

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

Friday, May 7, 1965

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Kenneth Brookes of Augusta.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

**Papers from the Senate
Senate Reports of Committees
Leave to Withdraw**

Report of the Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act Eliminating Motor Vehicle Dealer Registration Board" (S. P. 458) (L. D. 1403) reporting Leave to Withdraw.

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

Ought Not to Pass

Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Conditions of Bail Accepted by Bail Commissioner" (S. P. 382) (L. D. 1198)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

Ought to Pass in New Draft

Report of the Committee on Highways on Bill "An Act to Make Allocations from the General Highway Fund for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1966 and June 30, 1967" (S. P. 63) (L. D. 124) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 529) (L. D. 1511) 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 and accepted in concurrence, the New Draft read twice and assigned the next legislative day.

Report of the Committee on Retirements and Pensions on Bill "An Act Providing for Cost of

Living Plan for Retired State Employees" (S. P. 216) (L. D. 675) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 530) (L. D. 1509) under title of "An Act Providing for Cost of Living Plan for Retired State Employees, Teachers and Participating District Employees, or Beneficiaries of Same" 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. Hunter of Clinton, the Report was accepted in concurrence.

The New Draft was read twice and assigned the next legislative day.

Ought to Pass

Report of the Committee on Business Legislation reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Ownership of Property by Nonstock Corporations" (S. P. 394) (L. D. 1219)

Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting same on Bill "An Act Providing for a Study and Revision of Maine Corporate Law" (S. P. 500) (L. D. 1466)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Penalty for Indecent Exposure" (S. P. 501) (L. D. 1467)

Report of the Committee on Taxation reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Application of Certain Carriers to Gasoline Road Tax" (S. P. 263) (L. D. 917)

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

In the House, reports were read and accepted in concurrence, the Bills read twice and assigned the next legislative day.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act Providing State Aid to Towns for Care of Poor Persons" (S. P. 80) (L. D. 225) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. DUQUETTE of York
HARDING of Aroostook
BROWN of Hancock
—of the Senate.

Messrs. ANDERSON of Orono
JALBERT of Lewiston
HEALY of Portland
BIRT of East Millinocket
—of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. BISHOP of Presque Isle
BRAGDON of Perham
DUNN of Denmark
—of the House.

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

In the House: Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Healy of Portland, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted in concurrence and the Bill was read twice.

Committee Amendment "A" was read by the Clerk as follows:
COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 80, L. D. 225, Bill, "An Act Providing State Aid to Towns for Care of Poor Persons."

Amend said Bill by striking out all of that part designated "\$4495." of section 1 and inserting in place thereof the following:

" 'Sec. 4495. Reimbursement by State

When a town incurs net costs for furnishing general relief in any municipal fiscal year in excess of 10% of all money raised by it for all purposes of taxation, the Department of Health and Welfare shall reimburse the town for $\frac{1}{2}$ the amount of such excess costs which it considers to be reasonable and appropriate expenditures. The overseer of the poor and the treasurer of the town shall make and deliver to the Department of Health and Welfare a monthly return under oath on forms provided by the Department of Health and Welfare stating the amount of moneys raised for all purposes by

taxation and the amount of net costs for furnishing general relief beginning at the end of the month in which the town's general relief expenditures exceed 10% of all moneys raised by it for all purposes by taxation. For the purposes of this section moneys raised for all purposes by taxation shall include all moneys raised for the operation of a town or school district whether or not such moneys are raised for the operation of such town or school districts as separate entities.' "

Further amend said Bill by striking out in the 3rd and 4th lines of section 2 the figure "\$50,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure "\$25,000"; and by striking out in the last line the figure "\$50,000" which appears in 2 places, and inserting in place thereof the figure "\$25,000" in both places.

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

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Transportation reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Weight of 3-Axle Trucks" (S. P. 155) (L. D. 395)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. SHIRO of Kennebec
MENDELL
of Cumberland
—of the Senate.

Messrs. KEYTE of Dexter
BEANE of Moscow
STORM of Sherman
BUSSIÈRE of Lewiston
CROSBY of Kennebunk
LEBEL of Van Buren
—of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. CAHILL of Somerset
—of the Senate.

