

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 Second
Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1965

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Richard P. Rice of Brewer.

The members stood at attention during the playing of the National Anthem by the Winthrop High School Band.

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

The SPEAKER: On behalf of the House the Chair would like to thank the members of the Winthrop High School Band under the supervision of their Music Supervisor, Frank O. Stephens and the Director of Bands, Henry A. Caron, for the very fine concert that has been presented prior to the convening of the Legislature this morning. We thank them again for playing the Star Spangled Banner which is played on the first legislative day of each week.

To the best of our knowledge this is the first time that live music has been used in the playing of the National Anthem during a Legislative Session. We are most fortunate that this group who played here this morning is the same group who played at the recent Inauguration of our President Lyndon B. Johnson. This has been extremely pleasant to me as the Music Supervisor, Frank Stephens, was a classmate and a good friend of mine at Edward Little High School a few years back.

At the same time the Chair on behalf of the Members of the House would like to thank our Clerk for making these arrangements. (Applause, the Members rising)

Papers from the Senate

From the Senate:

The following Communication:

(S. P. 478)

NORTHEAST AIRLINES

March 23, 1965

Mr. Edwin H. Pert
Secretary of the Senate
State of Maine
State House
Augusta, Maine

Dear Mr. Pert:

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter and the attached resolution which you sent me (Joint Resolution, H. P. 1030, March 12th)

I would like the members of the Maine House and Senate to know that Northeast does have a firm schedule for the summer period — a schedule we believe to be a good one, one that can be operated dependably and safely. As you know, a very substantial part of our Maine traffic originates and terminates at the Portland, Bangor and Presque Isle airports, and you will be pleased to know that this year our availability of seats and frequency will compare most favorably with any schedule we have ever performed.

With respect to the smaller airports where we, of necessity, must operate DC-3s because of airport limitations, it is our belief that this schedule, also, will meet with favor as the frequency of flights, the times of departure are attractive from the public standpoint.

We look forward to an unprecedented volume of passenger traffic to and from our Maine cities this coming summer season.

Sincerely,

(Signed)

JAMES W. AUSTIN
James W. Austin
President

Came from the Senate read and ordered placed on file.

In the House, the Communication was read and ordered placed on file in concurrence.

On motion of the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Wheeler, House Rule 25 was suspended for the remainder of today's session in order to permit smoking.

Senate Reports of Committees Leave to Withdraw

Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Membership on Boards and Commissions in City of Lewiston" (S. P. 228) (L. D. 687) reporting Leave to Withdraw.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Number of Members of all Boards in City of Lewiston" (S. P. 229) (L. D. 688)

Report of the Committee on Public Utilities reporting same on Bill "An Act to Permit Eastern Maine Electric Cooperative to Build Hydroelectric Plant on Mattawamkeag River" (S. P. 214) (L. D. 673)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

In the House, Reports were read and accepted in concurrence.

Ought Not to Pass

Report of the Committee on Business Legislation reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Providing for Mandatory Cumulative Voting for Directors of Corporations" (S. P. 378) (L. D. 1195)

Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Actions for Injuries Causing Death" (S. P. 311) (L. D. 1024)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, the Reports were read and accepted in concurrence.

Ought to Pass in New Draft Tabled and Assigned

Report of the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act relating to Schooling of Children on Indian Reservations" (S. P. 308) (L. D. 1021) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 466) (L. D. 1404) under same title 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.

(On motion of Mr. Binnette of Old Town, tabled pending acceptance of the Committee Report and

specially assigned for Friday, April (9.)

Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment

Report of the Committee on Claims on Resolve to Reimburse Richard Robinson of Robbinston for Damage by Highway Construction (S. P. 142) (L. D. 383) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

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

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

Committee Amendment "A" was read by the Clerk as follows: COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 142, L. D. 383, Resolve, to Reimburse Richard Robinson of Robbinston for Damage by Highway Construction.

Amend said Resolve by striking out all of the 2nd, 3rd and 4th lines and inserting in place thereof the following: 'Highway Fund the sum of \$500 to be paid to Richard Robinson of Robbinston to replace his water supply pipeline from an artesian well from across the road which was damaged by construction of U. S. Route 1 in Robbinston.'

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence and the Resolve assigned for second reading tomorrow.

Report of the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act relating to Tuition for Students Attending Secondary School Outside of Residence" (S. P. 335) (L. D. 1080) 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" was read by the Clerk as follows: COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A"

to S. P. 335, L. D. 1080, Bill, "An Act Relating to Tuition for Students Attending Secondary School Outside of Residence."

Amend said Bill, in section 2, by striking out in the 20th line from the end the underlined words "from bond issues"

Further amend said Bill, in section 2, by inserting after the underlined words "schools of the State" in the 13th line from the end, the following: ', except that any unit which receives state or federal funds for capital outlay purposes, either equipment or construction, shall have such amounts deducted from the allowable insured value of buildings and equipment in the tuition computation'

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence and the Bill assigned for third reading tomorrow.

Report of the Committee on Liquor Control on Bill "An Act relating to Time of Ordering Liquor by Certain Licensees" (S. P. 403) (L. D. 1227) 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" was read by the Clerk as follows: COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 403, L. D. 1227, Bill, "An Act Relating to Time of Ordering Liquor by Certain Licensees."

Amend said Bill by adding after the underlined word "license" in the last line the underlined words 'and may advertise such effective date'

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence and the Bill assigned for third reading tomorrow.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Abolish the Council and Make Changes in the Matter of Gubernatorial Ap-

pointments and Their Confirmation (H. P. 6) (L. D. 6) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" in the House on March 19.

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

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act relating to Adequate Brakes on Truck Tractors and Semitrailers (H. P. 575) (L. D. 745) which was passed to be enacted in the House on March 12 and passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" on March 3.

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

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would like to recognize in the balcony forty pupils from Bridge Academy of Dresden, Maine; they are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Bass, Mr. Knapich and Mr. Wells.

On behalf of the House, the Chair welcomes you, and we hope that your visit will be both enjoyable and educational. (Applause)

Orders

On motion of Mr. Graham of Freeport, it was

ORDERED, that Miss Nancy Lee Carroll of Limerick be appointed to serve as Honorary Page for today.

