mathematical genius therefore to see that it is about equally divided, \$20 million from each source, personal and corporate. The other thing I want to remind you is that you have many people in this state

who are in the very fortunate position of earning personal incomes in excess of \$75,000 or \$80,000. Now if you start fooling around with the personal tax rate you are going to get in a problem on that end.

Now the other thing that I want to try to point out is, the Part II budget, the budget itself, is \$36,721,790. These figures that I read off to you — additional interest on new bond issues, debt retirement, leasing, parochial school closing, staff for the tax, the Bath Home, the first year of the school subsidy — all of these items add up to show a revenue in balance of \$40,743,227. By not adopting the 18% program at this time we then have in access of \$2 million for L. D.'s. Now for the benefit of the gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird, I have spoken to the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee. There is absolutely no commitment whatever to cut out the second year of the Indian Affairs Department, and in fact it is our intention that it be included in this program.

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

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The question that I asked I consider answered by the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson. And it seems funny to me that every time somebody rises on his feet in this House who is sincere in what he is trying to do, gets slapped down by his own dictatorship. I took it once and I laughed about it. This morning I am a little bit angry. I don't ask questions to have half answers because I am sincere in what I am trying to do. I was against a \$43 million budget. Now it is being cut to \$38 million, which is a little bit more palatable to me, and I accept those things. But it is kind of tiresome when you have been here for a number of years and know a little bit, you think, about state government, a little bit about finances, and maybe the other 1608 other bills that are before us. But every time one is supposed to have a little bit different idea than the so-called leadership we get up here and we get slapped down with ir-

responsible answers and I don't like it.

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

Mr. BENSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would address myself just to the tax itself. We are talking about repealing the auto trade-in tax. It doesn't take too much figuring to come up with figures at the 6% rate, and the 6% sales tax seems to be appealing to many in the House, a 6% sales tax on a \$4,000 automobile would be somewhere in the vicinity of \$240. That is the situation as it is today. If you had an automobile to trade in against that purchase of \$2,000 you would get a credit of \$120. We have heard numerous expressions of concern for the middle income group.

The middle income group as far as I am concerned can range anywhere from we will say 7-\$8,000 to 15-\$16,000, set it where you will. Take the person earning \$15,000, married and with two children. At \$15,000 he would pay a State tax of \$150. If he were to trade cars in that year, assuming he might buy a \$4,000 car and turn in his \$2,000 trade-in, there would be a difference of \$120. He is going to get a credit against his federal income tax for the amount that he pays in State tax. I don't see that we are hurting the middle income person here very seriously. As a matter of fact, I think that the imposition of the tax package that we are talking about today is doing the middle income person a great favor.

Once again there has been reference made several times to the Indian Affairs Department. There has been no agreement nor has there been any intention on the part of leadership nor on the part of the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee to effect any cuts in the Indian Affairs budget. This is completely erroneous and I hope that you do not take this type of information to heart. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lincoln, Mr. Porter.

Mr. PORTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: My good seatmate and I have been doing

some figuring on this and he was kind enough to get up and ask a question and as yet it has not been answered and I think we are due an answer.

The original Part II budget was a little over \$34 million. Now we find it is \$36.7 million. Something has been added there and we simply want to know what it was that was added to bring it from 34 to 36.

One other question, I presented an amendment here at one time to strike out the ADC and it was soundly defeated. Now are we going to be asked to vote again to strike out the ADC and do what I asked to do in my amendment and have it rejected? I am puzzled.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentlemen of the House relative to the rules. The gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson having spoken many times requests permission to speak again.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The reason for the differences in the figures is you have to add in all of these other items which I have listed not once but twice. You also have the ADC program in there. And the figures that I am using are not the product of my wild imagination; they are figures prepared at my request by the Legislative Finance Office so that we could sit down and go over this thing and find out what the present posture is.

Now the other thing is that I am well aware that the House earlier rejected any cut in the ADC or cutting this ADC thing out and I am one of those with many other Republicans in this House who voted against cutting it out, who voted against the gentleman's amendment, and the point we are trying to make is that we are willing to defer consideration of this until the next special session of the Legislature with the commitment only that we will reconsider it, not that we are going to put it

in or take it out. We are willing to take this out now so that the committed spending level can be reduced to \$38 million to meet the objections of the several of you who said time and again, "Harry, I will vote for your tax package if you just cut it down." And that is in the simplest terms possible, exactly what we are trying to do.

Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston was granted permission to speak a third time.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I made a statement a few moments ago if this amendment passes we will have \$145,000 left for L. D.'s. I stand on this statement. If we pass, however, another amendment that will strike out any part of the budget including the \$2,081,000 of 18% for ADC that is going back to the towns and cities, then we will have \$2,081,000 more for L. D.'s. I am not talking about what we are going to have later. I am talking about step by step what we have now and if the thinking is to just pass half of the ADC why that would leave us with a tremendous cost of administration of a 9% program.

And while I am on my feet I might say that if anybody thinks for a moment that this will have any effect at all upon the built-in program of a double tax, a double major tax two years from now, you forget it. This has no bearing whatever on it. This just eliminates the programs that we were told we couldn't do without and suddenly the compromise is made without us knowing a thing about it.

And while I am on my feet also I want to say this. I am not speaking for my own self; as far as I am concerned I have been politically buried so many times that recently I decided after a look-see May 30th at Switzerland Road in Lewiston that my grave had worn out so I bought another site in Pemaquid. So that doesn't bother me at all of being buried, because I can resuscitate myself very very quickly. I have been home; I have talked to the people; I know what the people are thinking; I know what the people are saying. By the same token in

that this is said here and that is said here because apparently there are those who might think that underneath the dome on the third floor is the Empire State House.

What is said about me doesn't bother me too much. What is said about a friend of mine annoys me and what is said about a colleague of mine that I have known all of my life and whom I respect really annoys me. For my money I think Representative Cote has served well in this House and he has a right to his own thinking and he can flick the key any way he wants to. That is his business. He has flicked it against me on several occasions and I haven't climbed all over him and I don't think anybody else should, particularly anyone who is in the capacity of leadership.

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

Mr. CAREY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I certainly wish that the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert would have let the Representative from Auburn, Mr. Laberge also form his own opinions.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, in looking over this new proposal I see some of the fat has been taken away but they haven't really got to the meat of the subject. Now as I understand it, I would like to assure the gentleman from Kingman Township that he has not much to worry about because if you read between the lines on the ADC the 18%, what they are saying under their breath or so, if you pay much attention, that we will have a special session and these will be reconsidered and at that time to put any amount they want to into this income tax. It only takes just a simple majority and so I wouldn't worry about anything that is taken out because it will be put in anyway in October or January. So that is not my concern.

What I am concerned is that the leadership is so afraid that these people sitting here in this House this afternoon seem to be so afraid

that these people will go home and really discuss the issue over the weekend and if this is as serious as I think it is, and they think it is I mean, I am sure these people would be back and we would have nearly a unanimous vote here coming Monday morning.

Now at this hour and knowing how long it takes to engross bills I can assure you you are going to be here Monday morning even if you sit in your seats, so I am going home and get a little sleep pretty soon and be back Monday morning. And I would suggest that it would be a good idea to go home everybody and talk this over with some very intelligent people in your area I suspect; there is in mine, and they may want this. The leadership may well be right. They certainly are not right in my area but they may be right in yours and in this case we would make a more sensible decision than we will this afternoon. So I hope that you don't get hasty this afternoon and pass something that is the same thing that you voted on on several occasions and scarcely the fat taken off of it, and that we will discuss this issue back home over the weekend and we will make a sensitive, decisive vote on Monday morning. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the adoption of Senate Amendment "A" to House Amendment "D".

Whereupon, Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor requested a roll call.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Southwest Harbor, Mr. Benson moves that when the vote is taken it be taken by the yeas and nays. 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, and more than one fifth of the members present having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the adoption of Senate Amendment "A" to House Amendment "D". If you are in favor of adopting this