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

In the House: Reports were read.

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

Mr. BUSSIERE: Mr. Speaker, I move that we accept the majority report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Bussiere, moves that we accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Pike.

Mr. PIKE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I suppose it is inevitable that we shall go along with this bill. Two or three weeks ago I mentioned to the House that we would have a spate of bills, each one looking innocent by itself, coming up, but when they came to be added up they probably would result in an intolerable series of weights on our highways. Well, some of them have come up already. And then we will have some more. I don't think half of them are through yet, but when they get all added up I just think we are going to do a real injustice to our highway system, especially that part of it which is not yet brought up to federal standards. This is one of those bills. I hope, though I don't believe, that the motion of the gentleman will fail.

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

Mr. BUSSIERE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: A committee "ought not to pass" report was signed by Senator Cahill and I understand that he was the one that moved to pass the bill to be engrossed in the Senate. So there is no objection.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from York, Mr. Erwin.

Mr. ERWIN: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: Like the redoubtable gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Pike, I think lost causes are perhaps the only ones worth fighting for. That is not my thinking whether a lone member somewhere else surrendered finally to the intolerable pressure of one of the greediest and cleverest lobbies that

has been in this place in a long time. These people are asking too much. They have already received far more than I think they really expected themselves and I think it behooves you and me to stop right here.

How many of you now riding along the roads in the spring notice that along the shoulders of the secondary roads in the State of Maine there are pieces of pavement approximately fist size or a little bit larger, all broken away but still staying together in kind of a honeycomb pattern? This damage isn't done by frost. This is impact damage done by oversized trucks. And there are hundreds and hundreds of miles of roads in the State of Maine that these ever larger, ever heavier, ever increasing axle size trucks are going to break up into smaller and more difficult to repair pieces than we already have. One of our difficulties has been the fact that there has been silence at this session of the Legislature from the State Highway Commission. I am sorry that the State Highway Commission hasn't seen fit at this time to express what must be opposition there, at least in the engineering department where they have to design new roads and plan for the rebuilding of these old ones.

I hope that you will not accept the majority "ought to pass" report and I ask for a division.

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

Mr. LUND: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question to any member of the Highway Committee or anybody else who can answer it. I would like to ask, what will be the new limit under this law counting the ten percent tolerance that is being granted now to a great many vehicles and counting the fifteen percent tolerance which is granted in the winter time and how many thousand pounds is this above the maximum permissible load on our Interstate Highway system?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lund, has posed a question to any member of the Transportation Committee or any other member. Any mem-

ber of the Transportation Committee or any other member may answer if he so desires.

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

Mr. BUSSIÈRE: Mr. Speaker, what I know about this bill is that the majority report was nine to one and the gentleman who signed against is the one that moved to pass the bill in the Senate and I understand the maximum weight was reduced two hundred pounds, that is all.

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

Mr. PIKE: Mr. Speaker, I will try to answer the question although I am not a highway expert, except I am always bothered by trying to get by these beat 'em offs who are trying to make larger or heavier. The original bill called for forty-eight thousand pounds. It has been, through some kindness, reduced to forty-six thousand pounds. At ten percent of that forty-six hundred makes fifty-one thousand pounds two hundred; then add fifteen percent to that, January, February and March, would be about six thousand pounds more during the time when the frost, especially that latter part when the frost is coming out and you have got a very fancy load on our poorer highways. It would be way in excess of what the federal government would allow on Route 95, if I am not mistaken, but we can pound our poor highways to death and it is perfectly legal and lovely.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Poulin.

Mr. POULIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I happen to come from that territory where the gentleman signed the minority report. I can't understand it, because every third house up there is a truck driver. And if you have ever seen pulp workers, drivers and all working, that extra two thousand pounds means quite a bit to them, because in a course of four loads they have to make the fifth load which costs money to move one of those trucks. And as far as damages to the roads, if you would go in some of those places they'd say, well the edges

are all beat up because a lot of the edges have not been taken care of. But to get back to the fact, these workers work very hard to get the product out, and if we cut down their limitation too much, you are going to have a hard time finding truck drivers to work for six dollars a cord.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Bussiere, that we accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report in concurrence. The gentleman from York, Mr. Erwin, has requested a division.