The SPEAKER: Nancy Lee is the daughter of our Representative from Limerick, Mr. Carroll. She is a sophomore at Gorham State Teachers College.

On behalf of the House, the Chair welcomes you, Nancy, and we hope that you will enjoy your

duties as honorary page on this day. (Applause)

On motion of Mr. Palmer of Phillips, it was

ORDERED, that Rev. John Hoffman of Strong be invited to officiate as Chaplain of the House on Friday, April 16, 1965.

House Reports of Committees Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Lowery from the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Revising Laws Relating to Advisory Council of Sea and Shore Fisheries" (H. P. 600) (L. D. 792)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Additional Fee for Lobster and Crab Fishing License" (H. P. 776) (L. D. 1030)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Providing Additional Fee for Lobster Licenses for Conservation in the Lobster Industry" (H. P. 966) (L. D. 1301)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Ought to Pass in New Draft New Draft Printed

Mr. Graham from the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act relating to School Construction Aid in Administrative Units" (H. P. 993) (L. D. 1343) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1052) (L. D. 1427) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was read and accepted, the New Draft read twice and tomorrow assigned.

Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment

Mr. Lowery from the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries on Bill "An Act relating to Suspension of Lobster License for Molesting Lobster Traps" (H. P. 850) (L. D. 1149) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Bill read twice.

Committee Amendment "A" was read by the Clerk as follows:
COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 850, L. D. 1149, Bill, "An Act Relating to Suspension of Lobster License for Molesting Lobster Traps."

Amend said Bill by inserting at the beginning of the first line the underlined abbreviation and figure 'Sec. 1.'

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of the 7th line and inserting in place thereof the following: "not to exceed of 3 years."

Further amend said Bill by adding at the end the following:

"Sec. 2 R. S., T. 12, Sec. 3752, sub-Sec. 5, amended. The first sentence of subsection 5 of section 3752 of Title 12 of the Revised Statutes is amended to read as follows: 'Any person whose license, permit or right thereto has been suspended under subsections 1, 2, 3 or 4 may request the commissioner for a hearing.'"

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill assigned for third reading tomorrow.

Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Pitts from the Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act to Create the Maine Indian Housing Authority" (H. P. 933) (L. D. 1270) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read.

(On motion of Mrs. Carswell of Portland, tabled pending acceptance and specially assigned for Friday, April 9.)

The SPEAKER: The Chair at this time would like to recognize in the balcony of the House thirty-five students from Durham Elementary School, accompanied by their teacher, Miss Hisler and chaperones Mrs. Ward and Mrs. Chesley. They are the guests of the gentleman from Durham, Mr. Hunter.

On behalf of the House the Chair welcomes you and we hope that your visit will be both educational and enjoyable. (Applause)

Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Education reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Conveyance of Secondary School Pupils" (H. P. 465) (L. D. 619)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. SNOW of Cumberland
FALOON of Penobscot
— of the Senate.

Messrs. CARROLL of Limerick
GRAHAM of Freeport
GIFFORD of Manchester
LEVESQUE

of Madawaska
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. RICHARDSON
of Stonington
Mrs. HANSON of Lebanon
— of the House.

Reports were read.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I would like to move that we accept the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report and speak briefly to the motion.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House now is on the motion of the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Richardson, that we accept the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report, and the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I have no personal interest in this bill in view of the fact that all of the towns that I represent do transport their secondary pupils. On the other hand, I felt, and Mrs. Hanson felt I am sure, that this would create a hardship in some of our smaller towns in the State of Maine. I think that rather than forcing this on them it should be the duty of the Department of Education and the Superintendents of the State of Maine to educate the various school committees as to the ad-

visability and desirability of transporting their secondary school pupils. I hope that the "ought not to pass" report will be accepted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Lebanon, Mrs. Hanson.

Mrs. HANSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: My objection to this bill is the same reasons that Mr. Richardson from Stonington has mentioned and also the fact that towns, as my town, will be in dire circumstances if this bill is passed. In fact, the Superintendent of Schools told me that Lebanon in particular would be in a financial catastrophe, as we as a small town send our pupils as some other towns do to more than one surrounding town for high school education. In our town it happens to be sent to five different towns. In two of these towns it's likely that they could cut our pupils off at any moment. They will not take the full quota of our pupils. Therefore, this would be a very bad bill for our town and many other small towns and I hope the minority report prevails.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This document before you this morning is not as complicated as it might seem, because you will find the biggest majority of the towns now in the State of Maine are now conveying their elementary and secondary school pupils. This, it is our sincere feeling, is to help promote town areas to get into this conveying of all school pupils. In some areas it is creating hardships on secondary pupils for them to further their education because of lack of conveyance. In some areas, as the gentlewoman from Lebanon, Mrs. Hanson, has pointed out, it might create a hardship for four or five pupils. We are not advocating here or never have been, that these pupils should be conveyed by bus that holds twenty-five or thirty or forty pupils. The town could get into a contract with a person that

has got a car and has the time available and they would be able to convey these pupils, the secondary pupils, at a very minimum cost.

So this is why we feel that the elementary schools that are being transported now and a big majority of the secondary schools and the cost added to this if they have only got a half a dozen pupils, they don't have to buy a school bus to convey these pupils but they can do that by car or by beach-wagon or what have you at a very small cost to the municipalities if they will only sit down and review what they have got and take the necessary steps between now and 1966, 1967 to make sure that these secondary pupils are taken care of. And I will hope that you will vote against the adoption of the minority report. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from China, Mr. Farrington.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have this matter tabled until April 6.

Thereupon, the Reports and Bill were tabled pending the motion of Mr. Richardson of Stonington to accept the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 6.

