

# 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**

Friday, January 23, 1970

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Douglas Robbins of Augusta.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

**Papers from the Senate**

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that when the House and Senate adjourn, they adjourn to Monday, January 26, at 11 o'clock in the morning. (S. P. 634)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

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

From the Senate: The following Order: (S. P. 633)

WHEREAS, it is reported that many growers supplying Maine Sugar Industries and its affiliates have not been paid for their 1969 crop; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Easton has refused to waive any more property taxes of the Maine Sugar Industries plant there; and

WHEREAS, five other Aroostook communities have also refused to grant abatements on Maine Sugar Industries loading stations; and have not received payments for taxes due; and

WHEREAS, the Maine Industrial Building Authority, which has guaranteed \$10,000,000 in loans to said industry has been requested to extend the term for payments; and

WHEREAS, a moratorium for the payment of principal and interest has already been granted by the Economic Development Administration to said industry for outstanding obligations; and

WHEREAS, there are recorded against Maine Sugar Industries and/or Vahlsing, Inc. certain liens and attachments in connection with unpaid claims; and

WHEREAS, said industry is in arrears on rent due the Aroostook Development Corporation; and

WHEREAS, these facts combine to create grave concern lest the

structure of government loans, state credit and local concessions involved in the operation of Maine Sugar Industries may be in serious jeopardy and raise the question of whether further legislative action is necessary to protect the credit, peace, health and safety of the State; and

WHEREAS, the same is of immediate and vital interest to Maine taxpayers and the Maine Legislature because of the guarantee of the Maine Industrial Building Authority supported by the full faith; now, therefore, be it

ORDERED, the House concurring, that a Special Interim Legislative Committee be created consisting of 3 members on the part of the Senate, appointed by the President of the Senate, and 6 members on the part of the House, appointed by the Speaker of the House. The Committee shall by a majority vote elect a chairman. The Committee is directed, in conjunction with the office of the Attorney General of the State of Maine, and with the full and complete cooperation of all state departments, to investigate fully and completely the facts surrounding the approval of said guarantees, the loans and the present financial problems, including but not limited to, the circumstances and facts of the applications, all assurances and representations connected therewith, the events and documents supporting said representations upon which the Maine Industrial Building Authority acted relating to the sugar beet and potato-processing industry in the State, and all corporate entities involved; in order that the Legislature may determine whether further legislative action is necessary to protect the credit, peace, health and safety of the State. The Chairman, or any member of the Committee designated by him, shall have the power to administer oaths and to subpoena and require the attendance of witnesses and production of books, papers, records and other evidence pertinent to such investigation. In case of the refusal of any person to reply to any subpoena issued hereunder, or to testify to any matter to which he may be examined, the Superior Court in

any county on application may issue an order requiring such person to comply with such subpoena and to testify. Any failure to obey such order may be punished by the Court as a contempt thereof. The Committee shall report its findings together with any proposed recommendations for legislative action to the Legislative Research Committee or the next regular session of the Maine Legislature, and therefore hereby appropriate from the Legislative Appropriation for said purpose a sum not exceeding \$75,000.

Came from the Senate read and passed.

In the House, the Order was read.

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

Mr. JUTRAS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The analogy that I shall use today, in an attempt to kill and bury this order in the legislative files, is not to be construed as a facetious one. Even though I am not actively engaged in the practice of mortuary science, I still hold a current license from this and other states in this field.

Vahlsing Inc. is a moribund organization on the brink of death and burial.

The question I have to pose to you as responsible legislators disbursing monies of your constituents is, do you think that this body should authorize the sum of \$75,000 to send a delegation in to Aroostook County to attend the funeral of Vahlsing, Inc.? And to confirm your judgment in this matter, I request, Mr. Speaker, the indefinite postponement of this order, and then when the vote is taken, it be taken by the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. BRENNAN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This proposed order represents precisely the kind of hasty, ill-conceived action which this or any other legislative body should avoid. An analysis of the basis of this order, as set forth in the preamble, makes it crystal clear that it will serve no valid legislative

purpose. We are told, among other things, that this company is behind in some of its bills, that it has tried to get its property taxes reduced, that there are some liens and attachments filed against it.

Mr. Speaker, many companies, indeed many individuals, are behind in some bills. Many have tried to get their taxes reduced. If this is to be the basis of investigation, then we had better plan to create a thousand new commissions.

As to the liens and attachments, as many members of this body already know, the filing of a lien or attachment proves absolutely nothing except that a claim is being made. I can go out this afternoon and file a claim or a lien against every company in this state for any amount I want. That would prove just as much as the liens mentioned in this order, and yet this is offered as a reason for creating a \$75,000 special investigating commission whose sole objective would be to harrass one single individual.

It is true that the Maine Industrial Building Authority has guaranteed loans to Maine Sugar Industries. It is also true that company is in serious financial trouble, but it has not failed. The State of Maine has received several thousands of dollars in premium payments on that guarantee. And up to this point it has not lost a nickel.

An examination of the situation indicates that the guaranteed loan is secured by first mortgages on the plant which is worth many times the amount of the loan. Thus, even if the worst happens, it is doubtful that the state will lose any money whatsoever.

I am advised that in MIBA's history, approximately ten companies have failed and many others have been in default at one time or another. Yet never before have we had a request for an investigation. Why? I think the answer is an easy and very simple one. The real reason behind this order is clear from the fact that it includes the Potato Processing Company in this investigation. This is a company that is com-

pletely separate from the sugar company. It is in sound financial condition. It is current on its repayments on its MIBA loan. It employs nearly 700 people, and yet they want to investigate this company. I submit that this is ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, I neither accuse nor defend Mr. Fred Vahlsing. I have never met him and wouldn't recognize him if he walked into this room. If he has done anything wrong, there are appropriate judicial procedures to handle it. The Attorney General, I am sure, is aware of this. He already has all the power he needs to punish wrongdoers.

Let me remind you, ladies and gentlemen, this is a legislative body and not a kangaroo court. The sugar company is in serious difficulty according to published reports. A plan of merger has been proposed that may enable it to survive and to provide the assistance to Aroostook County which it was intended for. This order cannot and will not do anything that will help that merger. In fact, it will probably hasten its death.

Who will benefit from this order? Certainly not the hundreds of employees whose jobs will be lost. Certainly not the farmers of Aroostook County who will be forced to continue to rely on a single crop. Mr. Speaker, no individual in this body, no group, neither of our political parties, none of us has any monopoly on decency and fair play. We have all been guilty at one time or another of partisanship, of action which apparent political gain was placed before the public good. That is inevitable, if unfortunately a part of the political process. But I believe that the majority of the members of this House will not be willing to go along with an order of this nature which is so blatantly political.

There is no question that the Attorney General is going to run for Governor, as far as I can see, and I think if the Republican Party wants \$75,000 to start off its campaign, they ought to get it from the Republican Party and not from the people of the State of

Maine. I urge the House to defeat this order.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I had quite sincerely not intended to debate this order because I think that the order is very clear in its terms. But as one non-candidate for governor, I want to assure the good gentleman from Portland, Mr. Brennan, that the scope of the order is designed to look into this situation.

Now I don't know whether or not this enterprise is a moribund organization on the doorsteps of death, as Mr. Jutras, the gentleman from Sanford suggests, or whether or not it is in trouble. I simply suggest to you that the indicia are very clear that the growers have not been paid and a number of other instances have occurred that give rise to our concern.

The gentleman from Portland suggests there is no valid legislative purpose. I suggest to you there is an absolute nondelegable duty on our part, having authorized this procedure in the first place, to look into the facts and circumstances surrounding the present situation to determine what those facts are; and to take such corrective action with respect to the whole concept of MIBA as may be indicated.

The thing that particularly concerns me is the suggestion by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Brennan, that a legislature carrying out its sworn duty is somehow going to precipitate the failure of a healthy, well-organized, properly conceived organization. I think that suggestion is preposterous.

Mr. Speaker, I join in the request for a roll call, and I urge every member of the House to vote no on the motion to indefinitely postpone.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I had intended to debate this even though the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, was not.

He has been lobbying since this morning for the votes, and obviously there was no reason to even debate it at all.

I am sure that now you are fully aware of the contents of the order and of the statements that have been made to the news media both attacking and defending this action. I will spend a little bit of time with you reviewing the background of the sugar beet industry in Maine, because it is obvious that it is from this beginning that there has been both technical and economic problems.

Research teams at the University of Maine, as many years ago as I can remember, struggled for years to prove that it was economically feasible to grow sugar beets in Aroostook. While these experiments indicated a high degree of probability of success, there was no substitute for practical quantity growing by farmers in actual production. Problems such as proper spacing of plants, effective cultivation, soil acid, weed control still remain to be solved in terms of the large scale production at the time the industry came into being.

Over the last few years some of these difficulties have been resolved while still others remain to be answered.

