

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

Ninety-Eighth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

VOLUME II

1957

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

Further amend said Bill by striking out the underlined figure "\$3,250" in the 4th line of "Sec. 74" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure "\$3,400".

Further amend said Bill by striking out the underlined figure "\$2,800" in the 4th line of "Sec. 36" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure "\$2,900".

Further amend said Bill by striking out the underlined figure "\$3,250" in the 4th line of "Sec. 38" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure "\$3,400".

Senate Amendment "C" was adopted and the Bill assigned for third reading at eight o'clock this evening.

On motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, the House voted to take from the table the fourth tabled and unassigned matter, House Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Exempting Children's Clothing of Cloth Material from Sales Tax", House Paper 841, Legislative Document 1195, tabled on May 22 by that gentleman pending acceptance of the report, and the Chair recognizes the same gentleman.

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This was tabled pending our final decision on exempting children's clothing from the sales tax. As you recall, we made our decision this morning and I therefore move we accept the "Ought not to pass" Report.

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

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am certainly in one position at this time that there is no other way than for me to go along with the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, to accept the "Ought not to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, that the House accept the "Ought not to pass" Report. Will those who favor the acceptance of the "Ought not to pass" Report please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the "Ought

not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would request the Sergeant-at-Arms to escort to the rostrum the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, to serve as Speaker pro tem.

Thereupon, Mr. Fuller assumed the Chair as Speaker pro tem amid the applause of the House and Speaker Edgar retired from the Hall.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The House is working under orders of the day. The Chair awaits the motion of any of the members to take any bill off the table.

On motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, the House voted to take from the table the first tabled and unassigned matter, Bill "An Act Increasing Registration Fees for Motor Vehicles and Operators' Licenses", House Paper 1088, Legislative Document 1572, tabled on May 21 by that gentleman pending passage to be enacted.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman.

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I don't know quite frankly what particular arguments are necessary at this time inasmuch as I feel that we have so thoroughly debated the idea of taking a million dollars from the general fund that if we wish to go through with our intention of financing the bond issue, we have left before us this L.D. plus the so-called Highway Use Tax which is item five. I believe the proper misconception has been made that increase in registration fees for motor vehicle and operators' licenses is solely drivers licenses and registration plates. I would point out that this bill is a combination of three or four separate bills that were before the Transportation Committee. We have put three or four bills into one. This bill represents the increase on the drivers' license of one dollar, it represents the increases on the automobile license plates of one dollar, and it represents also something that has not been mentioned too much, but it certainly is the most

important part of the bill in my estimation. It represents a seven per cent increase on the registration fees of trucks. You will probably hear in subsequent debate that we are letting the trucking industry get off comparatively easy in view of the bond issue which will finance new major highways. I would like to point out that the Transportation Committee in bringing this bill out attempted to give an even seven per cent increase across the board to both automobiles and trucks in this bill, and neither segment is favored. I would also like to point out that some members at least of the Transportation Committee, and this particular bill was unanimous "Ought to pass" Report, felt that while there may be some merit in future years in a more responsible taxation bill for trucks, in view of congressional action now pending to make a thorough study of truck taxation, we would be imposing a new major taxation method on an outdated foundation if we should pass the so-called Weight Distance Tax now until that study is completed.

Therefore, the Transportation Committee recommended this bill, and I believe the most intelligent way to proceed is to take a vote on the measure.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway.

Mr. HATHAWAY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: Having been a freshman in this place up until now, I think I am graduated now that we have three days left, it has been my policy to sit in my seat and listen and try to learn, at least up to the capacity of my small brain. We have been listening to figures here and specially on this particular bill. Figures bother me at times anyway, and I cannot quite understand. This—I believe this bill is for the purpose of financing the bond issue which would raise around a million dollars a year. The other day when this particular item was up I understood some gentleman to say that it would only require \$90,000 a year for the next two years to finance. I would like to ask if the gentleman who said that remembers