All those in favor of accepting the Majority "Ought to pass" Report on Bill "An Act relating to Weight of 3-Axle Trucks," Senate Paper 155, L. D. 395, will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Sixty-four having voted in the affirmative and fifty-nine having voted in the negative, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted in concurrence and the Bill read twice.

Senate Amendment "A" was then read by the Clerk as follows: SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 155, L. D. 395, "An Act Relating to Weight of 3-Axle Trucks."

Amend said Bill, in the 34th line from the end, by striking out the underlined figure "48,000" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure "46,000"

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sherman, Mr. Storm.

Mr. STORM: Mr. Speaker, Senate Amendment "A" reduces from the present law, from forty-eight thousand to forty-six thousand. This is not giving them anything; it is taking away two thousand pounds that they already have, and I move for the indefinite postponement of Senate Amendment "A".

Mr. Dunn of Denmark requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Denmark, Mr. Dunn, requests a division. All those in favor of Senate Amendment "A" 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. Sixty-seven having voted in the affirmative and fifty-four having voted in the negative, Senate Amendment "A" was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

Thereupon, the Bill was assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

On motion of Mrs. Lincoln of Bethel, House Rule 25 was suspended for the remainder of today's session in order to permit smoking.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Closed Time on Deer in Southwestern Zone" (S. P. 413) (L. D. 1309) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and House Amendment "A" in the House on April 23.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I move that we insist on our previous action and I ask for a Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, moves that we insist and requests a Committee of Conference.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Anderson.

Mr. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, well I was going to make the motion that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House now is on the motion of the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Anderson, that we recede and concur with the Senate.

Mr. Ross of Bath requested a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested. All those in favor of receding from our former action and now concurring with the Senate, will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had. Eighty-seven having voted in the affirmative and thirty-five having voted in the negative, the motion to recede and concur prevailed.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Repealing the Law Requiring Assessment of Municipalities in Aid to Dependent Children Grants" (H. P. 445) (L. D. 599) on which the House substituted the Bill for the "Ought not to Pass" Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs and passed the Bill to be engrossed on May 5.

Came from the Senate with the Report accepted in non-concurrence.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Orono, Mr. Anderson.

Mr. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I now move that we recede and concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Orono, Mr. Anderson, now moves that we recede and concur with the Senate.

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

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, is this debatable?

The SPEAKER: Yes, it is.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I had intended to move that we insist and ask for a committee of conference on this particular matter. Primarily because I believe it of great importance to every municipality in the state, and more especially to the larger cities who possibly if the uniform effort bill goes through — is enacted, the larger cities will not get any additional school money. This would be an opportunity to kind of balance between the larger cities and the smaller towns, would create the same ultimate results in that the aims are to alleviate the property tax. Therefore, I would hope that we might, at least as I said once before, get this matter to the appropriations table for this consideration. Therefore, I would hope that you would defeat the motion

and if the motion is defeated I would then move to insist and ask for a committee of conference, at least an opportunity to discuss this matter further. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Bishop.

Mr. BISHOP: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Again I rise to caution you to look on this with a great deal of care and particularly to the proponents of this measure which will cost nine hundred thousand dollars per year that, if they are going to be responsible in their duties here, to tell us where we are going to get the money.

Mr. Hunter of Clinton requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Hunter, requests a division.

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

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: My good friend, Mr. Bishop, I feel does not understand what I was trying to put across this morning, in that I think we would gain the same aims. We would satisfy two factions instead of one faction, in that we all realize that in each municipality there is a school element and there is also the municipal officials who — I know it is true in my area anyway and I suspect it is true throughout the state, are separate units, they are separate political units actually.