Out of Order Ought to Pass Printed Bill

Mr. Crommett from the Committee on Towns and Counties reported "Ought to pass" on Resolve for Laying of the County Taxes for the Years Nineteen Hundred Sixty-Five and Nineteen Hundred Sixty-Six (H. P. 1043) (L. D. 1421)

Report was read and accepted. The Resolve was given its two several readings, under suspension of the rules, passed to be engrossed without reference to a Committee and sent forthwith to the Senate.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act to Consolidate The Universalist Church of Maine with Northeast District of the Unitar-

ian Universalist Association" (S. P. 471) (L. D. 1410)

Bill "An Act to Consolidate the Maine Unitarian Association with Northeast District of the Unitarian Universalist Association" (S. P. 472) (L. D. 1411)

Bill "An Act to Provide for the Apportionment of Interest on Bonds and Notes Acquired by Estates of Deceased Persons" (H. P. 280) (L. D. 362)

Bill "An Act relating to Jurisdiction of Law Court on Questions of State Law Certified by Federal Courts" (H. P. 417) (L. D. 529)

Bill "An Act relating to Election of Certain Municipal Officials" (H. P. 470) (L. D. 623)

Bill "An Act relating to Microfilm of Records in Registries of Deeds" (H. P. 570) (L. D. 740)

Bill "An Act relating to Expenses of Sanity Examination of Accused Persons in the District Court and Expenses of Blood Tests in Drunken Driving Cases" (H. P. 819) (L. D. 1110)

Bill "An Act relating to Election of Officers of Independent Churches" (H. P. 831) (L. D. 1058)

Bill "An Act relating to Payments to Washington County Law Library" (H. P. 865) (L. D. 1162)

Bill "An Act relating to Post-audit Statement in County Reports" (H. P. 940) (L. D. 1276)

Bill "An Act relating to County Estimates Sent to Municipalities" (H. P. 941) (L. D. 1277)

Bill "An Act relating to Purposes of Old Town High School District" (H. P. 943) (L. D. 1279)

Bill "An Act to Extend the Territorial Limits of the Dover and Foxcroft Water District" (H. P. 1017) (L. D. 1380)

Bill "An Act relating to Attending Secondary School Outside of Residence" (H. P. 1045) (L. D. 1416)

Bill "An Act relating to Group Accident and Sickness Insurance" (H. P. 1048) (L. D. 1419)

Bill "An Act Providing for Contents of Certain Volumes of County Records of Deeds to be Copied" (H. P. 1049) (L. D. 1420)

Resolve Proposing Amendment to the Constitution Relating to Bond Issues to be Voted Upon by

the People (H. P. 612) (L. D. 804)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, Bills read the third time. Resolve read the second time, all passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

Amended Bills

Bill "An Act relating to Uniforms for Full-Time Deputy Sheriffs" (H. P. 260) (L. D. 330)

Bill "An Act Providing for Inventory of Legislative Property by Legislative Research Committee" (H. P. 432) (L. D. 561)

Bill "An Act relating to Open Season on Muskrat in Somerset, Franklin and Piscataquis Counties" (H. P. 490) (L. D. 643)

Bill "An Act relating to Time of Complaint Against Dangerous Dogs" (H. P. 595) (L. D. 787)

Bill "An Act relating to Sale of Liquor by Social Clubs to Members of Same National or Affiliated International Organizations" (H. P. 649) (L. D. 877)

Bill "An Act relating to Taxes on Spirituous and Vinous Liquors Sold to Certain Instrumentalities" (H. P. 840) (L. D. 1141)

Bill "An Act relating to Closing County Roads for Maintenance" (H. P. 872) (L. D. 1169)

Bill "An Act Providing Public Dump for Forest City, and Indian Township, Washington County" (H. P. 967) (L. D. 1302)

Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Providing for Annual Legislative Sessions (S. P. 44) (L. D. 215)

Resolve in favor of Francis J. Boudreau, Jr., of Carmel for Damage by Highway Construction (H. P. 39) (L. D. 51)

Resolve in favor of Mahlon Dore of York for Well Damage by Highway Construction (H. P. 41) (L. D. 53)

Resolve to Reimburse Charles Larson of Brownville for Well Damage by Highway Construction (H. P. 318) (L. D. 421)

Resolve to Reimburse Paul Galusha of Jay for Damage to Well by Road Construction (H. P. 399) (L. D. 511)

Resolve to Reimburse Vernon Meldrum of Wilton for Well Dam-

age by Highway Construction (H. P. 400) (L. D. 512)

Resolve in favor of Roland S. Rose of Arundel for Well Damage by Highway Construction (H. P. 462) (L. D. 616)

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

Bill "An Act relating to Vacation Time and Retirement Pensions for Employees of City of Lewiston" (H. P. 514) (L. D. 667)

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

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act Prohibiting Obstruction of Discontinued Woods Roads (S. P. 250) (L. D. 760)

An Act relating to Trapping Beaver (S. P. 339) (L. D. 1083)

An Act Repealing the Law Regulating the Canning of Herring (H. P. 95) (L. D. 104)

An Act relating to Pensions for Beneficiaries of Members of Lewiston Police and Fire Departments (H. P. 355) (L. D. 458)

An Act relating to Hours of Moving Pictures on Sunday (H. P. 421) (L. D. 533)

An Act relating to Applications for School District Formation (H. P. 580) (L. D. 772)

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.

Enactor

Tabled and Assigned

An Act Revising the Laws Relating to Plumbers (H. P. 591) (L. D. 783)

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

(On motion of Mr. Conley of Portland, tabled pending enact-

ment and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 6.)

An Act relating to Malt Liquor Licenses (H. P. 710) (L. D. 948)

An Act relating to Payment of Insurance Premiums of School Employees (H. P. 730) (L. D. 968)

An Act relating to Adoption of Ordinances by Tribal Indians (H. P. 787) (L. D. 1040)

An Act Clarifying the Offense of Procuring Liquor for Certain Persons (H. P. 890) (L. D. 1187)

Finally Passed

Resolve Appropriating Funds for a Motor Vehicle Registration Service and Storage Building (S. P. 82) (L. D. 226)

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:

An Act Establishing a State Board of Pesticides Control. (S. P. 420) (L. D. 1329)

Tabled—March 16, by Mr. Mills of Eastport.

Pending — Passage to be enacted.

On motion of Mr. Mills of Eastport, passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

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

SENATE DIVIDED REPORT — Majority (7) "Ought not to pass" — Minority (3)—"Ought to pass"—Committee on Election Laws on Bill, "An Act to Eliminate Straight Ballot Voting in Elections." (S. P. 191) (L. D. 571)

Tabled—March 23, by Mr. Levesque of Madawaska.

Pending—Acceptance of Either Report.