who he was and I wish he would explain that to us.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway, asks a question through the Chair to any member of the Transportation Committee who may answer if he so chooses.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Perhaps it would be more in order for a member of the Highway Committee to go into the reasons for the financing, but I think I can answer the specific question very briefly. It is true that to finance the bond issue itself and nothing more, it would require \$90,000 a year. However, unlike the general fund budget which was brought out in two parts, a current balanced budget plus a supplemental budget, the Highway budget was brought out in one form and included the expenditure of \$2,000,000 for the next biennium, a million dollars a year, and those two millions of dollars were expected to be raised through this particular bill. Now I recognize myself among the first to agree that that in my opinion is a rather unusual procedure. In other words, we are bringing out a highway allocation bill that presumes that a suggested piece of legislation will pass and we will get our revenue from a new source of taxation. I wonder if I have answered the gentleman's question.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Does the gentleman consider his question answered?

Mr. HATHAWAY: No, not exactly. If it was to cost a million dollars a year which on a \$24,000,000 bond issue I can see where it would around four per cent if you had to pay, but why only \$90,000 the first year. Does that mean that we are only going to issue bonds for about \$2,000,000 the first two years?

Mr. TOTMAN: I would like to go on and answer the question more specifically.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. TOTMAN: It has been shown that the actual retirement and interest payments during the next biennium will only cost approximately \$90,000. Without confusing the House, I will say that is the net

result. How it is arrived at I don't see any particular point in going into detail. I will say that the million dollars that this bill is raising is not going towards the bond issue, it is going towards the highway allocation bill for various types of road construction that the Highway Committee brought out. It is over and above the bond issue, and I repeat, I would normally have looked for a supplemental highway financing budget, but the Committee saw fit, and perhaps some of the Committee would care to comment on why they did it that way, they depended upon this bill, the million dollars raised in this bill, to help finance our regular highway allocation fund.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway.

Mr. HATHAWAY: Mr. Speaker, I don't plan to be difficult at all but when this other bill was in to take a million dollars from the fund, from the surplus fund or the unappropriated fund to pay for this bond issue, it was turned down and then we said we would have to resort to this. In other words, if the first bill had passed, this would not be necessary. Am I right? The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, now states that it is to be used for highway construction and not necessarily to pay off the interest on the highway bond issue.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway, asks a question through the Chair. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman.

Mr. TOTMAN: I would repeat to the gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway, that we have a choice of financing our road construction. It is financing both our road construction and the bond issue in general, our entire program. We had three choices, we could take it out of the general fund, we could pass this bill or we could pass the truck weight distance bill. The House the other day voted not to take the money to finance the highway construction program from the general fund.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Buxton, Mr. Bruce.

Mr. BRUCE: Mr. Speaker, I don't know the gentleman's name over there, I don't know him very well, but I perhaps can clarify it by saying that there are two — I hope to his satisfaction— there are two contemplated bond issues proposed, one for twenty-six million and one for twenty-four million. We passed the twenty-four million one with the idea that two million of the financing program will be financed by current taxation. I hope that answers the gentleman's question.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn.

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have heard it said here that we are using the front door and the back door to obtain results. I think somebody found a secret passage to this one by the cellar door. This type of legislation I am certainly opposed to because to me I have been given all kinds of alternatives how to raise money. We have had incidents here where we did not force upon people taxation which would have brought returns back in here pretty near sufficient enough to meet these needs. Now they come up with something more of taxation to put upon people who may be with a certain amount of income, set income, and we are going home to tell these people once again we are going to put a hardship upon the small rural areas which it certainly will hit because wages have gone up in big cities. Living costs have gone up it is true, but living costs went up in the rural areas but wages have not. Now that is the biggest part of your segment that you have got to consider on the particular type of legislation of this nature, and at this time I know there is a lot will get into it in discussion and I hope they do, but I would move indefinite postponement of this bill and ask for a roll call vote when the vote is so taken.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fort Fairfield, Mr. Hersey.