amendment you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Allen, Baker, Barnes, Bedard, Benson, Berman, Bernier, Binnette, Birt, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Brennan, Brown, Buckley, Burnham, Carey, Carrier, Casey, Chandler, Chick, Clark, C. H.; Clark, H. G.; Coffey, Corson, Cote, Cottrell, Cox, Croteau, Cummings, Curran, Curtis, D'Alfonso, Dam, Dennett, Donaghy, Drigotas, Dudley, Durgin, Dyar, Erickson, Eustis, Farnham, Faucher, Fecteau, Finemore, Fortier, A. J.; Fortier, M.; Fraser, Gauthier, Gilbert, Giroux, Good, Harriman, Haskell, Hawkens, Heselton, Hichens, Hunter, Johnston, Jutras, Kelley, K. F.; Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Kilroy, Lawry, Lebel, Lee, Leibowitz, LePage, Levesque, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Lund, MacPhail, Marquis, Mars-taller, Martin, McKinnon, McNally, McTeague, Meisner, Millett, Mills, Mitchell, Moreshead, Morgan, Mosher, Nadeau, Norris, Ouellette, Payson, Porter, Pratt, Quimby, Richardson, H. L.; Ricker, Ride-out, Ross, Sahagian, Santoro, Scott, C. F.; Sheltra, Snow, Starbird, Stillings, Tanguay, Temple, Thompson, Trask, Tyndale, Vincent, Watson, Waxman, Wheeler, White, Wood.

NAY — Bragdon, Couture, Cushing, Emery, Hall, Hanson, Hardy, Henley, Hewes, Huber, Immonen, Jalbert, Kelleher, Page, Rand, Rocheleau, Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Wight, Williams.

ABSENT — Bunker, Carter, Crommett, Crosby, Danton, Evans, Foster, Jameson, Laberge, Noyes, Richardson, G. A.; Soulas, Susi. Yes, 117; No, 20; Absent, 13.

The SPEAKER: One hundred seventeen having voted in the affirmative and twenty in the negative, Senate Amendment "A" to House Amendment "D" is adopted in concurrence.

House Amendment "D" as amended by Senate Amendment "A" thereto was adopted in concurrence.

Mr. Sahagian of Belgrade offered House Amendment "H" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "H" (H-610) was read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Belgrade, Mr. Sahagian.

Mr. SAHAGIAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This amendment of mine will produce in the neighborhood of \$38 million, slightly under \$39 million, and we can keep many of our projects that we can go along with and some of our cities and towns will get their subsidies, school subsidies, and then the ADC will be removed from them and it would only make a difference of about \$3 to \$5 on each family, the increase of the sales tax from five to five and a half per cent. For instance, if a family has four and they spend \$200 for each person for clothing or detergents, we all know that food is exempted and fuel is exempted; therefore it only leaves for a sales tax of clothing and detergent. That would mean on a family of four or five, an average family, a half a per cent times \$1200. If it is a family of six it makes it \$6 and a family of five, it makes it \$5 and a family of four it will only add \$4 a year.

Now there were some remarks made here earlier that \$1200 under the plan, previous plan, and then if we bring the auto trade-in back, that they will get \$120 back. But you don't change an auto every year. Some people don't change an auto for eight or ten years. So you really can't consider that an inducement. Thank you.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: At this zero hour I see that there are still some people trying to split different areas into the atom. As has been indicated on the Floor of this House in previous weeks and months, I doubt that any member of this House is going to vote for an increase in the sales tax of this amount or any other amount.

As indicated by the gentlemen from Belgrade, Mr. Sahagian, it would only cost only a few dollars to those that are making 10 or 15 thousand dollars a year and are raising a family, but he didn't indicate that it would also put

the same amount on those that are making two, three or four thousand dollars a year.

So therefore I move the indefinite postponement of this amendment and ask that when the vote is taken it be taken by the yeas and nays, because I don't see that this type of amendment is the type of program and raising monies to burden the state's population. So I hope, when the members of the House have debated this amendment, that there will be no area that this is feasibly or logically possible to put this burden on the people of the state.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Belgrade, Mr. Sahagian.

Mr. SAHAGIAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I just want to correct one thing that I think Mr. Levesque does not understand. I did not say it was only \$3 to \$5 for a man that is earning 10 to 15 thousand dollars. I said the poorest family. But if you take a man for instance, who buys an automobile for \$8,000 he is going to pay at least \$50 more; and if a man buys an automobile for a thousand dollars, he is only going to pay \$5. So the rich man, as he refers, is going to pay more. If he buys a suit of clothes for \$500 he is going to pay just \$5, where a man who buys a suit of clothes for \$25 he is only going to pay 50c or 75c, whatever it may be.

I think Mr. Levesque misunderstood my remarks.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I might have misunderstood an area of Mr. Sahagian's remarks but not including the tourists. Granted this is going to put the burden also on the tourists but my only reaction was that if we do increase the sales tax by another half a per cent my reference that we are still going to put the burden on the lower income on relatively the same basis as those that are making a higher income. And I don't think that is a fair way of raising the monies to pay for the program.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: There are a great many persons here who are opposed to the imposition of an income tax and they have wanted to have alternatives. The gentleman from Belgrade, Mr. Sahagian, should be commended; at least he has offered something specific.