Secondly, we should remember that at the time that this industry came to Aroostook County, Maine potato prices were extremely depressed. And the arrival of the sugar beet industry as a supplementary crop was welcomed with the enthusiasm of a complete and total gold strike. Yet, we were also aware that the success of this industry in Maine relied entirely on the willingness of Maine farmers to grow those sugar beets. It should be obvious to everyone in Maine that without sugar beets there is no sugar beet industry.

The reasons are varied, but the facts remain that at no time since the industry was first established have farmers planted the full acreage allotment. Plantings have varied from about one third to two thirds of the total allotment. Furthermore, the amount of acreage planted has increased and decreased but it does not present a pattern of steady growth and ac-

ceptance of the crop by Maine farmers.

Third, I would submit to you that the difficulties of locating this industry in Maine were known to all members of the Maine Legislature who were in office at the time that it came to the state. The various problems have received such extensive publicity that there can be little doubt that a large portion of the people of this state had at least some awareness of the difficulties facing this new agricultural industry. I would point out to you that the desires to have this sugar beet industry come to Maine received virtually unanimous support from both political parties. Governor Reed and Senator Muskie and Senator Smith and now Governor Curtis worked in bringing this industry to Maine in obtaining the necessary sugar beet quota from the federal government.

No one questions the fact that due to some of the problems I have mentioned, the sugar beet industry is now having a certain amount of financial difficulty. Neither do I think that we can question the fact that all concerned in supporting this venture fully realized from the beginning that it was not then, and not now fully guaranteed of financial success. Indeed, this is the very reason why Maine Sugar obtained the financial backing and backing of the government. The provision of financial support for industries that the state judges to be of economic benefit, but which cannot obtain financial support through the normal commercial channels.

There are very few guarantees of success in this world, and virtually none of these are in the field of agriculture, and I am sure that the farmers know that. If we face the facts head on, yes, we gambled, we had to, because we had depressed potato prices in Aroostook County. We ventured the State's credit in support of a new industry, in the hopes of economic gain for agriculture, and for the entire State of Maine. We made this venture with the full realization that to make this gain we had to accept the possibility of economic loss, if sugar beets did not prove

a popular, profitable, and a worthwhile crop for Maine farmers.

Now we have, or perhaps I should say the Republican leadership of this Legislature has raised the question of whether or not it is necessary or advisable to take any legislative action in regard to the Maine sugar beet industry, its financing, and its present difficulties.

It is my feeling that an investigation such as this, that has been proposed in this legislative order now before us, at this point will accomplish nothing of value, and may instead do irreparable harm by adding one more weight on the back of an industry already heavily burdened with those problems. And I, as a legislator from Aroostook County, am not willing to take that gamble.

Such an investigation can certainly have no impact on local or state financial commitments whatsoever. Those will remain. Those pledges were made many years ago, in full accordance with the laws of the State of Maine, and they will be honored no matter what the fate of the sugar beet industry is in Aroostook County. Financially, Maine stands to alter its present standing not at all, except to the extent of spending \$75,000 on investigation by this so-called order.

However, the investigation which has been proposed could very well serve to destroy the national quota given to Maine in the field of sugar beets. And I am not willing to take that gamble, and I am not willing to have the burden cast upon my shoulders as a legislator from Aroostook County as having taken that gamble and agreed to this order. And it could serve to destroy the industry itself by leading to a further complete and total deterioration of the number of acres of sugar beets that will be planted this coming spring.

No beets, and I remind you there will be no sugar, and I remind you there will be no jobs, no industry. It is a very simple progression, and one I am sure that the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, understands. A situation that is now financially difficult might easily be made

financially impossible by this investigation that could only serve the purpose of weakening the interests of Maine farmers in continued planting.

I think it is unnecessary for me to tell you, to elaborate on the results of loss of jobs, and the economic hardship that would be created in Aroostook County when we at this time are still having depressed prices for potatoes. And if this is the net result of this proposed investigation, I remind you there would be a large financial loss for the entire state.

This dubious investigation can only be destructive, not constructive. I would challenge any member of this House to point out today one single economic benefit that can accrue to Maine by the passage of this order. It will not create a single new job. It will not serve to improve in any way the chances of success of the sugar beet industry to whom our financial commitments have already been made. And perhaps most of all this order will not serve in any way to enhance the climate of industrial growth which we have tried so hard to foster in this state. A purposeless witch-hunt aimed at a particular industry will serve only as a bright red warning flag to other industries to stop doing business, or not to start business in the State of Maine. And this brass band which the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, referred to during the regular session will indeed be at Kittery.

I would rather not bring into the question the motives of the authors of this order, but I do not think we can avoid the obvious conclusion. But since it can serve no practical economic purpose, there must be a reason for presenting this order to this special session of the Legislature. The only end that I can see that this investigation is serving is to set up a well financed committee whose activities could focus attentions on candidates for office in this year's coming election.

If, as I believe, the true motivation for the presentation of this order is political; and if, as I believe, it can accomplish nothing of benefit to the State of Maine;

and if, as I believe, that the final passage of this order could be extremely detrimental to the state, and to its industrial climate, then I think we as legislators should join together, regardless of a political affiliation, and vote against this proposal.

One last question perhaps, or a statement. I am sure that the members of the Republican leadership are fully aware of this, but I was just informed of this this morning. I would be wondering if the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, would deny the fact that the Attorney General of this state was in the Republican caucus yesterday afternoon when it was discussed?

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

Mr. LUND: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I can't hope to match the fiery oratory or the carefully prepared remarks of the gentleman from Eagle Lake. But I am a little bit concerned over his suggestion that we are talking about past history.

Now, I have on my desk here, and many of you have — all of you have, the report of the Maine Industrial Building Authority that was passed out at this special session, which reflects the loans made during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. And I note that it includes a total of \$4,250,000 to Maine Sugar Industries, Inc. I find this a remarkable fact in the light of the rather shaky business condition suggested by the gentleman, Mr. Jutras. If indeed there is to be a funeral, I would suggest to you all it is not going to be a private funeral, because the state has a good many millions of dollars invested in it. And it seems to me an entirely legitimate matter for public concern at this session.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In view of the action taken, or being taken by the members of this House this morning, before the session began I requested the

gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, if we could possibly delay this action to later in today's session. And his reaction, of course, was that the plans were made that they would take it up in order of the calendar.

My reason for requesting that is that I felt very strongly that a substitute order could be drafted which would, in effect, direct the MIBA people, the people that are responsible to the people of Maine for the credit of Maine in its investment, and trying to promote industrial development and projects in the State of Maine. And I personally feel that the gentlemen who are presently on this board represent the people of Maine in its investment towards progress. And I will read for the record the names of the members that are presently on the board that I feel would have been able to do a more constructive job of investigating some of their commitments of the state's money. Rather than have the state's money in the form of an order which has some political connotations to be conducted in an election year that might have been, and I repeat, might have been directed by a gubernatorial candidate in an election year. And I feel that these members would have been much more qualified to give the assurance of the people of Maine in a constructive investigation with the backing of the Legislature, and if they needed subpoena powers this could be granted to them, and if there was not availability of funds in the MIBA Board that they would also have an allocation of funds.

But this fund would not be used in a political year for a gubernatorial candidate to run from a muddy pool of water from the beginning of the year.

And I think these gentlemen here would have done justice to the people of Maine, its investment, and also not only one singled out company, but any other company that may be in financial trouble, might have been in financial trouble, that something could be done. And these names are: Carleton G. Lane of Portland, James M. Pierce of Houlton, William D. Deans of Biddeford, Harry Fitzhenry of Lubec, Arnold T. Gel-



lerson of Dover-Foxcroft, John A. Sevigny of Portland, John P. Carey of Bath, and John McPike of Hampden. I think these people would have been able to give us what I think the original purpose of the order was drafted.

The order now has reached somewhat of an out of proportion projection to the people of Maine that the MIBA people are not doing their job, or they are not investing the state's money into a constructive financial position. And the reason why I say that, there should be no question in our minds. The EDA, the Federal branch of the government, just this last summer has done a complete investigation of this particular industry in order for them to extend some parts of the loan of which the Federal Government have only second mortgages. The state has first mortgages. If anything happens we come in first, the state has priority over the Federal Government where they are only concerned with second mortgages.

If the EDA, the Federal branch of the government's investigation, of which I know was more than \$75,000 invested in their investigation: if they could not come up with a single thing wrong with the administration, financial or otherwise, what is this order hopefully to obtain, just six months since this Federal committee has investigated Vahlsing, Inc.? I don't see the purpose of the order as being able to accomplish something other than a platform for a gubernatorial candidate starting out from muddied waters, using state allocated money of \$75,000 to do something that there hasn't been one bit of evidence that has been presented to us or anybody else that there is in actuality anything wrong.