Mr. HERSEY: Mr. Speaker, this bill came out of the Transportation Committee of which I am a member without opposition, or at least on paper a unanimous report, although there were three of

the Committee who were not in favor of the bill in its present form, I being one of them. We had, as the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, has stated, several bills, one having to do with increasing registration fees on passenger cars, another to increase registration fees on light trucks, another to increase operators' license fees, and another one to increase the cost with the application to take a driving license examination. I was in favor of some of those bills, but not the one to increase registration fees on light trucks and passenger cars nor to increase the fee by one dollar for operators' licenses. I was in favor of the one to increase the registration fees for the heavy trucks, that is the 18,000 pound category and on up to the 50,000 or 60,000 pound limits which will be after this legislature adjourns, but I am not in favor of combining all of those bills in one and coming out with this one bill and reporting it out "Ought to pass". If there was some way that the thing could be broken down and give you a chance to vote on increasing the registration fees for passenger cars and the driving license and another bill to increase registration fees for trucks, I think we would be getting down to a better understanding of the measure instead of it being in its present form. There is another matter tabled, I think item five on the unassigned list, that will do a lot better job for the state, put the cost of these highways where it properly belongs, and I think with the amendment that will be proposed by the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Farmer, will be a good workable bill. But I do not want to go back home myself and tell the constituents in my town that I had any part in increasing the fees for driving licenses or their registration fees for their passenger cars and light trucks.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis.

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: If we are going to build any roads on that ninety-ten, we simply have got to have some money from somewhere, and I opposed this first just because of the increase of the drivers'

license for fear that they might not adopt the bond issue. But now we have taken care of the other, I believe it was the gentleman from Gardiner has presented, we killed that, and I believe that we should go along with this bill, and in answer to the gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway, about this \$90,000, as I understand it, bonds are only floated as they are needed, and it may be four or five years before the full \$20,000,000 will be floated. So this — that is just simply to pay the interest where they only intend to float \$2,000,000 at this time. If this bill passes the money will be in the highway fund to retire these bond issues year by year as provided. For that reason I hope that this receives passage.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante.

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to ask through the Chair of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, a question if I may be permitted to do so. If we do not accept item one under tabled and unassigned matters that is a way of financing our bond issue, is the alternative item number five on page ten of the tabled and unassigned matters?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, has asked a question through the Chair of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question if I heard it correctly, I will repeat it to see if I did get it right, would I accept number five in lieu of number one for the financing? I would say definitely not. I still think there are other avenues open to us.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich.

Mr. RICH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if this discussion has anything to do with the so-called hardship cases state aid, this million dollars. As I understood, that was tied in with the bond issue, if we didn't pass the bond issue that is the first thing that would be cut

out. The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, might be able to answer that.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich, has asked a question through the Chair of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. TOTMAN: I would answer the gentleman's question by saying this, that a million dollars from this particular measure was going to be used in the general highway fund allocation bill. As to what million dollars it would apply against, I did not understand it was specifically earmarked. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. RICH: As I remember it when we had the Highway Commission before the Republican Caucus some weeks ago, they told us that this million dollars for so-called hardship cases and the \$500,000, a half million for town road improvement, would be the first things that would be discarded if they didn't get the necessary money. I was worried about this bill here. If we indefinitely postpone this bill are we going away from here without any money for those things which we people from the rural areas are particularly interested in?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman.

Mr. TOTMAN: In further answer to the gentleman's question, where this legislature would decide to cut out a million dollars out of the highway bill would certainly be up to probably the Committee, the Highway Committee to decide with the direction of the legislature. It has been rumored admittedly that the most obvious place to cut first would be the hardship fund since there is no matching money.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich.

Mr. RICH: Mr. Speaker, I think we should think carefully before we discard every means of taking care of these things, not only taking care of the interest on the bond issue. You all know that I voted against the bond issue which probably was a foolish move of mine, but I certainly think that we must have some

more money, and if we are going to kill the other measures, we want to be careful before we indefinitely postpone this particular one. I personally know that it will create a lot of dissatisfaction, but I don't believe that is going to last very long. People will criticize us for giving them a dollar increase on the license fee or a dollar increase on their registration, but I believe the people who think carefully will realize that those things that we are working for, better roads, are worthwhile, and we have got to have the money. Therefore let's get it somewhere.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Buxton, Mr. Bruce.