However, I feel also that this is a futile effort. We must be practical. We never could get 101 votes on that at this time and so I must concur with the motion for indefinite postponement.

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

Mr. FARNHAM: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: What we see here in this amendment is another attempt to wring it out of the boys who eat the hamburg, the salt cod fish and the beans. Those of us who can afford filet mignon will get off again.

Now I hope the House has the courage to give this thing a decent burial in a grave six feet long, six feet deep, and well padded down.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque that House Amendment "H" be indefinitely postponed. He further moves that when the vote is taken it be taken by the yeas and nays. 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, and more than one fifth of the members present having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque that House Amendment "H" be indefinitely postponed. If you are in favor of the motion you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Allen, Baker, Barnes, Bedard, Benson, Bernier, Bin-

nette, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Brennan, Buckley, Burnham, Carey, Carrier, Carter, Casey, Chandler, Chick, Clark, H. G.; Coffey, Corson, Cote, Cottrell, Couture, Cox, Croteau, Cummings, Curran, Curtis, D'Alfonso, Dam, Donaghy, Drigotas, Dudley, Emery, Erickson, Eustis, Farnham, Faucher, Fecteau, Finemore, Fortier, A. J.; Fortier, M.; Fraser, Gilbert, Giroux, Good, Harriman, Hawkens, Heselton, Hunter, Immonen, Jalbert, Johnston, Jutras, Kelleher, Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Kilroy, Lawry, Lebel, Lee, Leibowitz, LePage, Levesque, Lewin, Lewis, Lund, Marquis, Martin, McKinnon, McTeague, Millett, Mills, Mitchell, Morgan, Nadeau, Norris, Noyes, Ouellette, Pratt, Quimby, Richardson, H. L.; Ricker, Rideout, Rocheleau, Ross, Santoro, Scott, C. F.; Sheltra, Snow, Starbird, Stillings, Susi, Tanguay, Temple, Thompson, Tyndale, Vincent, Watson, Waxman, Wheeler, White, Wood.

NAY — Berman, Birt, Brown, Clark, C. H.; Cushing, Dennett, Durgin, Hall, Hanson, Hardy, Haskell, Henley, Hewes, Hichens, Huber, Kelley, K. F.; Lincoln, MacPhail, Marstaller, McNally, Meisner, Mosher, Page, Payson, Porter, Rand, Sahagian, Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Trask, Wight, Williams.

ABSENT — Bragdon, Bunker, Crommett, Crosby, Danton, Dyar, Evans, Foster, Gauthier, Jameson, Laberge, Moreshead, Richardson, G. A.; Soulas.

Yes, 104; No, 32; Absent, 14.

The SPEAKER: One hundred and four having voted in the affirmative and thirty-two in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone does prevail. Is it now the pleasure of the House to concur with the Senate?

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "D" as amended by House Amendment "A" and Senate Amendment "A" thereto and House Amendments "F" and "G" in concurrence.

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

**Emergency Measure**

An Act Making Supplemental Appropriations for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1970 and June 30, 1971 and Raising Revenue for Funding Thereof (H. P. 1281) (L. D. 1608)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Belgrade, Mr. Sahagian.

Mr. SAHAGIAN: Point of inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may pose his question.

Mr. SAHAGIAN: Mr. Speaker, would I have the right at this time to make a motion for this item to lay on the table until later in today's session for a new proposal being prepared?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that he will not be entitled to because he has debated such a motion.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: No speech, no plea, no anything, except that every one of you examine your conscience and within the confines of your own experience in human affairs what the result will be if this Legislature goes home having failed to enact a Part II budget.

I ask for the vote to be taken by the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. JUTRAS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: By now you recognize that I am not easily bent. In the case of L. D. 1608 there has been no arm twisting in my case. No human being is perfect, we all make mistakes at one time or another, and the time has come today to make bold decisions and in so doing we must set aside personal feelings, potential political gains. We must demonstrate intestinal fortitude in the highest degree.

