

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

Tuesday, January 13, 1970

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Walter Brown of Randolph.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

The SPEAKER: We are honored this morning, ladies and gentlemen, to have with us in the House of Representatives a young man of great courage and tenacity, who has overcome many many physical difficulties and has the honor of having been named this year's Poster Child by the National Foundation March of Dimes. He is Brian A. Young of 255 Seventh Street, Auburn and he is at the rear of the House with his mother and father, Mr. and Mrs. William Young.

Brian was born with two serious physical defects, open spine and water on the brain, but because an early detection of these conditions was made and proper medical care was given to him today he is attending school and shows a great deal of enthusiasm for living. He is a handsome youngster and I welcome Brian and his father and mother to this Special Session of the 104th Legislature.

When Brian visited me earlier in the morning in my office, he showed a strong antipathy to cigar smoking. So if the members would refrain from smoking at this time I would invite these wonderful people to the rostrum that they may have their pictures taken and proper recognition given to this very courageous young man. Would the Sergeant-at-Arms escort these people to the rostrum so that they may have their pictures taken.

Thereupon, the Sergeant-at-Arms escorted Brian A. Young and his parents to the rostrum amid the applause of the House, the Members rising.

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

Report of the Committee on State Government reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Adjusting Salaries of Certain

Unclassified State Personnel" (S. P. 590) (L. D. 1745)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

**Ought to Pass in New Draft
Passed to Be Engrossed**

Report of the Committee on Liquor Control on Bill "An Act relating to Hours of Sale in Retail Stores under Liquor Laws" (S. P. 575) (L. D. 1702) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 618) (L. D. 1793) under title of "An Act relating to Hours of Sale under Liquor Laws" and that it "Ought to pass"

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

In the House, the Report was read.

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

Mr. HICHENS: Mr. Speaker, I would move for indefinite postponement of this report and the bill and would speak on my motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Eliot, Mr. Hichens, moves that both Report and Bill be indefinitely postponed. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. HICHENS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill 1702 I would read for your enlightenment: "No liquor shall be sold in this State on Sundays except as hereinafter provided, and no licensee by himself, clerk, servant or agent shall, between the hours of midnight and 6 a.m., sell or deliver any liquors, except no liquors shall be sold or delivered on Saturdays after 11:45 p.m. and except that in restaurants, class A restaurants, class A taverns, hotels, and clubs liquor may, except as provided, be sold to 1 a.m."

This bill was passed by the 104th Legislature. They have now added "retail stores" and then in the revision 1793 added "taverns." I feel that again this is just expanding our liquor sales to 1 a.m. the year round and that the retail stores being our chief offender, taverns being nothing but saloons, that this bill should be postponed.

Mr. Marquis of Lewiston requested a roll call.

The SPEAKER: A roll call vote has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All 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 Elliot, Mr. Hichens, that both Report and Bill be indefinitely postponed. If you are in favor of the indefinite postponement you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Allen, Baker, Barnes, Benson, Berman, Birt, Bragdon, Buckley, Bunker, Carrier, Chick, Clark, C. H.; Clark, H. G.; Crommett, Crosby, Curran, Curtis, Cushing, Dennett, Donaghy, Durgin, Erickson, Evans, Farnham, Finemore, Fortier, A. J.; Foster, Gilbert, Good, Hall, Hanson, Hardy, Harriman, Hawkens, Henley, Heselton, Hewes, Hichens, Hunter, Immonen, Kelleher, Kelley, K. F.; Lawry, Lee, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Lund, MacPhail, Marstaller, McNally, Meisner, Millett, Moshier, Page, Payson, Porter, Quimby, Richardson, G. A.; Ross, Sahagian, Scott, C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Snow, Starbird, Susi, Thompson, Trask, Tyndale, White, Williams, Wood.

NAY — Bedard, Bernier, Binnette, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Brennan, Burnham, Carey, Carter, Coffey, Cote, Couture, Croteau, Cummings, Danton, Drigotas, Dudley, Dyar, Emery, Fecteau, Fortier, M.; Fraser, Gauthier, Giroux, Goodwin, Haskell, Jalbert, Jameson, Johnston, Jutras, Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Kilroy, Laberge, Lebel, Leibowitz, LePage, Levesque, Marquis, Martin, McKinnon, McTeague, Moreshead, Morgan, Nadeau, Norris, Noyes, Ouellette, Pratt, Rand, Ricker, Rideout, Rocheleau, Santoro, Sheltra, Soulas, Stillings, Vincent, Wheeler.

ABSENT — Brown, Casey, Chandler, Corson, Cottrell, Cox, D'Alfonso, Dam, Eustis, Faucher, Huber, Mills, Mitchell, Richardson, H. L.; Tanguay, Temple, Waxman, Wight.

Yes, 73; No, 59; Absent, 18.

The SPEAKER: Seventy-three having voted in the affirmative and fifty-nine in the negative, the motion does prevail.

Thereupon, indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

Ought to Pass Passed to Be Engrossed

Report of the Committee on Education reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Conferring Associate Degrees by Husson College" (S. P. 600) (L. D. 1771)

Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Dumping Offal and Feathers on Highways" (S. P. 589) (L. D. 1744)

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

In the House, Reports were read and accepted in concurrence and the Bills read twice. Under suspension of the rules, the Bills were read the third time, passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment Passed to Be Engrossed

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act Appropriating Funds for Union River Anadromous Fish Restoration Program" (S. P. 580) (L. D. 1707) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-358) submitted therewith.

Report of same Committee on Bill "An Act Appropriating Funds for Providing Shade Trees through the Forestry Department" (S. P. 581) (L. D. 1708) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-357) submitted therewith.

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

amended by Committee Amendment "A".

In the House, Reports were read and accepted in concurrence and the Bills read twice. Committee Amendment "A" to each was read and adopted in concurrence.

Under suspension of the rules, the Bills were read the third time, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

Orders

On motion of Mr. Ross of Bath, it was

ORDERED, that Mr. Eustis of Dixfield be excused from attendance because of serious illness in his family.

House Reports of Committees Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment Passed to Be Engrossed

Mr. Allen from the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act to Create the Eastern Hancock County Community School District" (H. P. 1393) (L. D. 1748) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Bill read twice. Committee Amendment "A" (H-634) was read and adopted. Under suspension of the rules the Bill was read the third time, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

Passed to Be Engrossed Amended Bill

Bill "An Act relating to Fee for and Facilities of Class A Restaurants Serving Malt Liquor" (H. P. 1379) (L. D. 1728)

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

The following papers appearing on Supplement No. 1 were taken up.

