

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 Sixth
Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

Volume III

June 6, 1973 to July 3, 1973

Index

KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

to you some of the criticism directed against the MIBA. Also, the bill coming to us refers it to the Maine Recreational Authority, and I would like to remind you of the difficulties the MRA has had. This would be a local effort, directed by local people for local projects, and it would use the state municipal bond bank as a vehicle for securing the needed financing without any obligation to the community, without any obligation to the state.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Livermore Falls, Mr. Lynch, that the House reconsider its action whereby it accepted the "Ought not to pass" Report. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken. 39 having voted in the affirmative and 57 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

House Reports of Committees Ought to Pass Printed Bill

Mr. Curtis from the Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act Relating to the Terms of the Commissioners of the Departments of Health and Welfare and Mental Health and Corrections and the Constitution of those Departments" (H. P. 1621) (L. D. 2039) reporting "Ought to pass" pursuant to Joint Order (H. P. 1602).

Report was read and accepted, the Bill read once and assigned for second reading tomorrow.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Exempting "Trade-in" Property from the Stock in Trade Tax" (H. P. 679) (L. D. 886) reporting "Ought to pass."

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WYMAN of Washington
COX of Penobscot
— of the Senate.
Messrs. MAXWELL of Jay
MERRILL
— of Bowdoinham
MORTON of Farmington
IMMONEN of West Paris
SUSI of Pittsfield

DAM of Skowhegan

— of the House.
Minority report of the same Committee reporting "Ought not to pass."

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. FORTIER of Oxford
— of the Senate
Messrs. COTTRELL of Portland
FINEMORE
— of Bridgewater
DOW of West Gardiner
DRIGOTAS of Auburn
— of the House.

Reports were read.

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

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker, I would move acceptance of the Majority "Ought to pass" Report and would speak briefly to my motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore, moves the acceptance of the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hesitate this morning in accepting some of these reports, as I was on the minority report, "ought not to pass." But the next three bills, one, two and three divided reports are all taxation bills, and they all require hitting the income tax or hitting some other tax, and I hope you take a good look at them. We know they are good. This number one and two are wonderful bills. They do a lot of good, but I wish you would all look at how they are going to be financed before they are touched. I would appreciate you looking at them before we vote on them.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Finemore of Bridgewater, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted, the Bill read once and assigned for second reading tomorrow.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Reforming the Administration of the Property Tax and Replacing the Tax on Inventories with an Increased Corporate Income Tax" (H. P. 1384) (L. D. 1862) reporting

“Ought to pass” as amended by Committee Amendment “A” (H-575).

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WYMAN of Washington
COX of Penobscot
— of the Senate.
Messrs. MORTON of Farmington
FINEMORE
— of Bridgewater
COTTRELL of Portland
DOW of West Gardiner
MERRILL of Bowdoinham
MAXWELL of Jay
DRIGOTAS of Auburn
SUSI of Pittsfield

— of the House.
Minority Report of the same
Committee reporting “Ought not
to pass.”

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. FORTIER of Oxford
— of the Senate.
Messrs. DAM of Skowhegan
IMMONEN of West Paris
— of the House.

Reports were read.

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

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker, I move we accept the Majority “Ought to pass” Report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore, moves the House accept the Majority “Ought to pass” Report.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, could I ask any member of the Taxation Committee, how much of an increase on the corporate income tax would this mean?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, poses a question through the Chair to anyone who may answer if he or she wishes.

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

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I will explain this tax on this bill if I may at this time and answer your question at the same time.

This bill right here adds one more percent to the corporate income tax over and above \$25,000. But in another bill that we have

in here that is on the table in the Senate, there is a 5 percent sales and use tax off the equipment used in manufacturing. So in other words, that will make a 3 percent corporation increase over and above \$25,000. It doesn't touch the first \$25,000.

Also to finance this bill, it takes \$4 million from the General Fund and it will also take a tax to put one percent on the transfer tax on real estate, which will produce \$4 million, and this tax I just mentioned, in answer to Mr. Jalbert's question, is \$2 million. Then we have also got to add to finance this a \$4 million on the present personal income tax, which would be put on by beginning at one percent on each step above \$15,000 for individuals filing single income tax and for filing jointly, a husband and wife, it is one percent on the steps above \$30,000. That is what it takes to finance this. In other words, the total cost of this bill to the state at this time would be \$14,970,000, and this would bring in \$15 million, the money I have stated.