Representative Jalbert of Lewiston was so right a few days ago when addressing the leadership that he had a right to change his mind. He also respects that right among his colleagues. If there comes a moment in the legislative process that a new avenue is taken to achieve the same common goal, the ultimate good of the people of Maine. We are their elective representatives, we must make decisions in their name, even if it hurts.

We must search our own conscience and come up with the best possible solution in our opinion when asked to express an opinion. I have witnessed in these halls gems of rhetoric in defense of L. D. 1608 and especially today. It was a selfless speech, it was not an emotional appeal for a vote to fund the Part II budget. If there has been any arm twisting in this case, in my case, then it must be attributed to the effects of this great speech that I heard today. It did not fall on deaf ears.

I have searched my soul which has had budgetary troubles in these waning hours of the 104th Legislature, and I come to the conclusion that any legislator, lawmaker, politician, solon, who really likes his calling, or vocation, he or she must go along and cast a positive vote for this measure. The amendment lowers Part II of the budget by some \$5 million. Seven eighths of a loaf is better than none. This Legislature must not go home empty handed. This Legislature is a responsible one. I know that something positive will come as a result of the vote that we are about to cast. If until now you have wavered, if you have had doubts and reservations, please make an instantaneous or quick examination of your conscience, make a reappraisal of your conclusions, or of your mental reservations, and use your powerful vote to promote the general welfare of the people of the State of Maine.

In conclusion, do not let anyone question your vote after you have pushed that button to the left or to the right, preferably to the

left. Your vote is sacred. No one—repeat—no one has a right to question or berate you over it. It is as sacred as a privileged communication.

Finally let us on both sides of the aisle join arms and vote yes and adjourn this session of the 104th Legislature in a productive way, in a constructive manner, one which will be meaningful and ultimately helpful to the taxpayers of Maine.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Zero hour has arrived and I hope that with the wisdom of these chambers, the wisdom of each and every member of this House will be that of future prudence for the people of our State, for its betterment and certainly for its better approach towards the operation of State Government for years to come. And I know that you have searched your consciences time and again on many issues, and I hope that the better operation of State government will come of this and the people may become a better and closer part to our operation and trying to find a way and means to better our own society. And I thank you for your vote of confidence in the past, and I know that the people of Maine, once we have adjourned with the satisfactory provisions of the State operation, they will be somewhat proud of the members of this Legislature.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: One of the most important issues here is the \$12,500,000 worth of school subsidies. Probably the Representatives from Sagadahoc County, including Miss Watson and myself from Bath, Mrs. Coffey from Topsham and Mr. Curtis from Bowdoinham should be upset and not vote for this. Our county gets less school subsidy than any other county in the State. They always compare our county, as proven in the county salary bills, with

Franklin, Lincoln, Knox and Piscataquis. We will be getting \$250,000, and I repeat, that is less than any other county. For instance, Piscataquis will get \$421,000 and Knox \$516,000. We can't compare our county with the larger counties, but without this Aroostook would lose \$1,788,000, Penobscot \$1,398,000. Even though we get less, even though we come from an industrial area where pressures have been applied, the four House members, two Republicans and two Democrats, have stood firm all of the way through because we sincerely felt that this was a very fair program with the most responsible and equitable way to pay.

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

Mr. FECTEAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I stand before you today, as you know I fought for a bloc grant, this is the only thing that would help the City of Biddeford. I say to you we have been kicked from bottom up, but so be it. I have been a great advisor down in front of my people for an income tax instead of a sales tax because I felt it was really better. And this morning when I came here I was really decided to vote against it because I had a row with some of my people last night trying to make them understand that this was the fairest thing, but really they couldn't understand my viewpoint.

This morning I really searched my conscience and listened to the other body, and when I saw the President of that body leave his seat —

The SPEAKER: The Chair must advise the gentleman that he must not refer to the actions of the other branch to influence any member of this body.

Mr. FECTEAU: I am sorry that I can't mention that because really — Anyway, I will vote for it today, and I hope that everybody that has his fill up to the top of these school subsidies will really vote for this because I feel that in two years from now we will be voting for an income tax and it might be three times this much.



So why not see to it today, it is reasonable and we might get to the top, and see that this tax won't be increased too too fast. So I hope you go along with this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Albion, Mr. Lee.

Mr. LEE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise to go against this tax package. I have to change my ideas on all the things I came down here for. I thought that I would vigorously support any tax measure to support any spending that I would support. I can't support this. We raised \$27 million extra in the Part I, now we are asking for \$40 million in the Part II. It is too much. I am for school subsidies and a raise for the employees. I am not smart enough to tear this budget apart, so I have made no attempt to. I couldn't put it back together if I took it apart.