Passed to Be Enacted Emergency Measure

An Act relating to Fees of Certain Corporations Payable to Secre-

tary of State (H. P. 1320) (L. D. 1649)

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. 128 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Emergency Measure

An Act to Amend the Charter of the Community Life Insurance Company (H. P. 1321) (L. D. 1650)

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. 128 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Emergency Measure

An Act to Validate Certain Proceedings in Formulating Voting Districts in the Town of Brunswick (H. P. 1343) (L. D. 1672)

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. 129 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Emergency Measure

An Act Authorizing Androscoggin County to Borrow Money for an Addition to the County Jail (H. P. 1362) (L. D. 1691)

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. 129 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

An Act relating to Compensation for Full - time Deputy Sheriffs and Chief Deputies of Androscoggin County (S. P. 558) (L. D. 1633)

An Act relating to Code of Military Justice for the State Military Forces (H. P. 1338) (L. D. 1667)

An Act Extending Eagle Lake Water and Sewer District to Plantation of Winterville (H. P. 1349) (L. D. 1678)

An Act relating to Certain Classified Employees in the Forestry Department (H. P. 1354) (L. D. 1683)

An Act relating to Disqualification of the Administrative Hearing Commissioner (H. P. 1367) (L. D. 1716)

An Act to Amend the Charter of Great Northern Paper Company (H. P. 1368) (L. D. 1717)

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.

By unanimous consent the foregoing Enactors were ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

Orders of the Day

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

JOINT ORDER relative to Amending Joint Rules — Joint Rule 12-A (S. P. 616) (In Senate-passed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-359) (In House-Senate Amendment "A" adopted)

Tabled — January 12, by Mr. Birt of East Millinocket.

Pending — Passage.

The **SPEAKER**: This requires a two-thirds vote for passage. All in favor of this Order being passed as amended in concurrence will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

107 having voted in the affirmative and 26 having voted in the negative, 107 being more than two thirds, the Joint Order received passage in concurrence.

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

SENATE REPORT — Committee on Education on Bill "An Act

relating to Difference of Student Tuition Between University of Maine and the State Colleges" (S. P. 596) (L. D. 1767) reporting "Ought not to pass" as covered by other legislation. (In Senate-accepted)

Tabled — January 12, by Mr. Levesque of Madawaska.

Pending — Acceptance in concurrence.

On motion of Mr. Levesque of Madawaska, retabled pending acceptance of Report in concurrence and tomorrow assigned.

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

Bill "An Act relating to Penalty for Violations by Guides under Fish and Game Laws" (H. P. 1401) (L. D. 1757) (Committee Amendment "A" (H-628) adopted)

Tabled — January 12, by Mr. Birt of East Millinocket.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

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

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

HOUSE REPORT — "Ought not to pass" — Committee on Education on Bill "An Act to Create a School Administrative District in the Town of Madawaska" (H. P. 1403) (L. D. 1759)

Tabled — January 12, by Mr. Levesque of Madawaska.

Pending — Acceptance.

On motion of Mr. Levesque of Madawaska, tabled pending acceptance of Report and tomorrow assigned.

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

MAJORITY REPORT (6) — "Ought not to pass" — Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Resolve to Loan Funds from the Unappropriated Surplus for the Construction of an International Ferry Terminal (H. P. 1310) (L. D. 1624) and **MINORITY REPORT** (4) reporting "Ought to pass"

Tabled — January 12, by Mr. D'Alfonso of Portland.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Bragdon of Perham to accept Majority Report.

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

Mr. D'ALFONSO: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would ask you to defeat the motion to accept the "ought not to pass" report and to accept the minority report "ought to pass."

The Lion Ferry that is coming to Portland is a fact. Phase one of the construction of the terminal facilities is now a fact. Phase two of the construction of the terminal facilities is now open for bid and will be opened on January 27.

The effort within the greater Portland area to secure this ferry service has been remarkably outstanding. Under the leadership of the City Manager of Portland, John Menario, the effort of the entire city has been one of unbelievable tenacity to secure this ferry service. The leadership of the Chamber of Commerce has likewise been as great. The effort on the part of Cumberland County has been likewise as great. The leadership of private business in the greater Portland area has likewise been as great. As you know, they have pledged \$1 million to secure the operation of this ferry terminal over a five-year period.

You cannot help but congratulate the effort, the determination that has been put into this project on the part of so many people within the greater Portland area. And why have they done this? In a sentence, they have done this to enhance and abet the economic viability of the greater Portland area, and the State. Why do they say they are going to enhance the economic viability through the construction of the terminal facilities and the possibility that this will mean great things for the City of Portland and the state?

As an example—and this is a fact—under an E.D.A. grant undertaken by three M.I.T. economists for the Port of Gloucester, their study showed that the economic impact and benefits that

would have accrued if this particular facility had gone to Gloucester would have amounted to an additional spending of approximately eleven to twelve million dollars. So the greater Portland business leader says, let's cut this in half, taking into consideration inflation and a few other factors. And they concluded that the economic impact on the greater Portland area and the State of Maine would be at least \$6 million. This in itself, using the five percent sales tax, would add to the revenues of the State approximately \$300,000.

Now, this in itself tells you that this is not an expense to the State, it is an investment. The City of Portland has needed for a long time a catalyst which could effectively begin to improve and develop the Port of Portland. We believe, those of us in the Portland delegation, the Cumberland County delegation, and the citizens of Portland, that this ferry terminal facility will provide the catalyst to once and for all do something for the Port of Portland; to promote it, to improve it, to redevelop it.

We believe that the coming of the Prince of Fundy, the construction of the terminal facilities, is one of the best ways in a dynamic venture to promote tourism in the State of Maine. Tobin K. Andersen, in his little pamphlet, has already indicated the tremendous response to this terminal facility and what it will mean as far as providing the recreational opportunity that it will provide, the pleasure that it will provide.

Requests, information from as far away as Hollywood, California. This can mean nothing but an impact on the tourist business of the State of Maine. Not just Portland, not just York County or Cumberland County, but the entire state. A new activity generates new activity. Increased traffic generates increased traffic.

It has never been the intention of the city fathers of Portland, or anyone, to undertake a project that would be detrimental to either Bar Harbor or the Blue Nose Ferry. God forbid to think that anyone at a local level would undertake a project that would, in effect, scuttle the efforts of another commu-

ity. So please understand, there is no involvement on the part of anyone in the greater Portland community to do something that would be harmful or injurious to Bar Harbor or to the Blue Nose Ferry.

As a matter of fact, we believe that this service is going to complement the Blue Nose Ferry. Things have not been firmed up yet, but arrangements are being made whereby ticket exchanges can take place. It would be in the best interest of this entire operation taking place for the simple reason that you sail from Yarmouth to Bar Harbor, you desire to travel down through the coast or other parts of Maine, you end up in Portland, exchange your ticket, take the Prince of Fundy from Portland back to Yarmouth. And vice versa, you sail from Yarmouth to Portland, you then travel throughout the State of Maine, you then find yourself up around Bar Harbor, you don't have to come back to Portland, exchange your ticket, take the Blue Nose from Bar Harbor to Yarmouth.

So all in all, I think we can truthfully say that the City of Portland is interested in protecting the viable interests of Bar Harbor and the Blue Nose Ferry, and to improve the economic viability of the greater Portland area and the State of Maine.