Also, this hurts the communities. This is going to be sent to the communities and it will be phased out over a period of ten years. It is anticipated either five or ten, and I think it will be ten. It would drop 10 percent a year, and this would be returned directly, this money received from this tax, it would be returned directly to the towns — 10 percent the first year, 20 percent the second and so on until it pays up. And then from there on, the money will go into the revenue sharing to be returned to all towns equally. And the money left over from the first year tax would also go into the revenue sharing. But it is going to be a burden to towns, some towns and cities this stands to hurt over a period of ten years and in the years following.

I hope this answers the questions. If there are any further questions, I will try and answer them.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I just thought I would ask a ques-

tion so it would be a little thought for the tax reform experts to kick around this afternoon.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Morton.

Mr. MORTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: May I make just one correction in connection with Mr. Finemore's resume. It was excellent except the one percent increase in this bill on the corporate tax goes from a dollar one all the way up; it isn't over \$25,000.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson.

Mr. SIMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am not opposed to the bill. I just want to make sure I call to your attention one thing too. In a minute you are going to have the committee amendment that is going to come on here, and we are talking about putting the transfer tax on property and real estate up to one percent. Let me give you just a quick example of what that is going to do to sales of houses in this state. We have been talking lately about the problem of sales and subsidized housing and everything else. A house at \$20,000 right now would have a transfer tax on it of \$22 at the time of the sale. By putting the amendment on which you have right now, the tax on that property now when it is sold would be \$200, which is a substantial increase from \$22 to \$200 on a \$20,000 sale, and I would submit to you that a \$20,000 sale is where we are talking about the low income housing or the type of housing that would be subsidized and we are going to put quite a burden on this type of a sale.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Dyar.

Mr. DYAR: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to concur with the last speaker and also point out that the second section of this bill, as I understand it, under Section 22, while the county's registrar of deeds at the present time gets 10 percent of the stamps sold, this is going to be reduced to one percent. In es-

sence, the State of Maine is going to take 9 percent of the proceeds from the counties that the counties up until now have been receiving.

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker, I move this lie on the table one day, pending acceptance of the report.

Thereupon, Mr. Birt of East Milinocket requested a vote on the tabling motion.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Kelleher, that this matter be tabled pending acceptance of the Majority "Ought to pass" Report and tomorrow assigned. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

38 having voted in the affirmative and 63 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

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

Mr. BITHER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am a little slow this morning, and I am not sure whether I heard Mr. Finemore and Mr. Morton right or not. Does this bill increase the personal income tax by one percent. If it does, I was under the impression that talking with everybody, leadership and everyone else around here that we weren't going to pass any new taxes and certainly we were not going to touch the income tax this session. I would like to know from Mr. Finemore or someone else if this is true, did I hear right?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Bither, poses a question through the Chair to anyone who may answer if he or she wishes.

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

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker, would you have him repeat his question, please?

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Morton.

Mr. MORTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The question has to be answered in affirmative, but it is one percent—it has just a one percent, Mr. Bither, because it has to do with a graduated scale and it starts with incomes of single people over \$15,000 and of married couples or joint returns over \$30,000.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask another question. Does this bill hit the individual who sells his house, and does it hit him generally, personally, anyway?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, poses a question through the Chair to anyone who may care to answer.

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

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It does hit the one who sells it, but who is going to pay is the \$64 question, the one who sells it or the man who buys it? That is going to be the question. In some cases the man who sells it puts the stamps on and sometimes it is going to be the other way around.

But the reason we were interested in this tax, if I may continue, is the fact that so many people are coming from out of state and buying and they are paying twenty-five, thirty and forty-thousand dollars more for houses than they used to and for land. We figured we could get the tax probably from the ones from out of state. Of course, if you sell a house for \$10,000, you aren't going to be hit too hard. If you sell a house for \$100,000, you are going to be hit hard.

I hope that answers your question. Yes, it does. In answer to his question, yes, it goes onto that house.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This being Monday morning, and I have been in very close contact with the people, the ones I represent, over the weekend, I hope the rest of you have. If you have, there is no doubt what will become of this bill this morning. If there is any one thing they don't want, as I have told you on many occasions, is more services, more state buildings and more taxes, and this is a step in the very opposite direction from what they want.