Mr. BRUCE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: If you were to go over the highway allocation bill which we have passed here and is now resting on the table in the other house, if we fail to raise another one million dollars, there are just two places that you can apply the guillotine. One is the so-called million dollar hardship money, and the other is the million five town improvement fund, and I hope you will consider that very carefully when you vote on the motion to indefinitely postpone.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gouldsboro, Mr. Tarbox.

Mr. TARBOX: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is another shell game I should call it, for two years ago we had it thrown up at us if we didn't do such a thing we wouldn't have the hardship money and town improvement money. I put in a bill for it which came out of the Committee "Ought not to pass" and has been lost. Now this will be another thing for two more years. If we pass it now in two years hence they will throw out the town unimproved roads and what have you. I for one hope the thing is indefinitely postponed because I don't think this is the way to pay off our bond issue.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis.

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I hope this bill receives passage, but I hope it doesn't receive passage by someone

trying to say it as a threat. As I understand it we have already passed the million dollar hardship fund and the town road improvement fund, and it will last through the biennium. Now probably if we don't pass the bond issue why in other words we won't have the money to take up this ninety-ten, and then again another legislature will be faced with the same thing we are about this. So let's keep this scare thing away from it. As I understand it that has already been passed and I believe that we should go along and pass this bill because I think I am opposed to it as strongly as anyone but in looking over the situation more thoroughly and checking it which I have done very thoroughly and with the folks back home I think they will buy it when they find out what it is all about.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Southport, Mr. Rankin.

Mr. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: In this building and in the state office building are some of the greatest minds in Maine, and yet from no mind has come a single thought as to how we can raise this lonely million dollars without taxing the motorist in the State of Maine, and I can't understand this situation. Opposed as I am to this bill, I feel as though I have been shut up in a box. Now the box was built by whom I do not know, but I do know that the people of this State are absolutely opposed to any increase in motor vehicle registrations or an increase in drivers' licenses. I feel certain that if this measure is defeated some means will be found whereby this last and lonely million can be secured.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Chelsea, Mr. Allen.

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a signer of the "Ought to pass" Report here, and one signer that knew what he was doing and signed without equivocation, I believe that this is the fairest and most just measure of taxation to finance the highway problem. As has been brought out by the gentleman from Bangor,

Mr. Totman, by his statements, and questions asked by the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich, that your highway allocation bill has already been passed. The highway allocation bill does not say where the money is coming from to finance the whole program. There is a shortage of funds. We have discussed that at quite length. We have also passed the bond issue to take care of that, and I voted for the bond issue to take care of the shortage in the highway fund with the idea that we would raise money to take care of debt service of the bond issue. Now this money would go into the general highway fund increasing the amount there enough so that the special state aid program could—the hardship fund could be still kept in effect—your regular state aid highway could be kept in effect, and your mud money or your million and a half for your town road improvement fund could be kept in effect, and also so that your federal aid secondary fifty-fifty matching funds would not have to be sliced nor your matching funds on your ninety-ten on your interstate system. Now if you kill this bill, somewhere along the line I am going to assume that you are going to have to cut out something. It will be up to this House to decide what they want to cut. As many of us come from small towns, requesting cutting our town road improvement fund or our special state aid funds or our regular state aid funds. However, it would be kind of silly to cut out a matching fund too, especially a matching fund where we only have to contribute ten per cent. Now it has been said that there are fair minds, good minds that have worked on this. This is the program that they have come up with. It might not be the best, but I think it is the best one that this House has got before it to consider at this time, so I think you should consider well before you defeat this, and I hope the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Kittery, Mrs. Burnham.

Mrs. BURNHAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I hesitate to interject any observation into this

learned discussion, but there is an observation that occurs to me that I think should be mentioned. Every time we read a newspaper report of the doings of this legislature and so forth, we are confronted with the millions that are going to the surplus, that are going to be left over, and I am sure I don't want to go home and have to explain to the people of my community that we have to raise their license fees, their registration fees seven and a half per cent or whatever amount is needed, with the extra millions in the fund. I am sure I cannot explain it and I am not going to vote for this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Besse.