We also believe this to be a legitimate obligation of the State, in that this resolve is a request that the State give to the City of Portland \$800,000, interest free. This is not an expense to the State, whereas some people have said, "Well, what is the interest cost?" Figures such as \$700,000, as much as \$1.8 million has been bandied about. There is no interest payment. This is an \$800,000 appropriation from the unappropriated surplus. It is not an expense to the state. It is an investment by the state.

The Bar Harbor people were granted a similar request, and it is very interesting to note in studying the Legislative Record of what took place in 1953. On February 4, 1953 a resolve was presented by a Mr. Peterson from Bar Harbor to grant Bar Harbor \$1 million, interest free, in order to build the terminal facilities. On April 17,

1953, that particular resolve came out of the Appropriations Committee "ought to pass" unanimously. On April 30, 1953, Mr. Collins, who was then Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, removed the appropriation item from the table and simply announced this resolve is an appropriation of \$1 million to be given to Bar Harbor, and it went under the hammer.

Not one single word of debate. It went sailing through beautifully. It was a nice little railroad ride for the Canadian National Railway. And the Appropriations Committee at that time, in checking who the members were, was a very broad representation of legislators from all over the state. Everyone in the Legislature saw fit to grant Bar Harbor this \$1 million, interest free.

The \$1 million was actually given to the Maine Port Authority, the Maine Port Authority contracted with the Canadian National Railway to repay the loan over a 30-year period at the rate of three and a third percent per year. And at the end of that 30-year period all of those facilities costing \$1 million will then be owned by the Canadian National Railway.

As in the case of Portland, we will pay it back over a 30-year period, and at the end of the 30-year period it will be owned by a political subdivision of the state. We only ask that what they gave to Bar Harbor they give to Portland. Particularly in light of the facts that I have related. We are not begging. We ask you to assist us in a dynamic venture that should be truly manifested as a state-wide involvement in promoting the promising progressive economic development of the state. And this I believe to be progressive economic development.

Literature has been given to you. There is no need to cite all the facts about the size of the ship, its accommodations, about the total involvement of the State on a statistical breakdown. But I can mention this, that the City of Portland is making its own investment if we are granted this \$800,000, of approximately \$1.2 million. The

City of Bar Harbor invested \$15,000, simply to acquire six acres of land to make the terminal facility possible.

The City of Portland, the greater Portland area, and its citizens, they feel so sure of this project and what it means to them and the State of Maine, they are willing to go this total sum. And remind you, this entire package, this entire complex, is a fact. We are only asking the State to commit itself to an exciting, dynamic involvement. Can we ask you to do less?

So as sincere as I can be, I trust your confidence in our request shall be a trustworthy note of incomparable appreciation on the part of the delegation from Portland, and the entire Cumberland County delegation. So I ask you to defeat the "ought not to pass" report, and to accept the minority "ought to pass" report.

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

Mr. BENSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: If I were to be parochial about this issue, which of course I am not, I would be tempted to relate to you the history of the Blue Nose. It was conceived in the early '50s. It was operational in the mid '50s. It has had some 14 or 15 years of experience now, and according to testimony given to the Appropriations Committee, when this bill was heard, they are presently operating at a deficit of about \$100,000 a year. This is after 14 or 15 years of operating experience.

If I were to be parochial, which of course I am not, I would relate to you the deep concern of the business community on beautiful Mt. Desert Island. The deep concern, because with the Canadian Government picking up a \$100,000 a year operating loss, we are concerned that if some of the business that they presently enjoy is siphoned off by another run, another ferry service, it is questionable how long the Canadian Government is going to be patient, how long they are going to continue to offer a service at an ever increasing deficit.

We presently have, in our unappropriated surplus, approximate-

ly \$3,300,000. We have bills before us for consideration for the interest on municipal sewerage bonds in the amount of \$350,000. We have a bill before us which is of interest and concern to all of us, the removal of the 18 percent contribution to the ADC program; a bill that received favorable consideration in the earlier regular session, but for which there was not sufficient funds. It is back again. It has as much or more support today than it did six months ago. And this seeks \$3 million for one year.

If we were to consider the amount of money that each of our municipalities and cities was to derive from this \$3 million appropriation, we would be hard put to justify an interest-free loan of \$800,000.

It might be said that I have something against the ferry operation out of Portland. I wish Portland nothing but the best, and I mean that sincerely, in the operation of the second ferry. I hope that it does everything that they hope it will do. But, ladies and gentlemen, I find it very very difficult to believe that the Lion Ferry people are going to be satisfied with operating at a loss. And when I say that, I say it because if, on June the 1st, the Blue Nose Ferry Service were to go out of business, and turn every bit of the business that they presently enjoy over to the Lion Ferry Service, the service which is bigger and which will cost more to operate, I doubt very seriously, with all of the business, Lion Ferry would be satisfied to operate with a loss for very long.

I think that I can say to you something that each and every one of you know in your own mind. And that is that one or the other of these ferries will be operating in five years, but certainly not both of them. I think it's very unfortunate, Portland has worked extremely hard to secure this second ferry. And I have nothing but admiration for them for the tenacity that they have displayed in their success. I stand before you to make just one point. And that is, in 1953 when the Legislature awarded a \$1 million loan to the Maine Port Authority for the con-

struction of a terminal in Bar Harbor, I feel that they started a very very poor precedent. And I think that we, today, would show less than good judgement to continue a poor precedent. I might say that this bill would not be getting the attention that it is getting if we were today considering establishing a precedent. If we were talking today about interest-free loans for the first time, this would not have received the attention that it has.

Much has been made about treating Portland the same as Bar Harbor was treated in the early '50s, and rightfully so. But I think that we would be remiss in our responsibilities if we continued a precedent which I feel was a very, very poor one in the first place. Thank you.

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

Mr. SAHAGIAN: I would like to pose a question through the Chair to Representative D'Alfonso from Portland, or any member who may care to answer.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may pose his question.

Mr. SAHAGIAN: Did I understand through Mr. D'Alfonso that this will not cost any money to the State of Maine as long as we pay back within 30 years, and the State will not assume any financial burden?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Belgrade, Mr. Sahagian, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Portland, Mr. D'Alfonso, who may answer if he chooses. The meat of the question is, does the gentleman understand that this is not going to cost the State of Maine anything, and furthermore, what will be the interest carrying for the loan? The gentleman may answer if he chooses. The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. D'ALFONSO: I think I had stated that there is no interest to be paid on this loan. The loan would come out of the unappropriated surplus. The question, as I have mentioned, had been raised in the committee hearing. And the amount of money that it would cost the State if, for instance, the

State had to float a bond, or had to go out and borrow the money. We are not borrowing the money, we are not going to float a bond. This money, \$800,000, would come from the unappropriated surplus. There is no expense to the State, period.

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

Mr. SAHAGIAN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am not a banker, and I am not a financier, but I do know that whether you borrow money or not, whether you use the General Fund or otherwise, if you don't use that \$800,000 from the General Fund for this ferry, you would use it in another place. And therefore, you wouldn't have to borrow the money for that place.

Now, regardless of how you figure it, this is going to cost the State of Maine anywhere from \$800,000 to a million and a half dollars. I think we might just as well give them this grant, \$800,000, and be done with it. And then it would cost us less money to give them the money, the \$800,000, than pay the interest for the next 30 years.