So those of you who are not in touch with the people or wasn't home over the weekend, you probably will vote for the measure. I want you to know that I am a hundred percent opposed to it, every one in the House, and I want to be on record, so I would like to have a roll call. I would like to put these people on record who are not in touch with the people who sent them here, so I hope we will have a roll call on this this morning. I hope it does not receive passage.

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

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think an amendment is being prepared to exempt all real estate under \$30,000. Number two, the main purpose of this bill is to eliminate the inventory tax which is generally agreed to be a most inequitable tax. New Hampshire doesn't have an inventory tax, Massachusetts doesn't, those two neighbors of ours, and the purpose of this bill is to keep industry and warehouses in the State of Maine. I hope you do not indefinitely postpone it, because there is more information about the personal income tax. It is directed at people who are not incorporated. It is directed at businesses, partnerships and things like that.

I hope that you let it go through this morning and we will have a chance to discuss it later.

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

Mr. McNALLY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Two minutes before I got a chance to lock the door of the house in Ellsworth, my phone was ringing from a real estate dealer in Blue Hill. And I can assure you that there is a lot of interest in it.

I went over to the document room since I have been here and tried to pick up the bill, particularly 1862, and they have none. There is none in stock; there are none ready to be had. And from what I got from this gentleman and also from another one last night down Sullivan way, if I do much voting for it, I might be thinking about that political suicide that they tell you about.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Dyar.

Mr. DYAR: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Relative to Section 21, under 4651, rate of tax on instruments, I believe this is the exact route that the State of Vermont took two or three years ago to bring a standstill to advances and development in Vermont. Now, this worked real well keeping the out-of-staters out of Vermont, but it also hit the people right back at home. The young person who wanted to buy his first home, he was taxed as well as the out-of-stater.

Now, if we want to get at out-of-state people buying land here in the State of Maine, I don't think this is the way to do it. If we want to impose a tax, let's look at our forest productivity tax where we are giving things away rather than getting to the people who reside here on a year-round basis.

Now in the section on your tax stamps, if your county has been collecting \$20,000 a year at the 10 percent rate, and this has been going in to reduce your municipal taxes through county government, under this amendment the General Fund of the State of Maine will be getting \$18,000 of this \$20,000. Now if this is the way you want to go, if you want to thumb the money back up into state government to keep this bureaucracy going, I think you should go along with this amendment. Certainly, I don't think this amendment, the sections

I have referred to here this morning, are going to be beneficial to the people living in the State of Maine. I think this amendment is sort of a sneaky. The inventory tax can be argued. New Hampshire certainly took their inventory tax off. It has done wonderful things for the inventory in warehouse and inventory in factories in New Hampshire.

But let me tell you here this morning that in some of the municipalities in New Hampshire, due to this, the property tax at the local level tripped and quadrupled. One case in point I am directly involved with, the tax on real estate on this particular town where Brown Company has a large mill was \$358 a year before this became a law. The year after it became a law in New Hampshire, that real estate tax, elimination of the inventory tax, jumped in excess of \$1,400. Now this is what could happen in this state here where we have got large manufacturers in a small community. We are taking away the tax on his inventory and putting it right back on the property tax of the person who can least afford to pay it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Berwick, Mr. Goodwin.

Mr. GOODWIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to address myself to that last point. In New Hampshire, one reason why this may have occurred with the property tax increase is because they hold—that is almost the only tax they have in New Hampshire except for things on liquor and some sales taxes.

If you take a look at New Hampshire along the border towns, you will see that all the way up along the border all the industry is located in those towns. Whereas if you take the towns along the Maine border, Kittery, Eliot, South Berwick, Berwick and as you go up you won't find any industry at all. You will also find if you take a look at the problem that Simplex has had in North Berwick, they were hit very hard with this inventory tax.