If there would have been anything wrong the judicial part of our system should have been instituted in the first place. The County Attorney's Office, or the County Commissioners' Office should have been notified if there was anything wrong. The MIBA should have been notified, the Attorney General's Office of the state should have been notified if

there was anything wrong. So I hope this morning that the members of the House will support the motion to indefinitely postpone this order so that we will not start a political year from a muddied pool of water at the expense of state money of \$75,000.

I think if some Republican gubernatorial candidate wants this type of platform to start out from, I think the Republican organization of the state could allocate the money to support this type of platform, and not state money.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fort Fairfield, Mr. Johnston.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am a little understaffed to compete with some of the speeches that have been presented here, but I want to say as a representative from Fort Fairfield and Easton, and President of the Maine Sugar Beet Growers Association, that I rise to support this order in hopes that it will do something as far as the first three paragraphs of this order.

First, from the standpoint of the growers in Aroostook County, let me say this thing is critical. There is definitely quite a bit of money owed to the growers, but in the same respect, growers have an obligation to Mr. Vahlsing in that they have leased equipment, and he has financed them considerably in growing this crop of sugar beets.

They have had their problems growing them in many respects. Weed problem has been a big factor. Our PH of our soils has been a real big factor. And one year we had a crop failure due to moisture. So all isn't rosy up there, but at the same time, this industry is at a critical standpoint. These growers need to get paid for a crop they raise, regardless of the situation that they have with him there. And we hope that this industry will stay in Aroostook. It is needed, and as many of the speakers pointed out, we have done a big job here in the state in financing this thing, and it is definitely at a critical stage.

Third, from the standpoint of the towns that I represent, Fort Fairfield and Easton, and the other Aroostook towns that are

anxiously awaiting taxes, they need the taxes. The Town of Easton is waiting for some \$150,000, and they have a new school that they just built, and this is a very critical situation.

I realize that Mr. Vahlsing has had his problems from the standpoint of trying to get this industry to grow, but the growers in the county have done a considerable amount on their part to keep this industry alive. As the Sugar Beet Growers Association President, we have worked three years now to make changes and make recommendations and work wholeheartedly with him to keep this industry alive. But he has many, many problems that he may not be facing squarely, and these things should be brought out. And this report might possibly bring them to light.

So, therefore, from the standpoint of these three points I support this order and hope that it does bring out these things, and correct this problem here, and bring this industry back to life. Thank you.

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

Mr. SAHAGIAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in support of this Senate Paper 633.

I am not an orator, and I am not going to try to make a speech here, but if it is permissible I would like to quote from the remarks that I made in two sessions ago in the Legislature about this sugar industry, which most of you here do remember.

I seriously, strenuously opposed this sugar beet on the ground that it was not feasible. Maine soil was not ready at that time, and it would be a waste of money, and we are going to squander the taxpayers money at that time. Now, I would like to read just one or two paragraphs here. I will not go into detail. I asked the question: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose another question at this time through the Chair. What would happen to this sugar refinery in the event it was built and for some unknown reason that it did not pan out, and it went through the wringer with some fin-

ancial difficulties? Who would then pick up the tab? Who is going to lose the money?"

I don't want to mention the representative's name. It is in here. It is for a public record, they can look at it. But that representative at that time told me that he was surprised a question coming from a man like Herman Sahagian, who is going to pick up the tab? Naturally, he says, it was the stockholders. Then that was the very question that I wanted that representative to answer me. That was the question I was looking for. I knew the question, who are the stockholders? There is no individual in this House that has bought a single share. It was the State of Maine that guaranteed the loan of the \$10 million.

And at that time I cautioned and I warned that this was not the right bill for the State of Maine to get into and involved. And then I also brought out the fact, it is in here, all the record, I won't go into it. It is on Page 605, that I have quoted that the sugar at that time was selling for—at one time it was selling for thirteen cents a pound, it had dropped down to three cents a pound. And there is only one third, or fifteen percent of sugar can be produced from one ton of beets. And for one ton of beets to be transported within 50 to 125 miles area, the transportation cost will be twice as much as what they would receive for a return in sugar beets.

And now I am not going to go into detail. I am glad that I took that action at the time. I think it was careless for the Legislature to fall in a trap of \$15 million to \$25 million, and I hope that this joint order will prevail. Thank you.

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

Mr. McTEAGUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Today I would like to speak not of potatoes, but of politics and precedents. Having only a newspaper reader's knowledge of the difficulties involved, it seems to me that it might be very worthwhile to look into the general matter, not only of Mr. Vahlsing's companies, but the general matter of

the MIBA and various other outfits that have been financed.

I think perhaps a fair number of the members of this House already have rather hard commitments as to which way they are going to go on this. But perhaps they will listen, at any rate, and perhaps there are others who are concerned not only with this particular problem, but with the precedent we will set.

There will be other Legislatures, there will be other problems that will arise. There will be other candidates for governors. There may be a different majority party in this House and in the other body in the future than there is now. And I feel we set a very dangerous and undesirable precedent by choosing the particular vehicle suggested by the joint order to investigate the difficulties which exist.

I personally have no objection to, but rather favor, an investigation, thorough and immediate, and very importantly, non-partisan and impartial. Not by persons who may be candidates for significant offices, but by people who are withdrawn from the infighting that seems to go with active politics. If we are interested in curing the problem, it seems to me that we might delay for a short period of hours today, and have a substitute order drafted that could provide for an impartial body. But if we have our eyes not on the potatoes in Aroostook County, but rather on votes across the state during the next year, we may not.

The persons who feel that they may be helped by an investigation, which I fear will bear at least the tinges of partisanship, should remember the great danger of setting precedents of this kind. Some of the less glorious pages in the history of our national legislature, and our state Legislature, involve publicity ridden investigations by seekers of high public office about important subjects that should be investigated. And the reason that these things are often in the hindsight of history, considered not to be bright marks in the Legislatures involved, is not because the subjects did not need investigating, but rather because the people in-

involved were so bound up in active politics with their eyes so much on the elections that they perhaps were not the right ones to do it.

We could have, for example, in future Legislatures, significant sums of money, or perhaps even more than the \$75,000 here, to go into the private electric utility companies in this state. We could have candidates for public office try to ride that road.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that this course of action by the means suggested is in the interest of the people of the state. I don't think it is in the interest of responsible legislation, by members of either party. And it is not right anymore for people from York County than it is Aroostook. Let's look into it, but let's try to look into it fairly and let's not try to look into it as Democrats or Republicans. Let's look into it as people that owe a responsibility to the state.

I hope the members will consider not only this immediate problem which I recognize is significant, but the long run and very dangerous precedent they may set by an investigation into a weighty area that smacks of politics. The people expect and have a right to expect more responsibility out of their Legislature than that.

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

Mr. BENSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It has been hinted ever so gently, that there might be political overtones to this question. The last speaker, the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. McTeague, has mentioned on a number of occasions in his presentation that we would be setting a precedent here today.

I have a list of studies that were authorized by the 102nd Legislature, which you all will remember as a Democrat controlled Legislature. They total \$293,100. As far as the precedent is concerned I don't think that we have to even think or consider about a precedent here today. A study authorized by that session of the Legislature in the amount of \$75,000 was directed at the question of public versus private power. There are many others which I won't read

to you. But a total of \$293,100 worth of studies in one session, I think, erases any question of us setting a precedent here today.

I feel that it is unfortunate for the opposition to—looking into the business practices of one of our major industries here in the state today, I think it is very unfortunate that we should have to bring into the situation the fact that a gentleman is running for governor of the state, and that this is a back door method of securing funds for that campaign. I think that we might attack, if we must, this study from another point of view, rather than to accuse a political party of securing public funds for political purposes. I think this is rather unfortunate. Thank you.

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

Mr. BRENNAN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque, has stated that he has an alternative order which is in the process of being prepared. I was wondering if some member of this House would kindly extend the courtesy to table that so it could be put before this House.

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

Mr. DANTON: Mr. Speaker, I move that this matter be tabled for later on in today's session.

Whereupon, Mr. Richardson of Cumberland requested a vote on the tabling motion.

The SPEAKER: A vote has been requested on the tabling motion. All in favor of tabling will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken. 48 voted in the affirmative and 74 voted in the negative.

Whereupon, Mr. Binnette of Old Town requested a roll call vote.

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 on the tabling motion 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 the desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Danton, that this matter be tabled pending the motion of the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Jutras, that this matter be indefinitely postponed. If you are in favor of tabling this until later in today's session you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Bedard, Bernier, Binnette, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Brennan, Burnham, Carey, Carrier, Carter, Casey, Coffey, Cottrell, Couture, Cox, Crommett, Croteau, Curran, Danton, Drigotas, Dudley, Emery, Eustis, Fecteau, Fortier, A. J.; Fortier, M.; Fraser, Gilbert, Giroux, Goodwin, Hunter, Jalbert, Jutras, Kelleher, Keyte, Kilroy, Laberge, Lawry, Lebel, Leibowitz, LePage, Levesque, Martin, McKinnon, McTeague, Mills, Mitchell, Morgan, Nadeau, Ouellette, Ricker, Rocheleau, Santoro, Starbird, Tanguay, Temple, Vincent, Wheeler.