Now, I have been told that there is no interest charges if we take the money out from the General Fund. Well, that money in the General Fund could be used for something else. And if we don't use it for something else, then we have to float a bond to replace that money, so that we could use it for another project.

In my estimation—as I told you, I am not a financier and I am not a banker, but no matter how you figure it, it's going to cost the state, the taxpayers, the sum of over a million dollars in 30 years time to amortize.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: First, if Mr. Sahagian is not a financier, then anytime he wishes, I will be very happy to swap a very meager savings account with his. Secondly, I might state that the gentleman from Belgrade, Mr. Sahagian, might be a little bit confused. It

would be perfectly all right with me if there was an outright grant. I feel that strongly about this project as an inland resident. I might say, possibly he might be a little bit confused, because this article, or this particular measure, is not so prominent in the Wall Street Journal as it might be.

In any event, it might be fair to explain that this is a — the City of Portland is asking for a loan that they will repay back, and they're asking for interest free on it. And I think possibly that there was a little bit of area of confusion. I might address my remarks first, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, on the basis that I have heard the non - parochial remarks of the gentleman from Southwest Harbor, Mr. Benson, and now let me speak, not as an inland resident, but let me speak as a citizen of the State of Maine, in that it chagrins me at any time, because of my true personal feelings for the young man from Southwest Harbor, Mr. Benson, to at any time oppose him.

I might inform him, not facetiously, but possibly factually, that if he's ever seen any parochialism, he might have witnessed it had he been here in 1953 when this bill was presented and it might be that he might have been happy to join, and join fast. I speak more now as one of those who was here in 1953, still a resident inland, still on the Appropriations Committee, and still not only voting, but working and speaking for this program.

"I recall in those days that the Honorable William Newell, philanthropist, financier, and President of the Bath Iron Works, envisioning the development of the Port of Portland, with the remark, as I recall it so vividly, that the Port of Portland was some 300 miles nearer Europe or any European port than any port along our Atlantic seacoast. He envisioned developing this port to a point of really making for the State of Maine a great deal of progress and also bringing about a great deal of new industry, a great deal thereby of revenue so that we could support our non - revenue

gaining departments such as Education, such as Mental Health and Corrections, and such as welfare cases.

It would behoove anyone here that if we are to have progress, and I am referring to the article in Sunday's paper in which I stated that if we are to have progress, we must talk, we must act, and we must vote along that line. I am certainly not referring to that phase of the article which would state that I would be a power, because I am not even a power in my own home. I have enjoyed the spirit of compromise in that area for 31 years, and that is doing what the other half wants to do. That is how much influence I have got even there.

I feel very very strongly about this program, because I think that the gentleman from Southwest Harbor has proven the case for us to go along with this program when he states the deficit of operation as between Bar Harbor, next to Southwest Harbor, and the area that the Blue Nose goes to. All the more reason for us to branch out and go into a statewide area. All the more reason for us now to have another program.

I think any further remarks I would make would be repetitious as after having heard the remarks of the good gentleman from Portland, Mr. D'Alfonso, who gave you historical comments on the program so very very well. But it registered on my mind, and it did not switch me, it did not make up my mind, because I will admit my mind was made up from the time the bill was heard in committee. But the remarks of the good gentleman from Southwest Harbor did impress me, in that I feel that his remarks were more or less an issue that we might use to encourage us to go forward into another program, and that is the Portland program.

I certainly wholeheartedly endorse the remarks of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. D'Alfonso, hope that the Majority Report "Ought not to pass" will not prevail, so then a motion for the "Ought to pass" Report in progress will be entertained and passed.

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

Mr. SHELTRA: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Being a salesman by trade, naturally I am of a highly competitive nature. As I left my fair City of Biddeford this morning, I noticed on the marquee of a tire company, the marquee read, "We will accept cash." Accordingly, to the editorial in last Sunday's Telegram, I think there is no doubt about Portland's tax contribution to the State of Maine. I think they more than absolve the responsibilities of this state.

As it so happens, just shortly after Labor Day I happened to reside at the Frenchmen's Bay Motel for fifteen days, which is directly across from your Blue Nose Ferry of which we are speaking presently. Matter of fact, I wake by its whistle at 7 a.m. every morning. I will state that the motel reservations at that time were committed, they were filled relentlessly. As a matter of fact, in our little group we were staying there at reduced rates. And I think after the first week or so, the management was sorry that they let us in at these reduced rates.

Something else that astounded me, in other words, there was a lot of hustle and bustle in Bar Harbor; it was a thriving community. The season had passed; however, it appears in our day and age that there is a segment of our population that are now saving up their vacation time until after the regular summer season. The adults want to be in the position whereby they can vacation with the absence of children, and this is becoming ever more prevalent as far as tourism is concerned. Actually, the area of Bar Harbor was so busy while I was there that two of their major restaurants were closed to the public. They had made preparations to go to Florida or elsewhere on vacation somewhere.

I can't for the life of me see where this endeavor has to be a failure. I will be the first readily to admit that I am not a statistician. The only thing that I can say is today I rise in favor of John Q. Public. I think that the trip is actually over priced for one

thing, and I think that when it gets within a range of the average public, the average John Q. Public, that I think more would be in favor of taking this trip or a trip similar to it. And I think this is what would be brought about if this venture was permitted to set sail out of Portland — the more competitive the market, the better off we all are.

I made a recent investment in a bank, a savings account, several months ago, and one of their restrictions was that I had to give them prior notice of three months before I could make a withdrawal. I went back to this same bank yesterday, they had dropped this precedent. Your service charges for checking accounts are being dismissed. Who gains from all of this? John Q. Public. We must make everything competitive, ladies and gentlemen. I think this is how we have been able to arrive at our present standard of living, because of competition. Competition will definitely bring success to this venture, and I am heartily in favor of it. Thank you.

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

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I feel that I must speak out on this issue, and I would like to feel that I am representing a larger area than my constituency in Portland, a larger area even than the State of Maine. All of our New England states are in one of the great recreational areas in the United States of America. And I feel very certain that all the New England states and all the people in the New England states would heartily approve of this matter. Then too, there are thousands upon thousands of people that come to our shores every summer. They are not represented here today. And I feel that they would vote overwhelmingly in favor of something like this. And I am also trying to represent those increasing numbers of summer property owners, non-residents, who pay taxes here, who get very little from the taxes they pay. Their children don't go to school here. They don't live here in the wintertime and have their roads plowed. And I think

they should be represented, and I think that they would enjoy this recreational diversion. In fact I think Governor Rockefeller, who has a summer home in the Bar Harbor area, would heartily approve an investment of this kind.

Now we know that there are many other needs, and there always will be other needs. But we must too remember that our recreational business is the second largest business in our state, and to provide for other needs we must continuously nourish this recreational business. And I can think of no greater immediate investment than the investment of \$8 million which this Lion Ferry, this Scandinavian group, these descendants of Eric the Red and Leif the Lucky who first touched the shores of Maine. I know that with their expertise and their experience on the sea, coming from countries where they have had to depend upon the sea for their living, I am sure that they will be successful managers.