(In Senate, Minority "Ought to pass" Report accepted)

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

Mr. SAHAGIAN: Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of the Minority Report "Ought to pass" and I wish to speak on the motion briefly.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House now is on the motion of the gentleman from Belgrade, Mr. Sahagian, that we accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report, and the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. SAHAGIAN: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I view this L. D. 571 as a non-partisan issue and I speak to you on this bill in the same way. All of us here today, when we place our name before the public in our endeavor to seek elective office want the voter to vote on our ability to perform in office regardless of what party we belong to. Every person that goes to the polls to vote should have the privilege and the responsibility of voting for each individual candidate by placing a mark opposite the name of the candidate of their own choice.

Ladies and gentlemen, I urge you to help me in support of this bill so that we can accord this opportunity to the people of Maine. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Belgrade, Mr. Sahagian, that we accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report.

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

Mr. BINNETTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House: The elimination of that big square does not prevent anyone from voting for whom they so desire. There is a space beside each candidate's name with a box and all they have got to do is vote in there. So I disagree with my good friend from Belgrade, Mr. Sahagian, in that respect. And we have heard evidence while on that committee relative to this removal of the big square and it was overwhelmingly in favor of

leaving it there. I certainly hope that you will defeat this motion.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am delighted to see that this legislation has bipartisan support this year as evidenced by the co-sponsorship of the legislation itself. This does not really surprise me because I have seen the same thing in the past. I sponsored the bill in 1959. Before that, a member of the opposite party had done the same thing. The latest sponsor prior to this session was the present president of the other body. During many campaigns when I asked persons whether they were Republicans or Democrats, they said that that really did not make any difference because they always voted for the man they felt best qualified. Now, this being so, why should we give the opportunity for some pressure groups—political or otherwise—to talk voters into placing one X at the top of the ballot in fear of spoiling their ballot or defeating one candidate? I maintain that this is very unfair for certain candidates whose names appear near the bottom of the list. If this is done, it is often an affirmative vote for some person the voter would not choose on his own.

For those who say that voters don't know all the candidates I contend that it is a great deal fairer to vote for the persons you do know and leave the other names blank. Why was this procedure started in the first place? It was instigated by professional politicians who were often more interested in their party—sometimes for selfish motives—than any candidates except for the first one or two. They determined that if they had one good man at the top of the ticket, he could carry in other party hopefuls. I maintain that if a man is not competent enough to garner votes for himself perhaps he should not be running in the first place. Some of the opposition have said that this is trying to do away with two-party government. This is abso-

lutely absurd and as proof let us look at what could have been done if this had been the intention.

There are eighteen states that have what is called, "an office type ballot." On this the persons' names are listed according to the office they seek. They are either rotated according to party affiliation, listed alphabetically, or drawn by lot. Of these states, only three have any provision for straight party voting. If we wanted to do away with the two-party system, we might advocate something like this or better still do what four states do — have no party designations at all.

I feel that the people of Maine are sufficiently astute and have enough common sense so that they don't have to be led blindly down the ballot by checking the big box at the top. Several states evidently consider their voters very unenlightened. Aside from a box at the top of the ticket, they have symbols of a donkey and an elephant so that the persons who cannot read can encircle the animal of their choice. For those who say it is too complicated and time consuming to mark the ballot all the way down, I will only add that I firmly believe it is well worth the effort to devote a few extra seconds to one of our most cherished possessions — the right to vote, and I strongly support the motion to accept the minority "ought to pass" report.

Mr. Ross of Bath requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Belgrade, Mr. Sahagian, that we accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report and the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, has requested a division.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mars Hill, Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. DICKINSON: Mr. Speaker, I just want to go on record as concurring with the gentleman, Mr. Sahagian and the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross. I recall the comments of Senator Snow when he presented this particular

L. D. to the Election Laws Committee.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will remind the gentleman not to refer to members of the other branch. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. DICKINSON: I stand corrected. Then I would be out of order, I guess, in quoting the remarks.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may quote certain remarks but please do not refer to the other branch.

Mr. DICKINSON: Well, we were told that he felt the same as a Republican as he now feels as a Democrat when he sponsored the bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Belgrade, Mr. Sahagian that we concur with the Senate in accepting the Minority "Ought to pass" Report on Bill, "An Act to Eliminate Straight Ballot Voting in Elections," S. P. 191, L. D. 571, and the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, has requested a division. All those in favor of accepting the Minority "Ought to pass" Report will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Eighty-nine having voted in the affirmative and forty-two having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

Mr. Bussiere of Lewiston requested a roll call.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Bussiere, has now requested a roll call. For the Chair to entertain the motion for a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one-fifth of the members present. All those desiring a roll call will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

An insufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously, less than one-fifth having risen, a roll call is not in order.

Thereupon, the Bill was read twice and assigned for third reading tomorrow.

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

Bill, "An Act Authorizing the Appointment of the Commissioner of Agriculture by the Governor." (S. P. 219) (L. D. 678)

Tabled—March 23, by Mr. Levesque of Madawaska.

Pending— Passage to be Engrossed.

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate. (Later Reconsidered and Tabled)

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

HOUSE REPORT — "Ought not to pass" — Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Resolve, relating to Fish Screen at Outlet of Rangeley Lake. (H. P. 227) (L. D. 294)

Tabled — March 23, by Mr. Mills of Eastport.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Palmer of Phillips to substitute Resolve for Ought not to pass Report.

On motion of Mr. Palmer of Phillips, recommitted to the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on a viva voce vote and sent up for concurrence.

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

SENATE DIVIDED REPORT — Majority (6) — "Ought to pass" — Minority (4) — "Ought not to pass" — Committee on Industrial and Recreational Development on Bill, "An Act Clarifying the Laws relating to the Division of Geological Survey in Department of Economic Development." (S. P. 117) (L. D. 343)

Tabled — March 24, by Mr. Littlefield of Hampden.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Fortier of Waterville to accept Majority "Ought to pass" Report in concurrence.

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

Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

House: I would like to oppose the ought to pass motion on this bill.

In a news release of an ore deposit study which appeared in the Bangor News issue of February 24, may I read you the last paragraph.

"Several companies are now conducting more detailed explorations by drilling as the result of the survey work in Hancock, Washington and eastern Penobscot Counties."