Mr. BESSE: Mr. Speaker, you may recall that last Friday I think it was, the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, made the statement that money was drying up. The way he said it may have been funny, but what he said was no joke. I think money is drying up. Very recently one of the better stores in Waterville took in thirty-eight cents in cash. Now that doesn't indicate that money is flowing very freely around here. Also I think last Friday the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, offered you a way to finance this thing through the general fund with a million dollars, and to my mind that is saving a million dollars of the taxpayers' money. It was rejected as a matter of principle. Now when principles have a price tag of a million dollars each, I think they are too high for us to indulge in.

Now evidently from the discussion that has taken place, actually about a hundred thousand dollars is needed for the bond issue and the rest of it for other purposes. I don't know why the other money wasn't attached to the regular highway money instead of being brought in through the back door, if you please, this way. Through the increase in the sales tax and this money if this bill is passed, we are going to take approximately ten million dollars out of the taxpayers of Maine which is roughly a thirty per cent increase. Now I think we have a fair cross section of the people of Maine here in this House. Is there anyone here

who expects a thirty per cent increase in their income next year? I am sure they don't. And if we are increasing the taxes thirty per cent it means it must come out of peoples earnings or their savings. If it comes out of their earnings it means that they have ten million dollars less money to spend for goods and services. That means that there will be less business done, probably less business on which the sales tax will be collected, because there are many of those things, food and services and such, that are not taxed, so it is a possibility that there will not be a definite increase in the sales tax in proportion to the two per cent that we now have. I have been told since I came here, this is my first time, but I have been told that the previous legislature was criticized for passing patchwork taxation. If this doesn't qualify under that heading I would like to know what does. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins.

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Although you have passed the sales tax over my dead body, nevertheless with all the pickings that has gone out of it, there will be about \$3,000,000 left, and there is something like \$5,000,000 that the taxpayers are going to pay with that three per cent tax on automobile accessories and so forth, and there is no reason, no justifiable reason to shove this one to them.

This bill the way it stands today, you have got an increase of three dollars. You also passed a bill that is going to ask for that license on the birthday date. Now you think of one who is in the last quarter, he is going to pay six dollars when he gets his license to bring it around to his birthday. And you know many of you, there are many in this House that know that when a man has to pay two dollars some of them for their license to get it the first of the year they have to borrow it from somebody, and it is not going to set very well on their stomachs. I might say in answer to my friend from Fort Fairfield, Mr. Hersey, there still is alive L. D. 1039, An Act Increasing the Fee for Operators' License, and L. D. 1228, An Act Re-

lating to Registration Fees on Passenger Vehicles. They are still existing in that unspeakable body on my calendar here. And the gentleman mentioned that we might take them separately. There it is right there.

I believe the other day on the general appropriations bill I had an amendment here for a hundred thousand dollars. It was my understanding from the figures from the Highway Commission — not the Highway Committee, but the Highway Commission, that it would be a \$90,000 bill, well I put it in an even hundred thousand dollars, and I came into the House while that debate was going on on the million dollar bill and I understood at that time that the floor leader, our able floor leader, Mr. Totman, the gentleman from Bangor, said it had gone up to a million. Well now, today, I think if I heard right, the same gentleman said it was \$90,000, the figure I heard the other day. I did not present my amendment, but I believe we can take this segregated if we have to from those items that are still alive, and I hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone prevails.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway.

Mr. HATHAWAY: Mr. Speaker, my purpose in asking the questions was not that I was in opposition to this bill. My thought was that if it required only \$90,000 or \$100,000 to finance the bond issue and the bond issue itself was for the purpose of financing the roads, and the sales tax our other expenditures, why it might be possible that this particular item could be — bill could be turned over to the next legislature, and voted on then when we do have more expense to the bond issue. If the whole twenty-four million dollar bonds are out I don't believe interest would come to more than a million dollars then. Now if this money is needed for other purposes I certainly would go along with it, but if for only \$90,000 I would suggest that the next legislature could pass a bill like this, and where we are passing a sales tax it might look a little better to not pass this.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Elwell.