The people of Portland are doing their part. Now traditionally the government has subsidized all through our history means of communication and means of transportation. I am sure you wouldn't expect Portland to bear the expense of the airport in Portland alone. This is a seaport venture, and it is logical that this state should make its contribution. On an economic side, our DED budget is \$1 million a year, a portion of that goes into advertising. But the Lion Ferry has an annual advertising budget of \$200,000 a year. It is nationwide. And that \$200,000 will be expanded, because many of their advertising commitments are done on a share basis with tourist agencies, and others that are promoting recreational activity.

As I say, I am speaking for the great numbers of people and the interests of people who cannot be here on the Floor of the House to represent themselves. And I think you will agree with me that the people from the mountains and lakes of Franklin County and Oxford County, and all the other counties, will come down to our shores to get a diversionary sea voyage on their visit to Maine.

I certainly hope that you will give this your most broad, non-parochial consideration.

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

Mr. LUND: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As a member of the Appropriations Committee it isn't always possible to be popular in the decisions that the committee makes, or a majority the committee makes. And I would like at this time to indicate to the House some of the thinking that went behind the majority's "ought not to pass" report.

I don't think we were particularly impressed by the argument that gambling and liquor were involved, and this made it bad. I think that's a different issue altogether. I don't think this is a partisan issue at all. I personally was somewhat impressed by the argument that a tourist coming to Portland might be less likely to stop at other places in Maine than if the ferry were located somewhere else. But to me, that wasn't the key issue. I wasn't particularly impressed by the argument that a similar thing was done for Bar Harbor 16 years ago. Because the feeling was expressed in the committee, I believe that if the Bar Harbor question came up today it might get a lot harder and longer look than it got 16 years ago, when the state's financial problems were far different than they are today.

I think the chief factor that influenced me in voting "ought not to pass" on this very worthy project was the question of competing demands for our resources. It would be very easy to be popular, and do the popular thing and vote "ought to pass", and let this thing wrestle it out on the appropriations table with other money bills. On the other hand, I think the members of the House should be reminded of the fact that there are going to be other very pressing demands for money. Some of them are being presented by the same people who are arguing for this bill here.

We have the question of whether the State should provide a Renal

Dialysis Center, a very emotional argument indeed, one aimed at providing for relief for people who have got serious kidney problems, and who can't now get treatment in Boston. There is a bill today to be heard with a similar price tag to this one, to provide medical care, to provide aid to the medically indigent. And there is another matter that has struck a responsive cord in this House time and time again. And that's the matter of tax relief.

Now, two sessions ago, the bill to repeal the municipal contribution, the 18% contribution to the cost of Aid to Dependent Children, the price tag on that bill two sessions ago when we were in the minority was \$750,000. It failed for lack of support and lack of the funds to pay for it. The price tag, gentlemen, now on this same bill is \$3 million. If the State is to assume the municipal contribution to ADC, that 18% contribution, it will cost \$3 million. If it could do so this would be a very direct way of providing tax relief to our hard pressed taxpayers in our towns.

It appears doubtful if this could be done, but I wonder how many of you all have been reminded of the fact that the Federal Government has raised the assessment, has raised the cost of ADC by 23%. This would be retroactive to July. So our towns at our next town meetings are going to be hit with the bill for this retroactive increase in ADC, and I would suggest to you that even if we are not able to find the entire \$3 million to pay for all of the municipal contribution to ADC we may be able to do part or a substantial amount of it.

So to me the most compelling argument that swayed me from supporting this very worthwhile project is the argument that we have other more pressing demands for the State's resources.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Payson.

Mrs. PAYSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in support of the proposal of Mr. D'Alfonso, the gentleman from Portland. So far Lion Ferry has sent out thousands of brochures

throughout the United States and Canada. As a result there has been a response from travel agents throughout the United States and from tour operators, which has been most encouraging; in fact they call it fantastic.

This is a form of advertising for the State of Maine which we are getting for nothing at this point—\$200,000 worth of it. Certainly there will be an interest rate which will have to be paid on this money which will be lent to the City of Portland for this proposition. However, in the long run with a \$300,000 estimate return in sales tax annually, it seems to me that the State of Maine is coming out well ahead.

Further, the Canadian Government, the Nova Scotian Government, is planning at this point to match the funds for promotion which Lion Ferry is now spending on behalf of its proposal. I therefore feel that it is right and proper that we reject the motion of Mr. Bragdon, the gentleman from Perham, that this bill should not pass. I hope that you will vote against his motion.

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

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Unlike some of the other members, I did expect to be up here today. I have expected this since early last year when I spoke to my very good friend from Cumberland and asked him at that time when Portland would be in here for money in relation to the resolve that we get behind the Lion Ferry proposition in Portland. I was assured at that time that no money, as far as the taxpayers of the State were concerned, would be involved. I am sure that it is not the gentleman from Cumberland's fault that it is here.

However, I do want to congratulate the people of Portland for all their energy and enthusiasm, but in this enthusiasm I think that they have become a little confused. If they had done very much traveling, or had been living in a vacation area, they would realize that most of the tourists, so-called, get in their cars and go where they are going just about as fast as

they can go, and then get back again.

Now on this premise you will find that many folks will gas up on the other side of the border, they will buy liquor on the other side of the border, they will buy cigarettes on the other side of the border, get aboard the Lion Ferry, leave the State of Maine, spend their money, get back aboard the Ferry and get back to where they came from just as fast as they can. I can't see how that is going to help the tourist business in the State of Maine whether it be in York or Boothbay, let alone the beautiful isle of Mt. Desert. We have some Potato Blossom festivals, we have motels and hotels in the western part of the state.

I think that this bill would be a detriment to the whole State of Maine. If the folks in Portland have all the enthusiasm that they have shown I think that they will find a way to do without this, without getting any of the money that we might be able to use for Kidney Dialysis or Aid to Dependent Children or something of that nature.

I support the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, in the "ought not to pass" report.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Since the resolution introduced in the last session by me has been brought into question, I think that it would be fair to point out the resolution that I introduced, and which was subsequently amended, commended the Portland community leaders, including the elected leadership and the business community, in what I thought was a very fine effort, the very essence of the kind of municipal effort that makes for a viable and constructive progressive city.

Now in the discussion about this I indicated to the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Donaghy and others there was nothing in the resolution which committed the State of Maine to lend its financial assistance to this program and there was nothing in the resolution that committed the State of Maine to

underwrite the potential operating deficit. I would remind all of you that in the closing days of the regular session I joined with a great many of the rest of you in voting for the indefinite postponement of this bill because in my judgment it did not comply with what I thought was a rational standard, and that is that the people in Portland and those who have worked so hard for this deserve the same even handed, non-parochial treatment that this Legislature or its predecessor some fifteen years ago gave to Bar Harbor.