I think that this is the one thing that we can do to help solve a lot

of the problems of industry locating in Maine is to pass this bill. We do have a majority of our other state income through the income and sales tax. I don't think it will mean a large rise in the property tax of the local towns if we pass this.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House: So there won't be any mistake in the purpose of this bill, there have been some misleading statements as far as I am concerned here this morning about the purpose of this bill. Well, I am not gullible and the people I represent are not gullible enough to know what the purpose is. The purpose is to raise extra money, don't forget it. And let me tell you, the population of this state has remained pretty constant around a million, and this whole million don't pay a tax. You deduct the welfare cases and deduct the children, deduct the aged people that are living here and you have got a pretty small amount of people that is paying the tax. Now they know and I know and some of you must know whether you take it out of their side pocket or their hip pocket or where you get it, it is the same person that is going to pay. And they know it, whether you know it or not. So, don't get misled by the purpose, the purpose is for one thing, to raise more money.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Morton.

Mr. MORTON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have to disagree with the gentleman from Enfield. This tax is a tax reform measure. It is changing around where you collect it from and what you pay for it. This tax was thrust at exempting the stock in trade in retail establishments, stock in industrial establishments, wood, lumber, and logs, livestock, and a very minor other category. It will not come out of the towns, because it will be reimbursed to the towns directly by the state and paid for with other forms of taxation. It is a dollar for dollar swap, with the ex-

ception that it does phase in the revenue sharing formula over a five-year period.

It is a tax reform measure. There is nothing sneaky about it. I think the people want it. We know the business community wants it. It is going to be a great help to the business community in the State of Maine; it will create jobs. I hope you will keep this alive. We will pass it along with the other tax reform measures and consider it with them. This is no time to do away with this particular piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Jay, Mr. Maxwell.

Mr. MAXWELL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As a signer of the "ought to pass" report, also as a person who had two bills in that were covering similar items removing the inventory tax, personal property tax on inventories in stores and removing the personal property tax on cattle, all types of live stock, including poultry, both of my bills were withdrawn as covered by other legislation, and this is the other legislation. I feel that it is a very just removal of a tax.

For example, in my own town, one of the towns I represent, there is about a million dollar inventory in a factory there. These people are very seriously considering building in New Hampshire a warehouse.

At the committee hearing, the president of Shaw's Incorporated, who has nine stores in the State of Maine, six in New Hampshire, he says that if this bill passes they will build a warehouse in Maine. If it does not pass, they will have to build their warehouse in New Hampshire.

I could go on this morning and talk about this thing for at least an hour, but I am going to let somebody else have a chance to talk too.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I introduced this bill as a result of a study that was done to try

to resolve some of the problems that we presently face in this state. I am sure that the amendment that was put on by the committee is what raises the objections the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson, has.

Basically, the attempt is not to raise new taxes. It is an attempt to transfer where and how the taxes are paid. If you have a small business today in your community, you are paying property tax for the inventory that you are maintaining in that particular business, whether it is a store or whether it is a large paper mill it doesn't matter what it happens to be.

I can relate to you one instance in the case of one of the towns that I represent where a very large supply of pulpwood is kept on hand from year to year, and there is no tax on that at the present time because the law says that the tax shall be paid where it is finally disposed of, which means basically, in this case, either East Millinocket or Millinocket. Since neither Millinocket or East Millinocket need the money, they don't bother with it very much and there is very little attempt made to find out what the amount of pulpwood is on hand.

The community went to court and they lost the court case, because the law states very clear the inventory is to be taxed in the municipality where found only when it is going to be disposed from that point, but as far as pulpwood is concerned, it is to be counted in the municipality where it is finally going to be used by the paper mill.

Now here is an instance where a very large inventory is on hand and it isn't taxed. You have on the other hand in the very same town a very small store with maybe four or five thousand dollars of inventory. He makes absolutely no profit on it until he sells it and he may never sell it, what he has in that particular store or parts of it he may never sell and he continues to pay inventory tax on that.

Basically the bill is an attempt to shift the burden of taxation from the inventory to another

source. If you believe in the philosophy that it ought to be shifted, then I would suggest that you vote for the bill. If you believe that the inventory ought not to be shifted and the tax ought to be continued to be imposed on those people, then you ought to vote against it.

Now Simplex is a good example. The leadership met some time ago with a couple firms that were interested in coming into that area to use that area as a warehouse. I will tell you, they are not too happy about coming in if something isn't done about the inventory tax, because most of their inventory is going to be going into Massachusetts to be sold. So if the property that they have in Maine is simply taxed here as an inventory, they don't want to come. If they are going to be taxed on what is going to happen to it once it is here, they are very receptive to using that plant, and as I understand it, in the final analysis could be employing in the vicinity of 300 employees.