NAY — Allen, Baker, Barnes, Benson, Berman, Birt, Bragdon, Brown, Buckley, Bunker, Chick, Clark, C. H.; Clark, H. G.; Corson, Cote, Crosby, Cummings, Curtis, Cushing, Donaghy, Durgin, Dyar, Erickson, Evans, Farnham, Finemore, Foster, Hall, Hanson, Hardy, Harriman, Haskell, Hawkens, Henley, Hewes, Hichens, Huber, Immonen, Jameson, Johnston, Kelley, K. F.; Lee, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Lund, MacPhail, Marstaller, McNally, Meisner, Millett, Mosher, Norris, Page, Payson, Pratt, Rand, Richardson, G. A.; Richardson, H. L.; Rideout, Ross, Sahagian, Scott, C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Snow, Soulas, Stillings, Susi, Thompson, Trask, Tyndale, White, Wight, Williams, Wood, The Speaker.

ABSENT — Chandler, D'Alfonso, Dam, Dennett, Faucher, Gauthier, Good, Heselton, Kelley, R. P.; Marquis, Moreshead, Noyes, Porter, Quimby, Sheltra, Waxman.

Yes, 58; No, 77; Absent, 16.

The SPEAKER: Fifty-eight having voted in the affirmative and seventy-seven having voted in the negative, the tabling motion does not prevail.

The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Jutras, that this Joint Order be indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dixfield, Mr. Eustis.

Mr. EUSTIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I stood beside the gentleman from Belgrade, Mr. Sahagian in objecting strenuously to this article being introduced or being passed in the Legislature. I don't propose to prolong this thing by any oratory, but I will say today that I agree in substance with everything said by Mr. McTeague. I think a much better method than this, by duly constituted authority, is the proper way to pursue this investigation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I find it quite unfortunate this morning that because of party lines or because of divisions between the Republicans in the majority and the Democrats in the minority in this session of the Legislature, that a question of this magnitude, of this importance to the people of Maine, and the investigation is not going to start tomorrow, that we in the minority, because of this political division, are unable to ask or request the majority party at least the courtesy of tabling an important item such as this for at least later in the same day or, as I would suggest probably, in another day, to find out — to see if there are alternative areas that we should be venturing into rather than create this kind of dissension. I don't think that one day would make this much difference in our lives or the loans that are being loaned out by the people of Maine to the industrial complexes of the state. So therefore I feel very, very disturbed this morning that the members of this House, because we are a minority party, are not even extended a courtesy which in most instances is always afforded, a courtesy of the minority party or any member of the majority party, to at least table an important issue

such as this for one legislative day. Thank you.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am very concerned that the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque, is carrying on the general tone that seems to have been adopted by the opponents of this order. It has been referred to as a purposeless witch-hunt. The whole terms of this order, I believe, are sufficiently broad to permit us to inquire into the basic structure by which we approve the pledging of the state's credit and the apparent lack of any supervision over the — or any knowledge of the day to day activities of those firms who are, in fact, involved with the state and with the state's credit.

I would remind my friend from Madawaska, and he is my friend, that it is the members of his party which are screaming, screaming, screaming about politics.

Now history will judge whether or not this committee embarked upon a political witch-hunt—history will judge that. And as far as I am concerned, I want no part of any such effort. I believe that we confront a serious problem. There is ample legislative precedent for our undertaking the investigation at this time. And to those who are screaming foul, and to those who read a sinister implication into this order, I would attempt to remind them of the admonition of the law, that the guilty flee when none pursue.

Now this committee and this commission is given the power here to make a rational, calm, deliberative analysis of this situation without reference to politics. And that is the kind of committee or commission activity that I hope is pursued.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, seems to imply that the Democrats have something to hide. We don't. Now let's make it clear. We are attacking today a project at a time when it

is in trouble, when it has admitted its trouble, and when the effects of the investigation could well ruin the industry. And I would point out to the gentleman from Fort Fairfield that there are 900 jobs involved in those two industries. And I am not willing to take the responsibility upon my shoulders that I put the straw which broke the camel's back, and that that industry is now dead.

We talk of the MIBA and its authority and its loans. The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lund, pointed out to them, in its fiscal '69 report, they point to the loans made for machinery at Eastern Maine Sugar. According to Mr. O'Connor, they are not in arrears on payments on machinery. And on the money which went to Vahlsing Inc. many years ago, over half of that money has been repaid. They are not in arrears on that either. We are talking about one industry, MSI, Maine Sugar, and its problems.

I do not feel that we should make a political football with the lives of so many people that could well be affected as a result of this operation. And obviously it is a political deal. It was shown by the lobbying by the Majority Floor Leader and the Assistant Majority Floor Leader and some others within the party, and the presence of some people taken into the Speaker's office and talked to, it was shown by the vote on the tabling motion and it will be shown again as we see the vote on the action today.

I would challenge the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, to answer the question I posed to him, "Was the Attorney General present in the caucus and what was he doing?"

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fort Fairfield, Mr. Johnston.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to answer the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin. I don't believe this order will put 900 people out of work because if this industry isn't corrected and looked into and made to survive through good sound investigation, the farmers will put them out of work because they are not going

to grow these beets without payment. They have gone along for two years now, and Vahlsing has, like I say, done his part and done considerable for them, but this thing has to be worked on a sound business standpoint, and he is intermingling payment of potatoes with beets, which can't be done, and in order to have an industry survive, farmers must produce the beets, and the people, in order to work in that plant, must have beets to process. So it is the farmers that will put the thing out of business, not this order.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Topsham, Mrs. Coffey.

Mrs. COFFEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I read the Joint Order here, and it seems to me the committee would be made up of six people, am I correct? Three appointed by the President of the Senate, three appointed from the House by the Speaker of the House. If the minority party decided to take a stand and refuse to serve on the committee, where would this get the committee?

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker I would like to answer the two questions if I may. The terms of the order call for three members from the Senate and six members from the House. And I can't believe that the minority party of this Legislature would attempt to circumvent the statements that were made, the assurances that were given, that this committee will be made up of bipartisan representation — that is members from both parties from both the Senate and the House.

And the second thing, I want to answer the question posed by the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin. I requested, because I was concerned about whether or not the committee had sufficient staff and, would have sufficient staff and access to the resources of the state, including the Attorney General's office, and also including our friends over across the way whom we refer to in a friendly manner as a bureaucracy,

wanted to be sure that we had in the order sufficient funds to provide for whatever additional help the committee needed in addition to the materials and talents that we have right here in Maine State Government. And for that reason, and for that reason only, I requested the Attorney General to come to the caucus and to tell us whether or not in his judgment there was sufficient resources involved, both within his office and the other offices of state government to provide this assistance.

Now I mention this only because I insist that if you make this a political matter, if you try to downgrade this thing, you are going to ignore your sworn obligation to the people of this state. It is the State of Maine's credit, its procedures with respect to the guarantees of such loans that is involved. And on that basis I hope that you will vote against indefinite postponement.

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

Mr. BRENNAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As long as the gentleman from Cumberland is answering questions, I would ask a couple. I would like to know why the majority party refuses to let an item like this be tabled for one legislative day? Is it possible it couldn't stand the scrutiny of the weekend?

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

Mr. JUTRAS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I believe that — I never thought that I would have generated such a heated argument over this order, and in the interest of peace and harmony among both parties, I believe it would be preferable if I withdrew my motion at this time in order to cool things off over the weekend and I would withdraw my motion and have someone else table this for one legislative day.

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

Mr. McTEAGUE: Mr. Speaker, I move that this matter be tabled until the next legislative day.

Whereupon, Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor requested a vote on the tabling motion.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. McTeague, that this order be tabled until the next legislative day, pending passage. All in favor of tabling until the next legislative day will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken. 59 voted in the affirmative and 74 voted in the negative.

Whereupon, Mr. Starbird of Kingman Township requested a roll call.

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 on the tabling motion 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 the desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. McTeague, that this matter be tabled pending passage in concurrence. If you are in favor of tabling this matter until the next legislative day you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Bedard, Bernier, Binnette, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Brennan, Burnham, Carey, Carrier, Carter, Casey, Coffey, Cote, Cottrell, Couture, Cox, Crommett, Croteau, Curran, Danton, Drigotas, Dudley, Emery, Eustis, Fecteau, Fortier, A. J.; Fortier, M.; Fraser, Gilbert, Giroux, Goodwin, Hunter, Jalbert, Jameson, Jutras, Kelleher, Keyte, Kilroy, Laberge, Lawry, Lebel, Leibowitz, LePage, Levesque, Martin, McKinnon, McTeague, Mills, Mitchell, Morgan, Nadeau, Ouellette, Ricker, Rocheleau, Ross, Santoro, Starbird, Tanguay, Temple, Vincent, Wheeler.