The people of the City of Portland feel that they have a viable, economic enterprise that deserves your support. I think it does too, not on any parochial, geographic basis but simply because I think it is a good program. Now this House has had a tradition of effecting its judgment on the merits of legislation and allowing these bills to take their place with the other competing bills on the Senate appropriations table where the decision is made. I feel that it is a good bill. If you don't feel that it is you can vote against it, not out of any geographic consideration, not out of any phony recitation of all the other worthy things that we could do with the money, because we all know that we would like to have a \$10 million surplus.

Now if the precedent that has been established is so bad, I would suggest to the gentleman from Southwest Harbor that I would be delighted to vote for an emergency measure to have Bar Harbor or Canadian National Railway or whatever interest holds it give us the money back, if this is such a terribly difficult situation.

This bill I think is an opportunity for the House to rise above the geographic narrow parochialism and give a vote to a project which I think is demonstratively worthwhile, and I certainly hope that you will vote against accepting the "ought not to pass" report.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It is not easy for me to vote against an appropriation that

I know many legislators whom I count amongst my personal friends are vitally interested in, very enthusiastic about; and I don't usually do it unless I can justify, at least in my own mind, my position.

When I saw in the Sunday Telegram the statement by the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, to the effect that the ferry bill was assured of easy passage, my first reaction was to accept this as a fact and not attempt to offer any explanation as to why I voted as I did in committee. My further reaction to that thought was that if I had the courage to vote against the bill in committee I certainly have the duty and the courage to tell you why I did.

My opposition to this appropriation hinges upon the fact that I never felt that the establishment of this ferry was a sound or desirable venture for the State as a whole. The people of Portland of course disagree and they are willing to back this venture against loss with their dollars. They have guaranteed this fine corporation against loss with their dollars. They have also found that they have got to provide another two million to provide docking facilities and other shore facilities for this Prince of Fundy. In this bill they are coming to the State of Maine to ask us to share in that expense.

I want to make it clear at this time that it has been very well established that this ferry will run, will become a fact whether we vote this appropriation in this House or not. I submit that it would not be a very much greater burden to the people of the City of Portland who are so vitally interested in its inception if they went into the money market and hired this \$800,000 which they are asking the State of Maine as a whole to provide interest free.

They talk about the economic benefits. I don't agree. And of course I am trying in my presentation to think of the benefits of the State as a whole. If 500 beds are let on the Prince of Fundy every day during the tourist season, to me it is just as plain as anything can be that certainly many of these reservations are going to be

from people who would have otherwise toured the entire State of Maine in their vacation into the Maritime Provinces to Cape Britain Island, to Nova Scotia, if you will, or other areas in that general area.

If they rented beds along our highways in the motels that are already in existence, the State would collect a tax. I see no way that the state gets any revenue out of these 500 beds. If the operators of the Prince of Fundy sell meals, the State gets no revenue. If these meals were bought along our highways, yes, we would; we would collect a tax for that. There is no provision, no provision; this is a foreign corporation. There is no provision for the State to get any revenue out of this in spite of what you say.

You talk about the increase in the sales tax. I fail to see it. Apparently you are talking about expanded business. There may be some. But I am sincere when I say it is going to be at the expense of other parts of the State of Maine and the tourist industry as whole in the State of Maine.

I was surprised that the representatives of the tourist industry in Maine were able to come before the Appropriations Committee and pretty much assure us that they unqualifiedly endorsed this, because I can't see how anybody can come up with the idea that it is going to do anything but hurt other areas of the State of Maine. Now you can call this parochial if you want to, but that's the way I see it.

There is another matter that has already been mentioned that I had intended to touch on, and I will. This goes back to the last session when we discussed the 18 per cent, the bill which this session is 1703, An Act Repealing the Law Requiring Assessment of Municipalities in Aid to Dependent Children Grants. This is a bill, if we could find money to put it in effect in this special session, in my opinion, would make every member of this House look like a statesman in his own voting precincts. Otherwise, I look upon us as a bunch of politicians jockeying for uncertain advantage in our various areas.

I took the trouble this morning to look up some facts in regard to the benefits of this bill presented by Senator Duquette to repeal the 18 per cent share. To the best of their ability in the Department of Health and Welfare, they informed me that the benefits to the City of Portland in one year would be \$150,000. I submit to you that this would pay a slight interest charge on this thing that we are talking about and still leave something to the good of the people of the City of Portland. But this does not only apply to the City of Portland, this applies to every municipality in the State of Maine. It is something this Legislature would get credit for doing. Every member would receive credit for it. I wish you could see this as I see it. I am not very good at expressing myself.

Here in the State of Maine we have our horse racing and our pari-mutuel system. The state gets a cut from the revenue derived from the pari-mutuel betting. I don't see again any assurance that the State is going to get any revenue from this floating Monte Carlo that we are talking about. The money that is derived from their roulette wheels or their one-armed bandits, I don't see where they have made provisions. This foreign corporation is not offering the State of Maine any revenue from this gambling — we get it from our horse racing.

I suppose some might argue that the easy way, and that has already been suggested I think by our honorable floor leader, that the easy way is to vote for all appropriation bills, all bills calling for money, and let them end up on the appropriations table where the leadership will make the final decision. If we vote three times as many bills as we have got money for, the leadership will make the decision as to which bills shall receive passage. I think many of us were disappointed with regard to the 18 per cent, what happened to it in the last session. We had assurance that it would be considered seriously in this special session. I hope it will. I wish that we might save enough money in other areas so we could implement. This, in other words,

is my top priority. I shall vote for that in committee, even though no other member of the Appropriations Committee sees fit to vote with me.

And to get back to this matter presently before us, I look at this as feeling that we are paying a very high price for seeing, as I look at it, for the privilege of watching this boat pull out from our shores and take 500 potential, or 1,000 potential tourists up over the waters of the Bay of Fundy into the Maritime Provinces. Some of them may be so intrigued with the exotic atmosphere of this Prince of Fundy that they may return the same way, and the State of Maine will receive nothing. They will not even see them, unless possibly some of my friends down in York County might possibly catch one or two that didn't want to drive to Boston on the particular night that they came back.

I have been informed by one member of the York delegation that he has a concession in the gambling facilities on this boat, and for that reason he can't vote with me. I appreciate his position and I forgive him.

I have tried to express myself as best I can. I hope you will go along with my motion to accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" on this bill.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore.

MR. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise to oppose this bill for the simple reason I believe that we have been over pushed on this bill. They have even been to our motels here. They have even gone so far as to suggest that under Legislative Document 1632 that the different municipalities asking for airport aid would be voted against. But I would like to remind the legislators here who are from those districts that I don't believe that Portland will vote against a bill like 1632 that is going to give them \$61,-186 school subsidy more than they are getting now. And that is simply what they would be doing.