For the information of this House, this booklet that I hold is an excellent geological report of that area which was made in 1947 and 1948 by Professor Joseph M. Trefethen when he was State Geologist for the Maine Development Commission. And by the way, he received \$2,000 for being State Geologist and probably did a lot of the work with the students.

Two or three years ago, two helicopters from Canadian mining companies were making flights daily for most of the summer over this area, east of the Penobscot River, with geological instruments aboard making the survey. Options for mining have been requested from some of the lands. When our Department of Geology states that more explorations are being conducted as a result of their surveys in this area, I have to take it with a grain of salt.

This bill, L. D. 343, is An Act Clarifying the Laws relating to the Division of Geological Survey in Department of Economic Development. I have signed the "ought not to pass" report because laws pertaining to the Division of Geology were passed at the last session of this Legislature after a report had been received from the Joint Select Committee to study the functioning of the Department of Economic Development. From this study a bill to reorganize the DED was written and passed. That bill, among other things, defined the duties to be performed by a Division of Geology if one is maintained, and states that the Commissioner may employ a state geologist to serve at the pleasure of the Commissioner.

It is written in plain English, anyone can read it, and it does not need any clarification.

This new bill is an attempt to have this Legislature repeal those laws pertaining to geology and replace them with powers and duties, powers and duties which will cost a tremendous amount of money and require extra assistance to perform. In one year, July 1, 1963 to June 30, 1964, the Geology Division of DED spent \$64,440.00 and I can see no point in adding to the expense or personnel of the Geology Division by passing this L. D. 343.

I hope the "ought to pass" report is soundly defeated.

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

Mr. FORTIER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In respect to the gentleman from Hampden's remarks, I didn't quite see the logic in why he opposed the bill. Regarding the powers and duties it only says that the Division of Geological Survey shall gather and compile geologic information about the bedrock and superficial features of the state and present this information in printed maps with reports to the general public and mining industry to assist existing mining operations in the state and promote the development of the mineral potential of the state. Now, heaven knows that in the future this is what we have got to do. We have just got to promote the mineral potential of the state. Under the earth there are vast resources. The lumber companies are just beginning to explore the possibilities of multiple use of their lands. Harvesting machinery used in the lumber industry has replaced a lot of our workers in the woods and this may possibly open these areas to the employment of many thousands of people.

In many cases the state geologist, as he is known, has to attend national functions, conclaves of one sort or another, and he has no real prestige. He attends these as a messenger boy of Commissioner Bachman of the DED

and he is regarded as such by his colleagues in the business. Now this bill only seeks to clarify his duties and make him the Geologist, not merely a messenger boy for the Department, and I think Mr. Littlefield from Hampden, made a motion to — against the “ought to pass” report. I would urge you to pass this.

Mr. Speaker, what is the motion before the House right now?

The SPEAKER: The motion before the House is the acceptance of the Majority “Ought to pass” Report.

Mr. FORTIER: I would urge the acceptance of the Majority “Ought to pass” Report.

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

Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Waterville about the powers and duties that are expressed in this bill, an act clarifying the laws relating to the Division of Geology. I maintain that there is no need for this law at all. The Joint Interim Committee that studied the functions of DED at the last session wrote this Section 651 in the law as it is now on the books and it reads this way: “The Commissioner may employ a state geologist to serve at the pleasure of the Commissioner. The state geologist as heretofore appointed shall perform such duties as shall be required of him by law or assigned to him by the Commissioner and he shall act as division director.”

This gave the Legislature the chance to transfer this geological division to some school of geology or some other place if it wanted to. Now, under this bill that they are proposing they want this Legislature to spell out the powers and duties of the director of geology and then tell him what to do so that at the next session of the Legislature he can come in here with a tremendous bill and tell us that in order to perform these duties he has to have all these extra men and that's the way these departments over here grow and the taxpayer is shellacked to appropriate the money to pay for

it with. So I would — I hope that you defeat the “ought to pass” report of this bill.

Mr. Payson of Falmouth requested a division.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Berry.

Mr. BERRY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in support of the majority position of the committee and the motion of the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Fortier.

This is an example of perhaps a little bit—like too little, too late in this department. Actually the bill has no dollar sign attached to it whatsoever. The legislation proposes, as was said, to bring a little order out of chaos, to spell out the responsibilities and activities of this division, which is one of five divisions in the Department of Economic Development. It will put the Director of the Division on a par with the other Directors of the other Divisions.

I think that we have been treated in the papers in the past six months to a great deal of illuminating information on the prospects for mining in the State of Maine and this is why I bring up the question of too little, too late. We have only to look at the neighboring Province of New Brunswick which surrounds us on three sides, on the east, north and west and see what mining has done for New Brunswick. Let us hope the same thing can happen here in Maine and, if it can, the Division of Geology of the Department of Economic Development will have been instrumental in bringing this to pass. We have seen what happened down in Blue Hill. This is our only heavy metal mining operation in the State of Maine and it means a tremendous thing for us if this succeeds.

This Department has been carrying on very careful, intelligent, technological investigations into our possible metal resources in the state. The gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Littlefield, referred to the very, very capable Professor Joseph Trefethen of the University of Maine, who as charity

was acting as State Geologist at the time. He was succeeded by Mr. Rand, who was also a part-time geologist, both very, very capable men. And finally for the first time, we have a full time state geologist. This man, Mr. Doyle, has done a tremendous job. He deserves our full and wholehearted support.

I would like to read the concluding paragraph from Frank Sleeper's column which was in two parts in a recent issue of the Portland Press Herald. It says:

"It appears that the Department of Economic Development's geological division is one of the most valuable in the agency. If it needs more money—that division should certainly get it. In fact, it may be a division where some astute legislator should find out whether more money can do any good in further speeding up Maine's mineral development. And if so, make a documented appeal to increase Mr. Doyle's budget request."

This increase has not been requested. This legislation will go a long way towards modernizing the assistance the State of Maine gives to what we hope is a new-born industry in the State. I hope the motion prevails.

The SPEAKER: Before proceeding, the Chair would like to recognize in the balcony forty pupils of the 7th and 8th grades of Corinth and Bradford Elementary Schools accompanied by Principal of Corinth, Mr. Pineo and Principal of Bradford, Mr. Carroll, and chaperones Mrs. Mitchell and Mrs. Niles. They are the guests of the representative from Glenburn, Mr. Cookson.