**NAY** — Allen, Baker, Barnes, Benson, Berman, Birt, Bragdon, Brown, Buckley, Bunker, Chick, Clark, C. H.; Clark, H. G.; Corson, Crosby, Cummings, Curtis, Cushing, Donaghy, Durgin, Dyar, Erickson, Evans, Farnham, Finemore, Foster, Hall, Hanson, Hardy, Harrihan, Haskell, Hawkens, Henley, Hewes, Hichens, Huber, Immonen, Johnston, Kelley, K. F.; Lee, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Lund, MacPhail, Marsteller, McNally, Meisner, Millett, Mosher, Norris, Page, Payson, Pratt, Rand, Richardson, G. A.; Richardson, H. L.; Rideout, Sahagian, Scott, C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Snow, Soulas, Stillings, Susi, Thompson, Trask, Tyndale, White, Wight, Williams, Wood.

**ABSENT** — Chandler, D'Alfonso, Dam, Dennett, Faucher, Gauthier, Good, Heselton, Kelley, R. P.; Marquis, Moreshead, Noyes, Porter, Quimby, Sheltra, Waxman.

Yes, 61; No, 73; Absent, 16.

The **SPEAKER**: Sixty-one having voted in the affirmative and seventy-three having voted in the negative, the motion to table does not prevail.

The pending question is the passage of this Order in concurrence.

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

Mr. **DUDLEY**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise this morning for no political reason that I can think of, but I think I want you to know that I have sat here today, just the same as I have in days in the past, and if you will look back as far as the 96th or the 97th Legislature you will find that I opposed these type of orders whether they were put on during the 100th Legislature, or whatever Legislature it may be, for the very same reason I oppose this one today. In my opinion they accomplish nothing but a lot of clutter piled upon my desk which will end up in the wastepaper basket that costs the taxpayers considerable money.

Now I was in a hurry to go to dinner, but I have changed my mind. I have put it off until supper time. So if you feel like talking all the afternoon, I am ready to talk too. And if it is just words and conversation like I have heard this morning, most of what I have

heard so far was kind of meaningless, and I intend to make my conversation meaningless also, except to say that I oppose it for the same reason that I have in the past, the dollar value. And I would certainly endorse any kind of an investigation that didn't cost the taxpayers \$75,000, but this is not the case.

Now I suspected that members of the Legislature were being paid. I was satisfied with my pay. I have never quibbled over the small amount I get. I would be willing to serve on any investigation committee. I don't want any money, and I suspect I know something about business. I have been in business all my life. I also suspect there are other members of the committee that would work on this investigation. It wouldn't cost the state \$75,000. I suspect my seatmate is a very able attorney from Aroostook County, and I know for sure that he has donated a lot of services to the State of Maine. He is a very civic-minded man. I have no doubt but where it is right in Aroostook County he would probably donate a certain amount of time. I know he is very civic minded. And as I stand here in this back row and I look all over the halls of this House, I see a lot of people, and a lot of them look like they are civic minded. They are not looking here to feather their nest or recover a lot of compensation. And so I suggest that if this order passed, someone should amend it in such a way that it wouldn't cost the taxpayers of this state \$75,000. I doubt very much if this is needed — this order, but if it is needed, certainly we were elected by the people to do this job. Certainly I want to do my portion, and I think there must be some in this House that are willing to do the job of which they were elected to do. And if this becomes a part of our duty, let's do it. But let's not continually tap these very people who are so hard pressed for money that sent us here today for another \$75,000. And I think you should give this a little serious thought.

And I really don't think, the mood you are in today seems to be political, and I don't think you



are really thinking straight, and I don't think you are thinking of the people that sent you here to represent them. I really don't. I really think you ought to put this aside for a day or two until your pulse is a little different, you are not quite so hungry, and maybe you will think different. Maybe you will have a chance to think about these good people back home that sent you here with all good intentions and thought you would do a good job, thought you would do this job, and that you wouldn't continually look for a chance to find an extra dollar bill to put in your hip pocket. I realize that is the trend today. Everybody wants to hook somebody else for a few dollars. I get along very nicely on my meager pay.

And as I say, if you just want to talk this could go on all day today and maybe tomorrow. I am sure there are others — I don't blame you for voting down a tabling motion because there are probably a lot of people that haven't been heard from today. And I hope every one of you people sitting here express yourself today and see if you really, really seriously believe that you should ask the people back home for \$75,000 to go on a witch-hunt. And most of these orders that have been before us in the past, the same as this one, they are sort of a witch-hunt.

I don't have a very big vocabulary and I am well aware of it. But I can find words enough in my small vocabulary to express to you how I feel about these kind of documents that are before us. And I think the people back home know how I feel about these things, and I have got a stinking suspicion that is why I am here consistently year after year. That is why I am here year after year, I know what the people back home are thinking about these kind of things. They are thinking is this Charlie and Joe and Pete, are they really doing the job or are they just down there having a ball? Well I am going to try to do the job and I am going to try to have a ball at the same time. And I don't want any extra for any service that I render whether it be

here or any other place, I don't want any extra fee. I am willing to do what I do free.

I am quite civic minded at home. I donate to all the causes. And when I am asked to perform any civic duty, I am one of the first ones there. I don't care if it is to serve on the volunteer fire department, drive an ambulance, or any other thing that might require public service. I will be there. I will do my part. And I don't care if it is late at night or early in the morning. I will be there. And I just want you other fellows to be there and do your part. Frankly, I am going to be honest with you, I don't think you are. If you will present an order to this House of this nature for \$75,000, it is my honest and humble opinion that you are not doing the job that you were sent here to do. I really believe that, and I think the people who sent me here believe the same thing too. And they don't believe that we need to —

First of all, they don't believe that we needed this special session, and second of all, let me tell you, they don't believe that we need to discuss such issues as this at a special session. And I agree with them, and I know they agree with me. I see them every day.

I can go on a little further to tell you that I didn't go to the University of Maine and I didn't take a course in public relations nor history and government. This wouldn't be a fact. But I have worked with people and been with people all my life. No later than last night I talked with a lot of people on the outside of this House and I know how they feel about these things. So I feel as though I might be offering you a word of wisdom of what the people are saying.

Now I hope some of the rest of you get up and express yourself just as I have, just how you honestly feel. Are you under paid? Are you doing the job? Do you really think this would accomplish anything?

Let's take away the part that says whether this is political or benefits any certain party. Let's

try to forget this for a few minutes, and for a committee of one, I volunteer my time, as part of my legislative duty. I want no pay. I don't want any mileage. And I hope some of you others here will be gentlemen enough, if you really think they need this survey—I don't think so, but if you really think so, then you volunteer, I will volunteer. If you want to work all day up there or all night, two days or two weeks or six months, I will be there. And this afternoon if you want to talk all the afternoon, I am prepared to talk all the afternoon; if you want to go to lunch, I will go to lunch, but I can wait till four o'clock if you want to. I don't want to be troublesome, disagreeable. I don't think anybody that knows me ever found me to be too disagreeable when it comes to eating, or social activities. And I would say many other fields I try to be very cooperative. And I will try to cooperate with this House today.

And so I just would like to see a few more of you people express yourselves. And these are some of the things I would like to have you tell us, and tell the people so they can see back home that is how you feel. If you want to do the job, all right. If you don't want to do the job, there is an election coming up pretty soon, and I think there is probably somebody available in your community to do the job. And I am going to, probably, when it comes time to run again I may offer my services, with conditions in my area such as they are today, and my business is no more of a problem than it is now, I shall probably offer my services to do this job again at this meager pay. And I shall try to do as good a job as I have done in the past.

I hope that when you finally decide that you will pass this order without the \$75,000. I am quite sure I can see some very intelligent faces amongst this Aroostook delegation. These people wouldn't have to contribute a lot of mileage, or a big mileage expense check to be there to investigate this. Now, I can see that if we would elect a man, and he is very able, from

Cumberland County, and in the leadership, he'd have an awful lot of mileage to drive to Easton. I would suggest that a lot of these people in the Aroostook delegation be elected to make this survey, and report back to this House or the next one. And maybe from this we would accomplish something. Maybe they would come up with some sound information that would help the sugar beet industry.

Now, I would go on a little further. If I take you back a few days—I don't like to take people back a few days, because then they commence to realize how old I really am, and at this point I am getting so I would rather not divulge my age too much. But if I take you back just a little ways, I would say that I opposed this type of a loan, along with the gentleman from Belgrade, as not being sound. However, it has been done. And at this point I would like to try to make it survive, and do anything that we could to keep this job in operation, and all these people to work.