Mr. ELWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a member of the Highway Committee I would like to make a couple of observations. First I would like to state that we do need the million dollars in order to balance the allocation bill and in turn provide the funds that are necessary for the state's share of the services which we are expected to maintain, including the town road improvement fund and the special state aid or the hardship money as it has been referred to. Second I would like to say that I feel a responsibility to support some sort of a financing program that will carry our highway program over the years. We have debated the general fund approach twice and defeated it twice just as I think that we should have. I think this is the most equitable of all the proposals which are before us. While I don't like to vote for taxes any more than the next person, I would be in favor of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Harris.

Mr. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question through the Chair to anyone who may be able to answer it. Have I picked up the idea somewhere that if this bill is passed and the money that would be raised from it, that the state police force would be increased by twenty-five this year and twenty-five the following year? Is that something I just heard somewhere else?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Harris, has addressed a question through the Chair to any member who care to answer. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman.

Mr. TOTMAN: I would answer the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Harris, that I feel out of place somewhat as the Chairman of Transportation in answering questions for the Chairman of the Highway, but since the question has been raised towards me I would say that the highway

allocation bill does provide for additional police.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fort Fairfield, Mr. Hersey.

Mr. HERSEY: Mr. Speaker, in reply to a statement made by the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, he called attention to two items that are on the table in the Senate, both tabled, the House Report leave to withdraw on one an act increasing the fee of operators licenses and the other an act relating to registration fees for passenger cars. So far as I am concerned, they can grant leave to withdraw on those. There is also an item eleven on the Senate calendar another item, Bill, An Act Relating to Registration Fees on Certain Commercial Vehicles tabled pending enactment. If they will enact that piece of legislation in there I would gladly follow suit when it gets back here in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Farmer.

Mr. FARMER: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn. We have just sent to the other body a sales tax item increasing revenues some eight million dollars, and I would ask you to consider just where that eight million dollars is coming from. It is my contention that it will come primarily from the poor man in this state, and we are now presented with another piece of legislation that is going to hit that same man the same way again with the hardest proportion of the burden here. Presently our highway costs are divided with some seventy-five or eighty per cent falling on the small passenger car operator and some twenty-five per cent on the trucks. I am opposed to this measure because it will maintain the same ratio, and if anything it will increase the burden on the small car operators. About half of the revenue this measure will provide will come from the increase in the drivers' licenses, and it will certainly be much less than twenty per cent of that half that will come from the truckers.

It has been at least insinuated here today that if this were not passed, the first thing that would happen would be our town road and

special hardship money, it would be sacrificed. Well it is my contention that if this were not passed and if there were no revenue produced instead of this, which I do not recommend, but if that would be so, it would still be possible for the Highway Commission to meet their full program by simply deducting \$500,000 a year from their unappropriated surplus.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner.

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker, this is no doubt the first step our leaders feel in building our interstate \$50,000,000 state highway system. I don't think it is fair or reasonable to expect the little guy to carry the burden of paying for this super highway. In the last few years he has had a two per cent sales tax added to his troubles, also several increases in the gas tax, increased insurance costs. Take the excise tax and increased federal taxes and all told the little guy, the little family car man is sure doing his part for what little he uses the highway. I am against this bill and have been ever since the first of the year. At that time I was told by our double-barrel leadership what our financing program would be at that time for the new highway. We have just passed a bill giving the trucking industries of this state and the nation the right to increase the length of their vehicles five feet and their gross weight from 50,000 to 60,000 pounds. This gift is worth millions of dollars to the industry, and what did we get for that? Nothing. Nothing. The same industries now say they are in favor, and we must have this interstate highway. What are they offering to pay? Nothing. Nothing. This bill will not collect one cent from the out of state truckers. Do you think it is fair and just to let these out of state freight trains on rubber, 15,000 strong, use our highways for about five dollars each per year? Our highways, their place of business.