On behalf of the House the Chair welcomes you and we hope that your visit will be both educational and enjoyable. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Mills.

Mr. MILLS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: You have heard the discussion on this bill. There is one point that hasn't been brought out. On this

geological survey which took place in Washington County I was in contact with the man who was operating through there. At that time he showed me the clear traces of copper that were in Pembroke, Maine, a part of Washington County. His surveyor at that time told me that going northwest from Pembroke, across the airline, up towards Mount Katahdin there was a vein of copper up through there. What they were establishing was the tracings of this lode. The last report I had from Washington County in Pembroke is, that on drilling there in the northern part of Pembroke they have struck a copper lode which is feasible to take out. They gave me a figure, which I do not remember clearly at this time, of 2 point something which makes it feasible for mining operation. The drilling has shown a 3 point something, almost 4 points. This is a feasible thing. There are now two groups up there, a Canadian and an American mining company that are now operating up there doing a very intensive boring survey to strike the heavy lode which they are sure is there. I believe that this ought to pass.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Harpswell, Mr. Prince.

Mr. PRINCE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is indeed a privilege for me to say a few words in relation to this bill as it deals with the action of my nephew who uncovered the copper mine at Blue Hill. I likewise would like to concur with the gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Littlefield. The amount of money that Charles Robbins, who then was representing the Mohawk Mining Company of Canada, spent was tremendous in the eyes of the people of Maine. I doubt very much if any department could have loaned anywheres near the amount of money that it took to convince Dennison, who is now building a six million plant which will be completed in September, that there was ten years of copper there. He is doing the same thing that Mr. Mills is speaking of in Washington County.

It seems to me that with others who have the same thinking of Mr. Robbins and who have the money to operate with can do a far better job if he is allowed to operate and make his test borings to convince the mining companies to come into our state. I concur with Mr. Littlefield of Hampden. Thank you.

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

Mr. FORTIER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As long as there are prudent men of Mr. Littlefield's type in the Maine Legislature I am not worried about any department coming here and talking this Legislature out of more money than they are going to have to have.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Fortier, that we accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report. The gentleman from Falmouth, Mr. Payson, has requested a division. All those in favor of accepting the Majority "Ought to pass" Report on Bill, "An Act Clarifying the Laws relating to the Division of Geological Survey in Department of Economic Development, S. P. 117, L. D. 343, will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Ninety-one having voted in the affirmative and thirty-six having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

Thereupon, the Bill was read twice and assigned for third reading tomorrow.

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

An Act Providing for Safety Seat Belts for Motor Vehicles. (H. P. 436) (L. D. 565)

Tabled—March 24, by Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston.

Pending—Further consideration.

(In Senate, Engrossed as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" and Senate Amendment "A" in non-concurrence (S. "A" S-39) (C. "A" H-39)

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

Mr. CONLEY: Mr. Speaker, I now move that we recede from our former action and concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Conley, now moves that we recede from our former action and concur with the Senate. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not against concurring with the Senate, I am against the bill in general, so I will speak later.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to speak on this. However, and I haven't the Senate Amendment before me, but I did read it the other day and it seems to me in two or three areas this makes this bill ridiculous. A matter of wearing seat belts I believe on farm tractors. Am I wrong? I apologize if I am on the wrong track.

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

Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill because it tells me what to do. This L. D. 565 was referred to the Committee on Transportation on January 26 and now three months later I think we know less about it than we did in January. I have a list of amendments which have been made to the bill. The first one—automobile shall mean a motor vehicle designed for the conveyance of passengers with a seating capacity of less than eight persons. I am wondering how many seat belts we are going to put in the car. Senate Amendment "A" — in any accident involving an automobile, the non-use of seat belts by the driver or of passengers in the automobile shall not be admissible in evidence in any trial, civil or criminal arising out of such accident. I am not a lawyer, but I question whether that amendment

would stand in case of trouble. Senate Amendment "B" — this act shall not apply to Oxford County. Senate Amendment "C"—this act shall not apply to Androscoggin County. Senate Amendment "D" — this act shall not apply to Somerset County. I began to think that the bill didn't apply to anything but Sagadahoc County. Senate Amendment "E"—an automobile, underline the words an automobile and inserting in place thereof the underlined words a motor vehicle including trucks and farm tractors.

This bill in my opinion is an unnecessary piece of legislation. The new cars are going to have seat belts and we can use them if we want to. Seat belts may save your life or they may not. There have been recent accidents that prove that they may not save lives. The real factor in saving life lies in the gray matter of the driver's head. This bill is just another bill to clutter up the law books. I think it is one of the greatest promotional schemes to force the sale of millions of seat belts on the car owners that I have ever known. And I would move that this bill and all its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House now is on the motion of the gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Littlefield, that this bill and its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. In order so that there will be no confusion on the Senate Amendments, the Chair will request the Clerk to read what Senate Amendment was adopted in the Senate.

The CLERK: Senate Amendment "A" only in non-concurrence under Filing No. S-39.

The SPEAKER: Will the Clerk read Senate Amendment "A".

Senate Amendment "A" was read by the Clerk as follows:

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 436, L. D. 565, Bill, "An Act Providing for Safety Seat Belts for Motor Vehicles."

Amend said Bill by striking out the single quotation mark at the end of section 1 and inserting in

place thereof the following underlined paragraph:

"In any accident involving an automobile, the nonuse of seat belts by the driver of or passengers in the automobile shall not be admissible in evidence in any trial, civil or criminal, arising out of such accident."

The SPEAKER: The Chair will inform the members of the House that is the only Senate Amendment which was adopted.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Brewer.

Mr. BREWER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Speaker for clarifying the amendment as attached to this bill at this time. The other amendments were — went by the wayside in the other branch.

This is a co-sponsored bill, as you know, non-partisan; it was enacted in the House, but the other branch felt it was necessary to put an amendment on this bill pertaining to civil liability. Now in the meantime, we have researched the other twenty - six states that have seat belt legislation. I will quote just one particular letter that was received from the State of Washington, where this question was asked then and they say: "In the two years since the law has been in effect in our state, no civil suit has been filed on this question." Now that is prevalent with most of our answers.