And so if the Speaker will recognize me a little later on I will enter into rebuttal on what might be said later.

Mr. Ross of Bath moved the previous question.

The SPEAKER: For the Chair to entertain a motion for the previous question it must have the expressed consent of one third of the members present and voting. All those in favor of the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

The SPEAKER: A sufficient number having voted, the motion for the previous question is entertained. The question now before the House is, shall the main question be put now? This is debatable for no more than five minutes by any member. Is it the pleasure of the House that the main question be put now?

It is a vote.

The question is the passage of the Joint Order, Senate Paper 633. Does the gentleman still request a roll call vote?

Mr. JUTRAS: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I move that this be tabled until Tuesday.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will rule that this is a superfluous request and it will not be entertained.

A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting.

All those in favor of 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 Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Brennan.

Mr. BRENNAN: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry, please.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may pose his question.

Mr. BRENNAN: Is a tabling motion in order?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that it is not in order, the previous question has been ordered, and tabling motions have been lost, and at this time the Chair will rule that it is a superfluous motion.

Mr. BRENNAN: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may pose his inquiry.

Mr. BRENNAN: Can't a tabling motion to a later date be made under our rules?

The SPEAKER: Not at this time, the previous question has been ordered, and the Chair has ruled that it is a superfluous motion, having lost two or three times.

All in favor of this Order Senate Paper 633 receiving final passage will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

### ROLL CALL

YEA — Allen, Baker, Barnes, Benson, Berman, Birt, Bragdon, Brown, Buckley, Bunker, Carey, Chick, Clark, C. H.; Clark, H. G.; Corson, Crosby, Cummings, Curtis, Cushing, Donaghy, Dudley, Durgin, Dyar, Erickson, Evans, Farnham,

Finemore, Foster, Hall, Hanson, Hardy, Harriman, Haskell, Hawkens, Henley, Hewes, Hichens, Huber, Immonen, Johnston, Kelley, K. F.; Lee, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Lund, MacPhail, Marstaller, McNally, Meisner, Millett, Mosher, Norris, Page, Payson, Pratt, Rand, Richardson, G. A.; Richardson, H. L.; Rideout, Ross, Sahagian, Scott, C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Snow, Soulas, Stillings, Susi, Thompson, Trask, Tyndale, White, Wight, Williams, Wood.

NAY — Bedard, Bernier, Binnette, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Brennan, Burnham, Carrier, Carter, Casey, Coffey, Cote, Cottrell, Couture, Cox, Crommett, Croteau, Curran, Danton, Drigotas, Emery, Eustis, Fecteau, Fortier, A. J.; Fortier, M.; Fraser, Gilbert, Giroux, Goodwin, Hunter, Jalbert, Jameson, Jutras, Kelleher, Keyte, Kilroy, Laberge, Lawry, Lebel, Leibowitz, LePage, Levesque, Martin, McKinnon, McTeague, Mills, Mitchell, Morgan, Nadeau, Ouellette, Ricker, Rocheleau, Santoro, Starbird, Tanguay, Temple, Vincent, Wheeler.

ABSENT — Chandler, D'Alfonso, Dam, Dennett, Faucher, Gauthier, Good, Heselton, Kelley, R. P.; Marquis, Moreshead, Noyes, Porter, Quimby, Sheltra, Waxman.

Yes, 76; No, 58; Absent, 16.

The SPEAKER: Seventy-six having voted in the affirmative and fifty-eight having voted in the negative, the Order receives passage in concurrence.

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

Mr. BENSON: Mr. Speaker, I move that we reconsider our action whereby this Order was just passed, and I ask that you all vote against me.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Southwest Harbor, Mr. Benson, moves the House reconsider its action whereby this order was passed.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, I move that we table this reconsidering motion until next Monday. I suspect then we will have a chance to see if we can find some volunteers.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman's motion is out of order, he is debating his own motion.

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

Mr. DANTON: Mr. Speaker, I move that matter be tabled pending reconsideration until next Monday.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Danton, moves this matter be tabled until next Monday pending the motion to reconsider.

Mr. Richardson of Cumberland requested a vote on the tabling motion.

Whereupon, Mr. Binnette of Old Town requested a roll call vote on the tabling motion.

The SPEAKER: A roll call vote has been requested on the tabling motion. 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 Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Danton, that the reconsideration motion be tabled until next Monday. All in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Bedard, Bernier, Binnette, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Brennan, Burnham, Carey, Carrier, Carter, Casey, Coffey, Cote, Cottrell, Couture, Cox, Crommett, Croteau, Curran, Danton, Drigotas, Dudley, Emery, Eustis, Fecteau, Fortier, A. J.; Fortier, M.; Fraser, Gilbert, Giroux, Goodwin, Hunter, Jalbert, Jameson, Jutras, Kelleher, Keyte, Kilroy, Laberge, Lawry, Lebel, Leibowitz, LePage, Levesque, Martin, McKinnon, McNally, McTeague, Mills, Mitchell, Morgan, Nadeau, Ouellette, Ricker, Rocheleau, Santoro, Starbird, Tanguay, Temple, Vincent, Wheeler.

NAY — Allen, Baker, Barnes, Benson, Bertram, Birt, Bragdon, Brown, Buckley, Bunker, Chick, Clark, C. H.; Clark, H. G.; Cor-

son, Crosby, Cummings, Curtis, Cushing, Donaghy, Durgin, Dyar, Erickson, Evans, Farnham, Finemore, Foster, Hall, Hanson, Hardy, Harriman, Haskell, Hawken, Henley, Hewes, Hichens, Huber, Immonen, Johnston, Kelley, K. F.; Lee, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Lund, MacPhail, Marstaller, Meisner, Millett, Mosher, Norris, Page, Payson, Pratt, Rand, Richardson, G. A.; Richardson, H. L.; Rideout, Ross, Sahagian, Scott, C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Snow, Soulas, Stillings, Susi, Thompson, Trask, Tyndale, White, Wight, Williams, Wood, The Speaker.

ABSENT — Chandler, D'Alfonso, Dam, Dennett, Faucher, Gauthier, Good, Heselton, Kelley, R. P.; Marquis, Moreshead, Noyes, Porter, Quimby, Sheltra, Waxman.  
Yes, 61; No, 74; Absent, 16.

The SPEAKER: Sixty-one having voted in the affirmative and seventy-four having voted in the negative, the tabling motion does not prevail.

The pending question is the reconsideration of whereby this Order was passed.

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

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker, I now move that we adjourn pursuant to the Joint Order.

Mr. Richardson of Cumberland requested a vote on the motion to adjourn.

Whereupon, Mr. Couture of Lewiston requested a roll call vote on the motion to adjourn.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested on the motion to adjourn. 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.

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 Lewiston, Mr. Cote, that the House adjourn pursuant to the Joint Order. If you are in favor of adjourning pursuant to the Joint Order you will vote

yes; if you are opposed you will vote no.

**ROLL CALL**

**YEA** — Bedard, Bernier, Binnette, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Brennan, Burnham, Carey, Carrier, Carter, Casey, Coffey, Cote, Cottrell, Couture, Cox, Crommett, Croteau, Curran, Danton, Drigotas, Dudley, Emery, Eustis, Fecteau, Fortier, A. J.; Fortier, M.; Fraser, Gilbert, Giroux, Goodwin, Hunter, Jameson, Jutras, Kelleher, Keyte, Kilroy, Laberge, Lawry, Lebel, Leibowitz, LePage, Levesque, Martin, McKinnon, McTeague, Mills, Mitchell, Morgan, Nadeau, Ouellette, Ricker, Rocheleau, Santoro, Starbird, Tanguay, Temple.

**NAY** — Allen, Baker, Barnes, Benson, Berman, Birt, Bragdon, Brown, Buckley, Bunker, Chick, Clark, C. H.; Clark, H. G.; Corson, Crosby, Cummings, Curtis, Cushing, Donaghy, Durgin, Dyar, Erickson, Evans, Farnham, Finemore, Foster, Hall, Hanson, Hardy, Harriman, Haskell, Hawkens, Henley, Hewes, Hichens, Huber, Immonen, Jalbert, Johnston, Kelley, K. F.; Lee, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Lund, MacPhail, Marstaller, McNally, Meisner, Millett, Mosher, Norris, Page, Payson, Pratt, Rand, Richardson, G. A.; Richardson, H. L.; Rideout, Ross, Sahagian, Scott, C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Snow, Soulas, Stillings, Susi, Thompson, Trask, Tyndale, Vincent, Wheeler, White, Wight, Williams, Wood, The Speaker.

**ABSENT** — Chandler, D'Alfonso, Dam, Dennett, Faucher, Gauthier, Good, Heselton, Kelley, R. P.; Marquis, Moreshead, Noyes, Porter, Quimby, Sheltra, Waxman.