I do not believe that we should enter into private enterprise, and I do not believe that two wrongs

makes a right. And as the gentleman from Portland has said, Mr. Cottrell, he was telling us about the Swedish people landing on our continent here and what they had done for us and what this vote was going to do. I wonder if he realizes we have lost taxpayers like Richard Burton, Elizabeth Taylor, and millions of the legal dollars that have gone into Sweden under number accounts rather than under accounts with names on them. This has all been taken from the United States. Here we are again going to put them in a place where they can have gambling, things that will hurt our state, take the money from our citizens. Of course the only gambling I am in favor of is gambling where I can shuffle them. I can't shuffle this deal, so therefore I am not very much in favor of it. And I hope that the motion of — and my priority, excuse me, my priority is for the AFDC, or the ADC, so-called because in every city, town and plantation we would be affected by that. And it means a lot of money to each and every one of them, especially where our education is costing us so much money.

I wanted to speak briefly, and I believe I have got across a point, and I hope that you will vote with the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon.

Mr. Sahagian of Belgrade was granted permission to speak a third time.

Mr. SAHAGIAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a member of the Appropriations Committee, and as one of the signers of the "ought not to pass," I would be remiss if I did not call the attention of the members of this House, regardless of what you heard on the Floor of this House today, nobody gives you anything for nothing. When you get something you are going to pay for it, and we are going to have to pay. If we don't if we go out and vote for this bill today, we are going to have to kill another more important bill than this one is. Money doesn't come that easy. They are going to take the money away from the General Fund or they are going to take it away from the surplus. If they didn't put the \$800,-

000 in this business they could retire some of the bonds, and that would reduce our spending by 6 or 7 per cent.

Now in final analysis, I ask the same question to Mr. Menario, I believe that was his name, the City Manager of Portland, if this was going to cost the State of Maine taxpayers some money, and it wasn't going to cost as much as \$1,800,000, he did agree, publicly stated, it would not be \$1,800,000, but it would be in the neighborhood of \$1,200,000 to \$1,500,000.

Now I have voted against a sugar refinery in Aroostook County, I wasn't even against that. I don't think the state belongs in the banking business, and I think that is a profession all by itself, and I think the banks ought to take care of it, and I think the State of Maine will do better if we stay away from the finances. And I hope, and I urge each and every one of the members of this House to go along with the motion of indefinite postponement of Mr. Bragdon.

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

Mr. HASKELL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: There is an effect of this ferry operation, either out of Bar Harbor or out of Portland, that hasn't been discussed here this morning and I think is important. Northern Maine experienced a substantial increase in tourism following the advent of the Blue Nose out of Bar Harbor. It is fairly common for people to either take the ferry from Bar Harbor to Nova Scotia and return via New Brunswick, entering Maine at Calais or at Houlton. This has been noticeable during the summer months particularly. It is very common to speak with tourist groups who have made this circle trip either one way by ferry and return by automobile.

Now in my view, certainly if tourism in northern Maine has been increased by the operation of one ferry, it would be reasonable to expect that it would be further increased by the operation of two ferries. For this reason, I feel that it is certainly justifying for the state to be evenhanded in

their treatment of Portland as they were in the past in their treatment of Bar Harbor. And I shall vote in support of it.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I can assure the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, that my observation as to the outcome of this measure was merely made because I was asked a question and I gave my opinion. I feel that there is a certain amount of levity that eventually comes into any picture regardless of its seriousness. And I can't help but remember that it is only a few years ago that shoulder to shoulder I supported the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, on this famous project of a hospital at Fort Fairfield for a million dollars. I also remember that it is only a very short time afterwards that shoulder to shoulder I again supported the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, for the state to buy back that monstrosity for one dollar, against the quite cogent points and arguments that were brought forth by the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross.

I go back a few years, now let me go back a few hours, and there is, in my opinion, a certain degree of levity. It is true that the gentleman from Bath was accosted by me on the very first day of the session, and I said, "Rodney, bring me back that Democratic tie." He did. I will give him back his. Yesterday, the very first moment that I stepped into the Hall of the House, the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, accosted me. He said, "You know, I think we might have acted hastily on this school building authority concerning itself with Somerville Plantation, now it might be \$25,000, but a change of mind does not change the facts." And so I agreed with him, because I as he was somewhat partial to the project. But the fact of the matter is this, that the good gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, forgot then his duty as I did. As a member of the Appropriations

Committee we both got up and changed our minds and went against our own report.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In a sense I would just like briefly to comment on the gentleman's remarks, the gentleman from Lewiston. They point out one thing to me that he doesn't want to depend on the way I vote in deciding how he should vote, as he pointed out in the Fort Fairfield situation.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I shall try to be very brief in my remarks. If there is anybody in the State of Maine that is to gain less from this proposed legislation, I know that I would be one of the few that would gain relatively nothing, being 365 miles from Portland. But that being as it may still brings me back to a resident of the State of Maine and also a representative of the State of Maine, and naturally it is my responsibility to the people, not only of my particular legislative district, but to all the people of Maine, that I will have to vote on this document the same as every member of this House.

A lot of you have heard over the years that a lot of the municipalities failed to take any action or failed to take any aggressive action of any kind in regards to their problems. In the Portland area we find over the last several years that they have taken initiative on their own behalf, and I think this is remarkable. Because if Portland had not taken the initiative, then nobody else could do it for them. By the same token, if we, as Representatives of the State of Maine, not of a parochial area or provincial area, but of the entire State of Maine, that we only serve here to help the people help themselves. And I think this as an investment from Maine to the people of Portland is an indication that we in the State of Maine serve in an area that we can and that we

must use the availability of land, sea and air in the development of our state. Anything short of that, we would be selling our state short.

I fully realize that if the people of Maine would regard my own particular district as being so very important, I think I would even be so fair as to offer an amendment to the bill that we should also be able to provide services of this nature through the St. Lawrence River, down to the St. John River, so that we could have access to the Great Lakes area and also to the east coast of Maine by sea. That not being too logical at the present time prevents me from doing these things. It may be in the foreseeable future that this development of the northern part of the State of Maine, through the St. John River and the St. Lawrence River through the Great Lakes, might be feasible and logical. So this does not prevent me from trying to help another segment of our state in developing what they think will be good for the entire population of Maine.

For this reason I think that as a Representative of the people of Maine I will be one that will help support Portland in uplifting and rededicating the port facilities of Portland to the service of Maine, as any other people that so wish to come into the State of Maine and enjoy its benefits and help us help ourselves.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eliot, Mr. HICHENS.

Mr. HICHENS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I feel compelled to touch very lightly on the moral aspects of this bill, because some of the members of this august body are interested in the moral aspects concerned with this ferry, because several thousand people of the State of Maine are concerned with the moral aspects pertaining to this ferry from Portland to Nova Scotia.

I would take this brochure which has been handed to many of us. On the back are statistics on this vessel. It lists several bars which are called saloons on the diagram, and it shows one saloon next to

the teens' room. I have been led to understand that there are no restrictions on a vessel out at sea as far as minors drinking, except those set by the ship's master. There is also a gambling casino and then a tax free shopping. And I would read from the fun flotel information as follows: "It is a new concept in United States - Canadian ocean ferry service, an international cruise which you can easily fit into your budget and schedule. There is entertainment, dancing, good food and casino, all with that special continental touch and service to give you just a little more than you expected. A tax free international gift shop, with a variety of Scandinavian products — liquor, tobacco, perfumes, and so forth. This is a twenty - two hour exciting trip in true Scandinavian atmosphere. This could be your version of that sought after European trip."