Now it seems to me that this is the type of thing we have to be concerned about. I have never been one to stand here and support industry and toot their horn, but I do feel strongly that if you want to help the industries that are here and those that are coming and want to come into the state, that the best way we can do it is to remove the inventory tax, and to give them the break that they need.

I would certainly hope that you would vote for the bill.

The SPEAKER: 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 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 Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. O'BRIEN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: May I be

excused from voting? This bill is a definite interest to me.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman feels that he is in conflict of interest here. The gentleman may be excused.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Simpson.

Mr. SIMPSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: A point of parliamentary inquiry. If the gentleman from Portland would be excused because of a conflict of interest here, I believe there are probably a lot of us in business and so forth that would be affected by this same thing that ought to be excused also.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would answer the gentleman that the gentleman from Portland, Mr. O'Brien, very thoughtfully sent me a note a few minutes ago and asked if I felt that the gentleman was in conflict, and I wrote back that I felt that he was not because it applied all over the state to everybody that he was not in conflict. If he still feels he is, which apparently he does, I would abide by his decision.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore, that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report on Bill "An Act Reforming the Administration of the Property Tax and Replacing the Tax on Inventories with an Increased Corporate Income Tax," House Paper 1384, L. D. 1862. All in favor of that motion will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Albert, Ault, Baker, Berry, G. W.; Berube, Birt, Bither, Boudreau, Bragdon, Brawn, Briggs, Bunker, Bustin, Carrier, Chick, Chonko, Clark, Cooney, Cote, Cottrell, Crommett, Curtis, T. S. Jr.; Davis, Donaghy, Drigotas, Dunleavy, Dyar, Emery, D. F.; Farley, Farrington, Faucher, Fecteau, Ferris, Finemore, Flynn, Fraser, Gahagan, Garsoe, Gauthier, Genest, Good, Goodwin, H.; Goodwin, K.; Greenlaw, Hamblen, Hancock, Haskell, Henley, Herick, Hobbins, Hoffses, Huber, Jacques, Jalbert, Kauffman, Kelley, Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Knight,

LaPointe, LeBlanc, Lewis, E.; Lewis, J.; Lynch, MacLeod, Maddox, Mahany, Martin, Maxwell, McHenry, McKernan, McMahon, McTeague, Merrill, Mills, Morin, L.; Morin, V.; Mortin, Mulhern, Murchison, Murray, Najarian, Palmer, Parks, Perkins, Peterson, Pratt, Ricker, Rolde, Rollins, Ross, Santoro, Shaw, Shute, Simpson, L. E.; Smith, D. M.; Smith, S.; Snowe, Soulas, Stillings, Susi, Talbot, Tanguay, Theriault, Tierney, Trumbull, Walker, Webber, Wheeler, White, Whitzell, Wood, M. E.

NAY — Berry, P. P.; Binnette, Brown, Cameron, Carey, Dudley, Dunn, Farnham, Hunter, Immonen, Jackson, Kilroy, Lawry, McCormick, McNally, Sproul, Strout, Trask, Tyndale, Willard, The Speaker.

ABSENT — Carter, Churchill, Conley, Connolly, Cresseay, Curran, Dam, Deshaies, Dow, Evans, Kelleher, LaCharite, Littlefield, Norris, O'Brien, Pontbriand, Sheltra, Silverman.

Yes, 112; No, 21; Absent, 18.

The SPEAKER: One hundred twelve having voted in the affirmative and twenty-one in the negative, with eighteen being absent, the motion does prevail.

Thereupon, the Bill was read once. Committee Amendment "A" (H-575) was read by the Clerk and adopted and the Bill assigned for second reading tomorrow.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act to Provide Property Tax Reduction, Rent Relief and Equalization of Municipal Revenues" (H. P. 1620) (L. D. 2038) pursuant to Joint Order (H. P. 1582) reporting "Ought not to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. COX of Penobscot
 WYMAN of Washington
 —of the Senate.
 Messrs. MORTON of Farmington
 MAXWELL of Jay
 DOW of West Gardiner
 DAM of Skowhegan
 MERRILL of Bowdoinham
 DRIGOTAS of Auburn
 SUSI of Pittsfield
 —of the House.