However, there are two states that have this particular legislation in their seat belt act and those two states are Minnesota and Wisconsin and they adopted the same thing. Now the rest of the states, the answers we have that they have not had this question arise. We also find from these other states that no state has yet adopted a law of general application to passenger cars requiring the use of seat belts while the car is in motion, nor has any state yet applied the seat belt law to all motor vehicles whether new or old.

I think the proponents of this bill, which include your State Police, your Highway Safety Com-

mittee, your Secretary of State, who is concerned with the traffic fatalities in the State of Maine, agree that this is a good amendment. And I would hope that with all the debate we have had on this bill and realizing our problems on the highways today that the motion to indefinitely postpone this bill does not prevail and I would ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would like to recognize in the balcony of the House fifty-one pupils of the 7th and 8th grades of the Orland Consolidated School accompanied by Principal James McManus, Teacher, Dan Pooler and chaperones, Jane Bubar, Pauline Craig, Beulah Cole, Jane Lash, Mrs. McManus and Mrs. Pooler, guests of Representative Cushing of Bucksport.

On behalf of the House the chair welcomes you and hopes that your visit is both educational and enjoyable. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: Also at this time the Chair would like to recognize in the balcony of the House sixty-five pupils of the 8th grade of the Crescent Park School of Bethel accompanied by their Principal, Mr. Ryder and Teachers, Mrs. Gunther, Mr. Emens, and Mr. Nichols and several mothers as chaperones. They are guests of our distinguished gentlewoman from Bethel, Mrs. Lincoln.

On behalf of the House the Chair welcomes you and hopes that your visit will be both educational and enjoyable. (Applause)

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: On behalf of the co-sponsor of the bill, I wish to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the splendid assistance you have given them on this matter.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I hope you will excuse me for boring you so many times about seat belts.

I think it has been quite thoroughly discussed already, but all it has done is create doubt in my mind. Each time we talk about it I have more doubt. Now for some reason, in the other branch, they decided not to accept the amendment that included, let's say commercial vehicles, but did anyone try to define a commercial vehicle? No. A commercial vehicle, let me remind you, can be almost any vehicle. Toothpick salesman for instance, or a hairpin salesman if he carries his merchandise with him, he can very well register his car as a commercial vehicle. Therefore, this bill wouldn't cover him. Now we are getting into class legislation. We are picking out one small group of people that says you must have a seat belt in your car but the rest can go scot-free. This creates doubt for me.

Another thing we have been told by all the manufacturers, a matter of record, that all the 1966 cars will have seat belts put on them anyway. So why should we go to all the trouble of putting the bill on the books when we are going to have them anyway and irritate those few people that don't want to be told what to do. They may do it anyway, but they don't want to be put in the position or told they must do it. These are only a few.

If you want to talk safety, why don't we do something? I run a garage and I inspect cars and I see what some of the things we need to do for safety. Tires on twenty-five per cent of the cars on the highway today are not safe. They even allow them to sell fifth grade tires and vulcanized tires and everything. If we really want to do something for safety we would do something along this line, to improve safety. I fail to see how this improves the safety of the rider in the State of Maine, especially if he will not use them. Now rather than bore you some more, I have a clipping up here, we have passed it in the back row, from a New Hampshire newspaper showing how dissatisfied they are with the survey they made. I won't bother to read you, but the Director of Motor Vehicle Research and Company of New

Hampshire said that seat belts kill and injure more persons than they save. This is just a heading clipped out of a New Hampshire newspaper.

I am not going to bore you any more. I think you know all about seat belts and I don't think in the day when we are hearing so much about discrimination we don't want to discriminate against any particular group of people. I don't think the sponsors of the bill realized when they eliminated commercial vehicles from this bill that they were eliminating as big a group of people as they were, but if you want to go into the definition as I have showed you, you'll find that most any vehicle can be altered very little and be registered as a commercial vehicle. Thank you.

I hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone does prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Carswell.

Mrs. CARSWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I don't intend to go into detail on this, but if I remember correctly, the last vote we took was 55 to 87, and I hope that the House remains consistent and votes for this safety measure.

Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston requested a roll call.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed consent of one-fifth of the members present. All those desiring a roll call vote will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

An insufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously, less than one-fifth having arisen, a roll call is not ordered. A division has been requested by the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Brewer. All those in favor of this Bill "An Act Providing for Safety Seat Belts for Motor Vehicles," H. P. 436, L. D. 565 being indefinitely postponed will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Fifty-four having voted in the affirmative and seventy-two having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

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

HOUSE REPORT — "Ought to pass" as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" — Committee on Natural Resources on Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Adoption of a System of Marking the Waters of the State." (H. P. 952) (L. D. 1288)

Tabled—March 24, by Mr. Dickinson of Mars Hill.

Pending—Acceptance.

Thereupon, the "Ought to pass" Report was accepted and the Bill read twice.

Committee Amendment "A" was read by the Clerk as follows:

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 952, L. D. 1288, Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Adoption of a System of Marking the Waters of the State.

Amend said Bill by adding at the end, before the single quotation mark, the following underlined sentence:

'The marking of waters contrary to the rules adopted by the Director of the Maine State Park and Recreation Commission shall constitute a misdemeanor.'

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill assigned for third reading tomorrow.

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

An Act to Authorize the Town of Pownal to Form a School Administrative District. (H. P. 47) (L. D. 59)

Tabled—March 26, by Mr. Graham of Freeport.

Pending—Passage to be Enacted.

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 division was had. 119 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.

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

Bill "An Act relating to Hunting by Nonresident Aliens." (H. P. 699) (L. D. 937)

Tabled—March 26, by Mr. Crommett of Millinocket.

Pending—Adoption of House Amendment "B".

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Crommett.

Mr. CROMMETT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would refer you to this House Amendment "B" to L. D. 937, I have no objection to the amendment, other than my thought that this House is inconsistent in its voting. I refer you to the section where it says this paragraph shall not apply to those members of the Canadian Immigration Custom Forces who receive complimentary licenses under Section 2601, sub-section IV. Sub-section IV reads as follows: Employees of Veterans Administration Center, complimentary licenses. All employees of the Veterans Administration Center residing in Maine and employed by the Togus Facility are classified as residents of this State for the purpose of obtaining fishing licenses and shall pay the same fees and be held to the same laws, rules and regulations as residents of this State. The Governor may issue complimentary fishing and hunting licenses to members of the Canadian Immigration Custom Forces who serve in such capacity on the Maine border. The Governor may grant two year complimentary hunting and fishing licenses to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor upon their application therefor. I have no objection to this. This has been on the statutes for several years. The purpose of granting a com-

plimentary license to the Canadian Immigration officials is to facilitate and help the wardens of the Inland Fish and Game Department. It is also good public relations. I have no objection whatever.