Maine has a large investment in its roads. That investment must be protected by this body. There is no question that in fairness to all we must get our fair share of money that is being made on our highways today from the people who

use them as a place of business. We have heard about sending it back to the people. Why not be honest with the people? Let them vote on the bond issue; also on the method of payment, either this bill or the good honest weight distance bill. We will then see if the people want to bond the state and the people's choice of payment. What could be fairer? Oh, no! The leaders can ram it down the throats of this body, but they know with the voters they would be taking on too much territory. I have here over fifteen thousand signers on petitions. These petitions are sponsored by the Small Car and Small Truck Owners Association, John Gould, Lisbon Falls, President. In the heading of the petition it reads: "We the undersigned, believing that the average Maine motorist is already bearing more than his share of highway construction and maintenance costs, and that the large heavy commercial truck, a majority of which are owned and registered out of state, are not bearing their proportionate share of such highway construction and maintenance costs, do oppose passage of bill before the legislature which would increase the drivers license fees, and motor vehicle registrations." Now these petitions are from all over the state. Even some members in this House have circulated them and a lot of the members have signed them. These petitions are from the little people back home. The ones we knew when we were seeking election to this body. Do not let them down. Let's show that we have not forgotten them and kill this unfair measure. It isn't fair, honest or just to make this low income group pay for the place of business of the trucking industries of this state and all the other states. The success of the passage of the bond issue could be in the method of payment.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Carthage, Mr. Hutchinson.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I want to go on record as definitely opposed to this bill believing that we do not need it, and that the repercussions if we pass it will really hurt every member of

this House that supports it. I concur with the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, to indefinitely postpone it. I concur with the gentleman from Fort Fairfield, Mr. Hersey, and the gentlewoman from Kittery, Mrs. Burnham, and others that I for one don't want to go back home and tell the people that I supported this issue after having voted the three per cent sales tax and the \$24,000,000 bond issue. I believe the people in every legislative territory have a right to know how their representative voted on this matter, and I request that when the vote is taken it be taken by a roll call.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Yarmouth, Mr. Knapp.

Mrs. KNAPP: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I understand that some of this money that is to be raised is to hire more state police. I would say that if the state police that we have, got out on the road and worked all of them then we wouldn't need any more. Now I understand that the police over at the barracks over at Scarborough are just laughing at us. They say "Oh we'll get some more". Now I would think it is time something could be done. I travel from Yarmouth to Portland on an average of three times a week and there is only one state cop there that I see all the time, and I know there are two or three that should be going back and forth. Instead of that they are parked on the side of the road or two or three sitting in a car together, and I think that if the cops we have went to work we wouldn't need to raise any money for any more.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have not been in favor of increasing the drivers' licenses ever since I first heard of it, but if, as the gentleman from Southport, Mr. Rankin said, if we are boxed in, we boxed ourselves in last Friday, because when the supplemental budget was being discussed, the amendment was prepared as has been mentioned before this afternoon. For the benefit, and strictly for the benefit of those who might not under-

stand the situation in the House, I explained that they could either favor that amendment or they then would have to favor either the drivers' licenses or the weight distance tax. Now this afternoon I don't think that it is technically possible to do anything else—I will ask that question afterwards. I think that those who vote against increasing the drivers' license and registration fees are then going to be duty bound to support the weight distance.

Now I have a question, Mr. Speaker, I have a question as to whether or not since it has been more than two days, whether or not we could reconsider our action on the supplemental appropriation without unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER pro tem: In answer to the gentleman's question the Chair will rule that any reconsideration must take place within twenty-four hours by a two-thirds vote.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Southport, Mr. Rankin.

Mr. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker, I feel we have two reasons for voting against this bill. One, there has been a great deal of uncertainty as to how much money is needed, and in legislatures of many years ago when a problem was not understood it was considered good form to vote against that bill.

Secondly, here we have the chance to do something for the little fellow we have been talking about during the entire session by voting to indefinitely postpone this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wade.