Yes, 57; No, 78; Absent, 16.

The **SPEAKER**: Fifty-seven having voted in the affirmative and seventy-eight having voted in the negative, the motion does not prevail.

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

Mr. **MARTIN**: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think at this point it has gotten just a little bit ridiculous.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair would advise the gentleman the matter

is no longer debatable, the previous question has been ordered.

Mr. **MARTIN**: Mr. Speaker, may I pose a question?

The **SPEAKER**: The gentleman may pose his question.

Mr. **MARTIN**: Are we not on reconsideration?

The **SPEAKER**: We are on reconsideration.

Mr. **MARTIN**: Has the previous question been made for reconsideration?

The **SPEAKER**: It is in conjunction with the main question.

Mr. **MARTIN**: I apologize.

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

Mr. **BINNETTE**: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a parliamentary question.

The **SPEAKER**: The gentleman may pose his question.

Mr. **BINNETTE**: Would I be in order at this time to make a motion to recess for at least an hour?

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair would advise the gentleman that he would not be in order, and the Chair so rules.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Cox.

Mr. **COX**: Mr. Speaker, since we are on the reconsideration motion, I would like to pose a question which has been posed two or three times, not to the Chair but to the gentleman from Cumberland.

The **SPEAKER**: The gentleman may pose the question, he may not debate the bill nor the results of same.

Mr. **COX**: My question is, Mr. Speaker, we have sat here for two hours this morning. I wonder if the gentleman from Cumberland is afraid for us to go back and ask our constituents —

The **SPEAKER**: The gentleman is debating, and the Chair will not allow, and the gentleman is out of order.

The pending question is reconsideration. If you are in favor of reconsideration you will vote yes; if you are opposed you will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

54 having voted in affirmative and 79 having voted in the nega-

tive, the motion to reconsider did not prevail.

#### Reports of Committees Referred to 105th Legislature

Report of the Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act to Create a Commission to Prepare a Consumer Credit Code" (S. P. 560) (L. D. 1635) reporting that it be referred to the 105th Legislature.

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the Bill referred to the 105th Legislature.

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence and the Bill referred to the 105th Legislature in concurrence.

#### Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on State Government on Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Affecting the Apportionment of the House of Representatives (S. P. 598) (L. D. 1769) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WYMAN of Washington  
LETOURNEAU of York  
BELIVEAU of Oxford  
— of the Senate.

Messrs. DENNETT of Kittery  
RIDEOUT of Manchester  
Mrs. GOODWIN of Bath  
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. DONAGHY of Lubec  
D'ALFONSO of Portland  
MARSTALLER of Freeport

STARBIRD  
of Kingman Township  
— of the House.

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

In the House: Reports were read.

(On motion of Mr. Rideout of Manchester, tabled pending the

acceptance of either Report and specially assigned for Monday, January 26.)

#### Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve Authorizing Baxter State Park Authority to Purchase Land in Penobscot County (H. P. 1431) (L. D. 1803) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on January 21.

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

In the House: On motion of Mr. Birt of East Millinocket, the House voted to recede and concur.

#### Orders

Mr. Birt of East Millinocket presented the following Joint Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Joint Standing Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs report out to the House a Bill allocating the proceeds of the sale of bonds for planning, construction and equipment of pollution abatement facilities. (H. P. 1438)

The Joint Order received passage and was sent up for concurrence.

#### House Reports of Committees Ought to Pass in New Draft New Draft Printed Passed to Be Engrossed

Mr. Rideout from the Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act relating to the Salary of the Executive Director of the State Board of Nursing" (H. P. 1355) (L. D. 1684) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1436) (L. D. 1809) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

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

#### Passed to Be Engrossed Amended Bill

Bill "An Act relating to Rules and Regulations for the Protection of Health and Safety" (H. P. 1311) (L. D. 1625)

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.

**Third Reader  
Tabled and Assigned**

Bill "An Act relating to Rate of Interest on Real Property Taxes" (H. P. 1335) (L. D. 1664)

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

(On motion of Mr. Dyar of Strong, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Monday, January 26.)

**Amended Bill  
Tabled and Assigned**

Bill "An Act Creating a Commission to Study Means of Increasing the Effectiveness and Capability of the Maine Legislature" (S. P. 604) (L. D. 1784)

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

(On motion of Mr. Hichens of Eliot, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Monday, January 26.)

**Enactor  
Recommended**

An Act Appropriating Funds to the Department of the Attorney General (H. P. 1364) (L. D. 1713)

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 and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The question before the House is the enactment as an emergency measure of L. D. 1713. You will recall that because of alleged discrimination in the rental of housing it was requested that an investigation using the forces of the State of Maine be used in order to determine whether or not there were discriminatory pricing practices in the renting of housing in the Bangor area. And I plainly and simply would urge my friends in the Democratic party not to get carried with the frenzy of this morning, and recognize the fact that if you vote against the enact-

ment of this bill you are denying to people who feel that they have a legitimate complaint about rental procedures in the Bangor area, you are denying them an opportunity to have their complaint investigated to find out whether there are or are not such discriminatory practices which every one of us, at least on the face of it, is committed to oppose. And I therefore urge every member of this House to vote for the enactment of this bill.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker may I pose a question through the Chair to any member of the delegation from Bangor as to what the implications are in the housing field for the Attorney General to receive \$17,000 or \$15,000 to proceed with this investigation?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque, poses a question through the Chair to any member who may answer if they choose, particularly the Bangor or Penobscot delegation.

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

Mr. SOULAS: I will make an effort to answer this question. It appears that many, many citizens in the City of Bangor have become extremely upset about the general housing conditions in regards to health and safety. And for this major reason I feel that the Attorney General should have the prerogative to come because of the urgent need that we have in the city. Thank you.

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

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This investigation by the Attorney General's Office was proposed by a radio station, a radio announcer in Bangor. This gentleman is no longer in the broadcasting business, for the simple reason that he is nothing but a rabble-rouser. I can assure you, and I have been in every city in the State of Maine, I can assure you that there is nothing majorly wrong with the housing in Bangor. If you want an investigation — and

by the way I don't own any tenements in Bangor — if you want an investigation, do it statewide. Just because a young man had a cause celebre, and he happens to be a radio announcer, and wants to make his own hay, so to speak, don't put the state to this kind of an expense. It is needless, useless, and will serve no purpose.

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

Mr. LUND: May I inquire, Mr. Speaker, what the committee report was on this measure?

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from York, Mrs. Brown.

Mrs. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I request this be tabled until the next legislative day.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from York, Mrs. Brown, moves that Item 1 be tabled until the next legislative day pending passage to be enacted.

Mr. Cox of Bangor requested a vote on the tabling motion.

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

Mr. LUND: May I inquire, Mr. Speaker, whether there was an answer to the question which I posed?

The SPEAKER: The Chair did not have an answer for the question posed.

Mrs. Brown of York withdrew her motion to table.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lund, has posed a question through the Chair relative to the Committee Report on this Bill. Can any member answer?

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

Mr. BENSON: In answer to the gentleman's question, it was a unanimous "ought to pass" report.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The report of the committee was unanimous. This is one bill at which I did not attend the hearing. I had other bills that I went to. In any event, the information as brought by the gentleman from Bangor,

Mr. Cox, is startling to me. I felt that by going along with this thing, and it was discussed at the hearing, that it was a serious problem. However, my only reason for going with the measure in the first place, in any event, was to establish the fact that if this situation was corrected by such a program as we are now embarked, it might show itself as an example to the remainder of the state, and stop any further and future investigations.

In view of the fact that the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Cox, has brought some new light to the situation, I don't think it would take up a great deal of time to again discuss this thing. I think it would be a time-saving matter, and on that level, Mr. Speaker I would now make a motion that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs for straightening out.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, moves that this matter be recommitted.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: With regard to the gentleman's motion I meant to say that obviously this House has access to information which the Appropriations Committee did not have at the time they voted unanimously for approval of this bill. It is perfectly all right with me if this House goes ahead and votes in the light of the information they now have.

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

Mr. BINNETTE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Every word that my friend, Mr. Cox, has stated is true. If you will notice on there, there's only 50 people who signed a petition of a city of that size. I dare say that in each and every town or hamlet we have conditions that are not what we call up to standard, and they are deplorable. I will agree with you. But I will say this, the City of Bangor officials are making a supreme effort to correct a lot of these things that have been brought out on the air through this



so-called rabble-rouser. He, this rabble-rouser, has got our state hospital in a turmoil.

And therefore I don't believe that we need to give \$15,000 for an investigation. I certainly think that the City of Bangor is capable of handling their own affairs.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South-west Harbor, Mr. Benson.

Mr. BENSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I was impressed by the testimony from the Department of the Attorney General that not only had he received this petition, but he had also received a number of other requests from people in the Bangor area, as well as around the state, for investigation into these housing procedures.