Now I found on my desk one morning some time ago a little piece of paper. I had it reproduced and I am going to read it.

"I think I'm in trouble!!!"

"I was going through my pockets and I found something I can't explain . . . a genuine United States ten dollar bill. Obviously I've made a mistake somewhere and overlooked a tax.

I've paid my income tax, sales tax, state tax, city tax, amusement tax, gasoline tax, road tax. I've paid the liquor tax, cigarette tax, automobile tax, school tax, and even a tax to build a bridge at the other end of the country.

I've paid taxes for water lines to bring water in and sewer lines to take it away. I've paid taxes for fire protection, law enforcement and garbage collection.

I distinctly remember paying my excise tax, luxury tax, defense tax and even the tax to provide more scholarships for kids to go to college so that they can grow beards, sniff glue and protest against idiots like you and me.

I even paid my taxes for tanks for Israel, wheat for Russia, contraceptives for India, plane fare for congressmen and publicity for the birds of Texas.

Heck man, I've paid taxes on the toothpaste I use in the morning and the pillow I rest my head on at night.

How come I've got this ten spot in my pocket? How did it slip by? Did someone put it in my pocket to cause trouble? Is there a tax when you find money like that? I'm not sure, but I think I'll keep it hidden until it comes time to pay my tax when I register my gun.

Please keep this whole bit about my ten dollars confidential for I'm certain the government is going to be plenty sore if they find out I've got it.

When it comes time for the meek to inherit the earth, taxes will be so high they won't want it."

The SPEAKER: For the Chair to order a roll call 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 and more than one fifth having expressed the desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the enactment of An Act Making Supplemental Appropriations for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1970 and June 30, 1971 and Raising Revenue for Funding Thereof, House Paper 1281, L. D. 1608. This being an emergency measure a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House is necessary. If you are favor of the enactment of this measure you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Allen, Baker, Barnes, Bedard, Benson, Bernier, Binnette, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Brennan, Buckley, Burnham, Carey, Casey, Chandler, Chick, Coffey, Corson, Cottrell, Cox, Crommett, Croteau, Cummings, Curran, Curtis, D'Alfonso, Dam, Danton, Donaghy, Drigotas, Dyar, Erickson, Eustis, Farnham, Faucher, Fecteau, Fine-more, Fortier, A. J.; Fortier, M.; Fraser, Gauthier, Gilbert, Giroux, Good, Harriman, Haskell, Hawk-

ens, Heselton, Hunter, Johnston, Jutras, Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Kilroy, Lawry, Lebel, Leibowitz, LePage, Levesque, Lewin, Lewis, Lund, MacPhail, Marquis, Martin, McKinnon, McTeague, Meisner, Millett, Mills, Mitchell, Morgan, Nadeau, Norris, Noyes, Ouellette, Pratt, Quimby, Richardson, H. L.; Ricker, Rideout, Ross, Santoro, Scott, C. F.; Shaw, Sheltra, Snow, Starbird, Stillings, Susi, Tanguay, Temple, Thompson, Tyndale, Vincent, Watson, Waxman, Wheeler, White, Wood, The Speaker.

**NAY** — Berman, Birt, Bragdon, Brown, Carrier, Carter, Clark, C. H.; Clark, H. G.; Cote, Couture, Cushing, Dennett, Durgin, Emery, Evans, Hall, Hanson, Hardy, Henley, Hewes, Hichens, Huber, Immonen, Jalbert, Kelleher, Kelley, K. F.; Lee, Lincoln, Marstaller, McNally, Moreshead, M o s h e r,

Page, Payson, Porter, Rand, Rocheleau, Sahagian, Scott, G. W.; Trask, Wight, Williams.

**ABSENT** — Bunker, Crosby, Dudley, Foster, Jameson, Laberge, Richardson, G. A.; Soulas.

Yes, 101; No, 42; Absent, 8.

The **SPEAKER**: One hundred and one having voted in the affirmative and forty-two having voted in the negative, the Bill is passed to be enacted as an emergency, it will be signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

On motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland, by unanimous consent ordered sent forthwith.

On motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland,

Adjourned until Monday, June 30, at one o'clock in the afternoon.