The Bar Harbor ferry is an altogether different facility. It is a six-hour trip with promotional movies shown for entertainment of what to see in Nova Scotia. And I would suggest that the DED or some other agency in Maine make arrangements that when on this west bound trip that promotional pictures be shown showing the beauties of the State of Maine, so when people come back from Nova Scotia they will look for these things in our own state. There is one lounge completely removed from the dining room, and liquor is served as a convenience and not a promotion.

We have heard a lot said today about what our Swedish neighbors have given to us. But I would remind you that our Swedish neighbors provide a shelter for army deserters, they are furnishing phonographic material for the United States mails, and now they provide a sin ship between Maine and Canada.

From a practical viewpoint, I would remind you that this ship leaves at 9 p.m. for Nova Scotia. In other words, people will not be staying overnight like they do in Bar Harbor prior to leaving on the Bar Harbor ferry in the morning. When it arrives from Canada it arrives at 7 p.m. In the middle of the summer this is in broad

daylight. And I can see about 150 or 175 cars going across my toll bridge in Kittery about 9 p.m. headed for Massachusetts instead of staying in the State of Maine. I believe that the State is going to realize problems and not a profit from this ferry. If Portland wants the ferry, let them finance it. In other words, I will support Mr. Bragdon in his motion.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Some of you may have tried to figure out why I have waited so long before speaking today, but I figured it would be a good chance for me to make sure that members of my committee were not going to abandon their positions before I spoke.

I would hope that as we discuss the Portland issue, we keep in mind things that are going to affect the entire State of Maine. I do not think that we, as Representatives as elected by the people, can legislate morality. But this is an issue that people in our home towns will have to take by the horns and move with it. I do not think that we are in a position today to determine whether or not we can pass the ADC 18 per cent which I also am personally in favor of. I do think it is important to mention, however, this \$100,000 operating loss which people keep referring to as that being experienced by the Blue Nose ferry in Bar Harbor.

The gentleman that appeared before the Appropriations Committee told us that indeed there was a \$100,000 loss, which presently is being taken care of by the Canadian government. But he did not tell us that he had seen the books. As far as I know, that gentleman, who was then the manager when it was first opened, has not been the manager of the Blue Nose for some ten years or so. He is presently operating a hotel or a motel business in Bar Harbor, not too far from the terminal of the Blue Nose.

I think it is unfortunate for the Bangor Daily News editorial staff to use this information as a reason

for suggesting that Portland not get the Prince of Fundy ship. If the Bangor Daily News editorial staff wishes to know how much money the Canadian National Government is losing in its operation of the Blue Nose Ferry out of Bar Harbor, then perhaps they should make an attempt to find out from the Canadian National Railroad officials as to what that money is. And to quote from a former employee of the Blue Nose terminal in Bar Harbor, which he was some number of years ago, is indeed misinformation for the people of this state.

I think if we are going to help communities in the case, for example, of Somerville Plantation or in the case of anadromous fishes in Hancock County, on the basis of local participation and state participation which we have done yesterday and this morning in the case of item five on page one of the House Advance Calendar, then certainly when Portland is the largest city of this state, has the largest number of inhabitants, then perhaps it is entitled to a little larger amount than anadromous fishes in Hancock County.

And third, and finally, let me say that the Prince of Fundy, in my opinion would help recreation and would help the tourist industry throughout the state and not only Portland.

I do come from perhaps as far away as you can get from Portland, 350 miles plus to be exact, but I do feel that some people will use at their return trip, going through the Maritime Provinces in the Bay of Fundy area and return through either Houlton or Fort Kent, Madawaska or Van Buren. I think that it would increase tourists in Aroostook County and for the State of Maine. And therefore I will support the people from Portland in their endeavor.

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

Mr. JUTRAS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: One word before we do take this crucial vote. Let us remember this, that the New Hampshire Legislature precluded the progressive

people of the City of Portsmouth, New Hampshire from getting this ferry service when that was up for a vote about a year ago. And today is the day where we in the State of Maine are going to show our own people that we are working for their benefit. The New Hampshire Legislature regrets its past action, and now is the time for us to act properly.

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report on Resolve to Loan Funds from the Unappropriated Surplus for the Construction of an International Ferry Terminal, House Paper 1310, L. D. 1624.

Mr. Bragdon of Perham requested a roll call.

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

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 Perham, Mr. Bragdon, that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report. If you are in favor of accepting the Majority Report you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEAS — Allen, Baker, Barnes, Benson, Berman, Bragdon, Buckley, Bunker, Cummings, Curtis, Cushing, Donaghy, Durgin, Farnham, Finemore, Good, Hanson, Hardy, Harriman, Hichens, Immonen, Johnston, Kelleher, Kelley, K. F.; Lee, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Lund, MacPhail, Meisner, Millett, Page, Porter, Quimby, Richardson, G. A.; Ross, Sahagian, Scott, C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Snow, Susi, Thompson, Trask, Wight, Williams, Wood.

NAYS—Bedard, Bernier, Binnette, Boudreau, Bourgoïn, Brennan, Burnham, Carey, Car-

rier, Carter, Chick, Clark, C. H.; Clark, H. G.; Coffey, Cote, Cottrell, Couture, Crommett, Crosby, Croteau, Curran, D'Alfonso, Dam, Danton, Dennett, Drigotas, Dudley, Dyar, Emery, Erickson, Fecteau, Fortier, A. J.; Fortier, M.; Foster, Fraser, Gauthier, Gilbert, Giroux, Goodwin, Hall, Haskell, Hawkins, Henley, Heselton, Hewes, Hunter, Jalbert, Jameson, Jutras, Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Kilroy, Laberge, Lawry, Lebel, Leibowitz, LePage, Levesque, Marquis, Marstaller, Martin, McKinnon, McTeague, Mills, Mitchell, Moreshead, Morgan, Mosher, Nadeau, Norris, Noyes, Ouellette, Payson, Pratt, Rand, Richardson, H. L.; Ricker, Rideout, Rocheleau, Santoro, Sheltra, Soulas, Starbird, Stillings, Tanguay, Temple, Tyndale, Vincent, Wheeler, White.

ABSENT — Birt, Brown, Casey, Chandler, Corson, Cox, Eustis, Evans, Faucher, Huber, McNally, Waxman.

Yes, 48; No, 90; Absent, 12.

The SPEAKER: Forty-eight having voted in the affirmative and ninety in the negative, the motion does not prevail.

Thereupon, the Minority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted and the Resolve read once. Under suspension of the rules the Resolve was read the second time, passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

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

Bill "An Act Creating the Non-public Elementary Education Assistance Act" (H. P. 1395) (L. D. 1751)

Tabled January 12, by Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston.

Pending—Reference.

On motion of Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston, retabled pending reference and tomorrow assigned.

By unanimous consent, the foregoing several matters were sent forthwith.

(Off Record Remarks)

On motion of Mrs. Wheeler of Portland,

Adjourned until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.