But you recall L. D. 837 sponsored by me which read "An Act Providing Free Hunting and Fishing Licenses for Persons over Seventy Years of Age," residents of this State. It also has a Senate Amendment which was indefinitely postponed in this House, and the amendment read to L. D. 837 further amend said bill by striking out everything after the enacting clause and inserting in place thereof the following: Section 2601 of Title 12, Revised Statutes is amended by adding a new section 7a to read as follows: complimentary licenses to persons over seventy years of age. A complimentary license to fish shall be issued to any resident of Maine who is over seventy years of age and applies therefor.

Ladies and gentlemen, customs and traditions are made to be broken, precedents to be established; and I say to you ladies and gentlemen a precedent has been established. There are various parliamentary procedures that I might pursue but I assure you that an amendment from the other body will be forthcoming and so now, ladies and gentlemen, I move adoption of House Amendment "B".

Thereupon, House Amendment "B" was adopted and the Bill assigned for third reading tomorrow.

On motion of Mr. Levesque of Madawaska, the House voted to reconsider its action of earlier in the day whereby Bill "An Act Authorizing the Appointment of the Commissioner of Agriculture by the Governor," S. P. 219, L. D. 678 was passed to be engrossed.

On further motion of the same gentleman, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 13.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I would inquire if L. D. 1391 is in the possession of the House.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would answer in the affirmative.

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: At this time I would move that we reconsider our action of Friday whereby we indefinitely postponed this bill, and I would like to speak briefly on my motion.

I was somewhat disturbed at our action taken Friday because I have seen some figures on this bill and looking over the figures that were available to us, I found that most of the towns which I represent suffered materially between the passage of 1391 and the possible passage of 435 which was before us that day. This, I realize, is a somewhat personal reason, perhaps. However, I wouldn't want the people in my district to get the idea that I didn't know some of the things that were going by us here in this Legislature. I also find that the county which I somewhat represent was also penalized by the passage of this bill — by killing this bill, rather, and we would benefit under the passage of this as over the passage of 435.

Another reason, I note that the membership on that day was somewhat small. The vote for indefinite postponement was 61 to 47, and I felt that we might well re-evaluate the action that we took on that occasion. Another reason that bothered me, this the Members of the House are well aware of, this bill came to the Floor of the House with a unanimous committee report ought to pass. I noted that the Chairman of the Highway Committee was absent on Friday. He is here today and I feel that perhaps he may have something to say on this bill. I hope you will go along and reconsider our action of Friday.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, that the House re-

consider its action whereby this bill "An Act relating to Payments to the State by Municipalities for Winter Maintenance on State Highways" was indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Hunter.

Mr. HUNTER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It is true that some of these places that have a lot of state roads will benefit more that way, but that isn't the fair way. Under the other, L. D. 435, they will get their fair share on their country roads which need the help. L. D. 435 was started with a program that existed and started way back in 1927, that is nothing new; it is an old program. It is out of date and it should be brought up to date, and this increase of \$15.00 per mile will bring it up to date, and each and every town will get their fair share. Of course the towns that have got a lot of state roads won't get as much, but I don't think they should get as much. I think it should go to these towns that have a lot of country and state-aid roads, which is a lot more mileage, it is over 10,000 miles. The other way, it is only a little over 3,000 miles, so I think you can see from that very clearly that the other L. D. will cover and bring up to date an existing program which I feel is a great deal better than trying to get rid of a program that is already a good program whereby it only costs the towns \$40.00 per mile right now, and that's a set cost. It doesn't go up with any rise or increases in costs. The other program of the towns that is under \$400,000 they have also got a set cost. It only costs them \$35.00 per mile.

And on this other program that I am trying to bring up to date, the state reimburses \$65.00 per mile and still leaves a big lion's share to pay out of the towns. The state only pays about thirty percent. Under those other two programs the state has already paid eighty-five and ninety per cent, so I don't think those programs need being brought up at all. I think the ones where we are getting thirty per cent is the one

that we should bring up and bring it up to date which is the fair one. Thank you.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I just want to caution those members that do have state highways, that if you adopt L. D. 435 you will still be paying your \$40.00 a mile to the State.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do hope that they will go along and reconsider because we could by no stretch of the imagination lose any help from snowplowing because if L. D. 435 was to fail in the other branch, we would be left then with no relief for snowplowing. I think if we reconsider 1391, which I hope we will do, we will have two vehicles to deal with the other branch.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Hunter.

Mr. HUNTER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have confidence in the other branch of the Legislature. I think they are fair, and I think they are fair and I think they will know—

The SPEAKER: The Chair will remind the gentleman and other members of the House, kindly do not refer to the other branch. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. HUNTER: No one loses anything under this program, this is all gain. Whatever you got last year you will still get. Of course if you eliminate the \$40.00 per mile, you are just benefiting the towns that have the state roads. I think the benefit should go in the towns that have got a lot of country and state-aid roads and at the same time include these 57

towns that get nothing under the other program. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from China, Mr. Farrington.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In following this debate, I believe the first question was that the bill to be reconsidered would serve more people, and this bothers me immensely. It has been proven through facts and figures by the gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Hunter, that his proposal does serve more people and allows them more money for snow removal. The Committee's first stand was that their bill served more people. I reiterate, it has been proven by facts and figures that Mr. Hunter's bill does favor more towns. Therefore, I would want to go on record as opposing the reconsideration of this matter. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, that the House reconsider its action whereby this bill was indefinitely postponed.

Mr. Millay of Bowdoinham requested a division.

The SPEAKER: All those in favor of reconsidering our action whereby L. D. 1391 and its accompanying papers were indefinitely postponed will please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Forty-five having voted in the affirmative and sixty-seven having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

On motion of Mr. Eustis of Dixfield,

Adjourned until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.