Mr. WADE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have been told by some members of the Committee that this money is needed. Secondly, I believe that despite the vigorous efforts of John Gould and others who circulated the petition, that we are exaggerating the public objection to these increases in these fees for licenses and registrations. I base this upon the—I think it is an obvious fact that these same people whom we are talking about will buy a new set of tires and the sales tax on that purchase under the new bill will amount to probably three dollars or more, and they will pay that without batting an eye. I really feel that we are—

furthermore, I would like to point out that this million dollars from these fees isn't going to run our highway program next year, it is a relatively small contribution, but it is the last contribution to balance the highway allocation fund. I am going to vote against the indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brownville, Mr. Ross.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Member of this Legislature: I have to take exception with my good friend Bob Wade. When I went home after the last session and we passed the so-called package deal there was criticism from almost everybody. If I go back to Brownville Junction this time and we pass an increase in the drivers' license and an increase in the car license, there is no sense in me running again down there or anybody else because they are absolutely one hundred per cent against it in my section. We have a lot of people, it is a railroad town, and we have a lot of people there, they all own cars and they all work for the Canadian Pacific Railroad, and there is a tremendous amount of them now that are pensioners. Their pensions haven't increased but prices are going up and the cost of living is going up and if we increase the licenses, as I said before, they are dead against it, and I have to be against this bill and I ask that you don't crucify us on the cross of political expediency.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Walker.

Mr. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, I hate to disagree with my distinguished colleague from Auburn, Mr. Wade, but if I understand this situation, we are asked to increase the license and registration fees in order to provide some additional revenue for the Highway Department. Now in looking back I seem to recall that we increased the sales tax three per cent, even though two and one-half per cent was represented to us as an amount necessary to do the job. We were told that one-half of one per cent would be cumbersome to collect. It has been further suggested that our system of govern-

ment was such so that we could not touch the general fund. As a freshman legislator, I probably haven't been taught all the facts of life yet, but it would seem to me we are merely putting our collective heads in the sand like a bunch of ostriches, and I will go along with the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, to indefinitely postpone this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn.

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, before I make a few comments, I first would like to ask a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, if he can give to us a breakdown of what we will receive under this plan for drivers' license, truck registrations and license increase fees if that is available?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, who may answer if he so chooses.

Mr. TOTMAN: I would answer the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, on this obviously very unpopular bill, that the license fees are fairly simple to compute inasmuch as we have roughly four hundred odd thousand drivers in the state which includes incidentally truck drivers as well as automobile drivers, a dollar increase that is roughly four hundred thousand. On the increase in license plates, I am giving round figures, it is roughly two hundred and seventy thousand, and the increase on trucks which is around seven per cent increase on their present registration fees is the balance to make up the million.

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information. It certainly would fit the needs as he so claims, but I wonder if we realize that here just a week ago that we had an opportunity on the state police angle to pay for twenty of those state police that we now have in our budget which we have no income for or which we are seeking to get income for. However I am sorry to say we did pass it in the supplemental budget for those gentlemen. I do not deny the need or the right that we

should have them, but let's refer for one moment to the Maine Turnpike Authority where you had \$164,000 could be obtained by the state because they now pay it, which I still believe should have come out of the revenues derived from that highway, that would have paid for twenty police in our supplemental budget, we would be asking for the forty but we would only have to raise money to pay twenty, because the other money derived would have paid for the other twenty. Now we turn around and ask the same question once again, can we continue to tax the small individual man or family for any additional burden? I say it is political suicide for any of you who may attempt to do so in my estimation.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley.

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker, it seems that the question before the House today is to raise a million dollars to take care of the highway allocation bill. I wonder if some gentleman on the Highway Committee would tell us whether there is an additional twenty-five state police in the highway allocation bill and how much it costs for those police? In our budget, the general fund budget, we did not include the twenty-five police, so if there is twenty-five in the highway allocation bill, we will have to up the amount of money in our budget, in the general fund budget, to take care of half of those.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, has directed a question through the Chair to any member of the Highway Committee who may answer if he chooses. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner.

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker, in the new draft 1503 there is put up money enough for twenty-five additional new police. Where it says \$853,000 I think in the general budget there is only around \$600,000, is that right?

Mr. STANLEY: I didn't get the amount of money in the highway allocation bill for the extra twenty-five police.

Mr. TURNER: They are all added in together which makes it \$853,-