I think that it was such testimony as this that persuaded the committee to report the bill out as it did. And I think that this probably gives us cause to be concerned about the conditions, to the extent at least that we should investigate them. This was the intention of the committee, certainly. And I regret that we were not in possession of the information that has been brought forth here today, so that we might have considered those in our deliberations also.

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

Mr. HEWES: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to point out that in a bill relating to putting rent in escrow that was heard before the Judiciary Committee, a different bill from this one, there was testimony from people in the Bangor area as to housing conditions that were deplorable in the City of Bangor. And I should think before we take any hasty action on this we should either give more consideration to it, or go along with the unanimous "ought to pass" report of the Appropriations and Financial Affairs Committee.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that this Bill, An Act Appropriating Funds to the De-

partment of the Attorney General, House Paper 1364, L. D. 1713, be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs. The Chair will order a vote. All in favor of recommitment will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken. 110 having voted in the affirmative and 11 in the negative, the motion did prevail.

Sent up for concurrence.

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

An Act Reclassifying Certain Inland and Tidal Waters of York County (H. P. 1380) (L. D. 1729)

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. 107 voted in favor of same and one against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

#### **Bond Issue Tabled and Assigned**

An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Nineteen Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars on Behalf of the State of Maine to Build State Highways (S. P. 626) (L. D. 1801)

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, I request that this matter be on the table for one legislative day.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, moves that item 3, L. D. 1801 be tabled until the next legislative day, pending passage to be enacted.

All in favor of this matter being tabled until the next legislative day pending enactment will say aye; those opposed will say no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion did prevail.

**Enactor  
Tabled and Assigned**

An Act relating to the Taxation of Farm Machinery (H. P. 1360) (L. D. 1689)

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

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

Mr. FORTIER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Having signed the majority "ought not to pass" report on this bill, and not having been able to be on the floor of this House when it was previously debated this week, it seems to me that in all fairness I should explain my position and why I signed "ought not to pass" on this bill.

I would remind the members of the House that this is just one more case of eroding our tax base. I think everyone in this House is sympathetic to the farmer, but we are also sympathetic to all other small businessmen and to all other taxpayers who would eventually have to take this added burden.

This is simply a question of perpetuating and abetting the differences in our assessment procedures throughout the state. I would like to remind you of some of the actual effects of this bill. One town might reasonably be expected to give their farmers a \$5,000 exemption where under the same bill, due to the differences in our assessment procedures, this other town could give better than \$30,000, or a ratio of six to one.

There are other people who are in the same position, and I am wondering if this is not opening the door for further requests of this kind. For example, we take our neighborhood grocer, he may have an investment other than real estate that is very comparable to the farmer. He certainly is up against it too. It seems a question in business today, you either get big or you get out.

We are sympathetic with the small farmer. We are also sympathetic to the small grocer. We are sympathetic to all small businessmen. I think the one thing that this points out is the inequality and

inefficiency of our tax procedures that taxes on acquisition of tangible property and not on ability to pay. I hope that some day someone will have wisdom enough to be able to solve this problem. But meanwhile I do not feel that by throwing a few crumbs to the farmer, knowing and hoping that this will be absorbed by others of our taxpayers and particularly our small businessmen.

So I move, Mr. Speaker, that this bill be indefinitely postponed and I ask for a division.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: May I pose a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Fortier?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may pose his question.

Mr. LEVESQUE: The question that I would like to ask Mr. Fortier, because of his familiarity with the taxing processes or the assessors in the different municipalities, assuming a farmer of considerable size has farms in different municipalities, he has an established residence in one municipality, that the tax picture may not be as favorable as some of the other communities, could this farm machinery, taxable under this law, be moved to another farm that he owns where the tax structure may be more favorable?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque, poses a question through the Chair, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Fortier.

Mr. FORTIER: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend at this time to encroach upon the judiciary of our state. But it is my understanding that the exemptions would be in the town of residence and consequently very liable to such manipulation as the gentleman from Madawaska suggests.

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

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: If I might I would like to inform the gentleman, Mr. Levesque, that

all farm machinery and all personal property is taxed in the town of residence only, regardless of the town it is in. It is taxed in the town of residence. Therefore he would only be allowed \$5,000 exemption.

On motion of Mr. Gilbert of Turner, tabled pending the motion of the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Fortier, to indefinitely postpone and specially assigned for Monday, January 26.

**Passed to Be Enacted**

An Act Appropriating Funds for Construction of Phase II of the Marine Research Laboratory at Boothbay Harbor (H. P. 1388) (L. D. 1737)

An Act Extending the Term of the Maine State Sesquicentennial Commission (H. P. 1391) (L. D. 1740)

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.

Supplement No. 1 was taken up.

**Passed to Be Enacted  
Emergency Measure**

An Act relating to Sentences for Assault on Officers of, or Escape From, the Men's Correctional Center (H. P. 1332) (L. D. 1661)

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. 116 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 relating to Jurisdiction of Probate Courts in Adoption Cases (H. P. 1334) (L. D. 1663)

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. 122 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 relating to Leases of Buildings (H. P. 1366) (L. D. 1715)

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. 117 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 relating to County Jail Detention of Juveniles Pending Redisposition Cases (H. P. 1381) (L. D. 1730)

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. 116 voted in favor of same and 3 against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

**Passed to Be Enacted**

An Act relating to Place of Hearings on Post-Conviction Cases (S. P. 572) (L. D. 1699)

An Act relating to Grants and Interest-free Loans for Preliminary Planning of Pollution Abatement Facilities (S. P. 584) (L. D. 1711)

An Act Transferring Funds for Educational Subsidy (H. P. 1323) (L. D. 1652)

An Act to Repeal the Law Providing a Uniform Fiscal Year for Municipalities (H. P. 1424) (L. D. 1794)

An Act relating to State-owned Motor Vehicles (H. P. 1356) (L. D. 1685)

**Finally Passed**

Resolve Appropriating Funds for Purchase of Equipment at Washington County Vocational-Technical Institute (S. P. 587) (L. D. 1742)

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

**Orders of the Day**

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

HOUSE REPORT — Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to Easements in Lands" (H. P. 1336) (L. D. 1665) reporting that it be referred to the 105th Legislature.

Tabled — January 22, by Mr. Brennan of Portland.

Pending — Acceptance.

On motion of Mr. Brennan of Portland, recommitted to the Committee on Judiciary and sent up for concurrence.

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

MAJORITY REPORT (8)—Committee on Taxation reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act to Repeal the Bank Stock Tax and to Impose a Corporate Income or Franchise Tax on National Banks" (H. P. 1409) (L. D. 1775)—MINORITY REPORT (2) reporting "Ought not to pass".

Tabled — January 22, by Mrs. White of Guilford.

Pending—Motion of Mr. Susi of Pittsfield to Accept Majority Report.

On motion of Mrs. White of Guilford, retabled pending the motion of the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi to accept the Majority Report and specially assigned for Monday, January 26.

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

Bill "An Act relating to Licensing of Ambulance Service, Vehicles and Personnel" (H. P. 1430) (L. D. 1800)

Tabled — January 22, by Mr. Curtis of Bowdoinham.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

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

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

SENATE REPORT — "Ought not to pass" — Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act Ad-

justing Salaries of Certain Unclassified State Personnel" (S. P. 590) (L. D. 1745) (In Senate, Bill substituted for the Report and the Bill passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence).

Tabled — January 22, by Mr. Rideout of Manchester.

Pending — Further consideration.

On motion of Mr. Rideout of Manchester, retabled pending further consideration and specially assigned for Monday, January 26.

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

MAJORITY REPORT (6)—Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to Extend Medical Assistance to the Medically Indigent" (H. P. 1397) (L. D. 1753) — MINORITY REPORT (4) reporting "Ought to pass."

Tabled — January 22, by Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston.

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

On motion of Mrs. Goodwin of Bath, retabled pending the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, to accept the Majority Report and specially assigned for Monday, January 26.

Supplement No. 3 was taken up out of order.

**Papers from the Senate  
Reports of Committees  
Ought to Pass in New Draft  
Passed to Be Engrossed**

Report of the Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act relating to State Retirement Laws" (S. P. 593) (L. D. 1764) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 635) (L. D. 1810) under title of "An Act relating to Retirement Allowance for Widows of Governors" 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 and accepted in concurrence and the New Draft read twice. Under suspension of the rules, the New Draft was 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 Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to Subpoena Power for State Employees Appeals Board" (S. P. 570) (L. D. 1697) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

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

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence and the Bill read twice. Committee Amendment "A" (S-382) was read by the Clerk and adopted in concurrence. Under suspension of the rules, the Bill was read the third time, passed to be engrossed as amended and sent to the Senate.

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

On motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland,

Adjourned until Monday, January 26, at eleven o'clock in the morning.