Now we are going to spend no more money if we enact uniform effort. We are simply doing away with the program if we get rid of this eighteen percent payment of ADC that is undesirable. It has been indicated at the hearing and I believe that if you speak to your respective municipal officers, there are very few cases that would say they still wanted to maintain this particular program, especially where there is no control. I think we as politicians could favor the general public to a greater degree if we kicked this package out and gave

a little less in the other respect. Now, if it is a question of money, it is just a question of how much, if we are going to relieve property taxes this year by some method, it is just a question of how. No more money, if there is no money available, of course, you don't relieve anybody of anything. I hope that I have answered the question.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Orono, Mr. Anderson, that we recede from our former action and now concur with the Senate and the gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Hunter, has requested a division. All those in favor of receding and concurring will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Sixty-three having voted in the affirmative and fifty-four having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Create the Maine Indian Housing Authority" (H. P. 933) (L. D. 1270) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and House Amendment "A" in non-concurrence in the House on April 27.

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

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

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that when the Senate and House adjourn, they adjourn to meet on Tuesday, May 11th. (S. P. 532)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

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

Messages and Documents

The following Communication:

THE SENATE OF MAINE
AUGUSTA

May 5, 1965

Hon. Jerome G. Plante

Clerk of the House

102nd Legislature

Sir:

The President of the Senate to-day appointed Senators to join with members of the House in Committees of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches on Bills as follows:

Bill, "An Act Requiring Permits to Dam Waters for Recreational Purposes" (S. P. 342) (L. D. 1087)
Senators:

MAXWELL of Franklin

MOORE of Washington

DUNN of Kennebec

Bill, "An Act Providing for a Legislative Conference Prior to the Meeting of the 103rd Legislature" (H. P. 265) (L. D. 347)

Senators:

DUQUETTE of York

HARDING of Aroostook

BROWN of Hancock

Respectfully,

(Signed) EDWIN H. PERT
Secretary of the
Senate

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

Orders

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

Mr. BERRY: Mr. Speaker, I move that we reconsider our action of yesterday whereby we accepted the "Ought not to pass" Committee Report on L. D. 1176, House Paper 851, Bill "An Act Establishing the Maine Insurance Advisory Board and Reserve Fund for Uninsured Losses."

The SPEAKER: The Chair will first inquire if that paper is in our possession?

The gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Berry, now moves we reconsider our action of yesterday whereby we accepted the "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee. Is it the pleasure of the

House that we reconsider our action whereby we accepted the Committee Report?

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

Mr. BERRY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I might explain that there are before or will be before this body three bills which provide for the overhaul of the handling of state insurance. It has come to our attention since our acceptance of the "ought not to pass" report yesterday, that this legislative document well may be a vehicle for revision which we will use in ending up with something I think we can all agree on. The Attorney General and Insurance Commissioner and some members of the State Government Committee are working on a redraft of this and the two other bills. If this motion for reconsideration passes I will move that this item be tabled.

Thereupon, the House voted to reconsider its action of yesterday whereby the "Ought not to pass" Committee Report was accepted.

On further motion of the same gentleman, tabled pending acceptance of the Committee Report and specially assigned for Thursday, May 13.

The SPEAKER: The Chair at this time would like to recognize in the balcony of the House, twenty-eight pupils of the Fourth Grade of Wiscasset Elementary School, accompanied by their teacher, Miss Linda Silver and chaperone Mrs. Evelyn Hanson. And they are the guests of the gentleman from Southport, Mr. Buck. On behalf of the House the Chair welcomes this group and we hope that your visit will be both educational and enjoyable. (Applause)

Mr. Edwards of Portland presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Joint Standing Committee on State Government is hereby authorized to report a Bill which shall establish a constitutional commission or provide for the calling of a constitutional con-

vention according to the Constitution of the State of Maine, Article IV, part third, Section 15. (H. P. 1117)

The Order received passage and was sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Gaudreau of Lewiston presented the following Order and moved its passage:

WHEREAS, the members of the House have learned that today is the 54th birthday of Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston,

BE IT ORDERED, that the members extend to Mr. Jalbert their congratulations and their best wishes not only for today but for the years ahead.

(Off Record Remarks)

The Order received passage.

House Reports of Committees Leave to Withdraw

Mr. Binnette from the Committee on Health and Institutional Services on Bill "An Act relating to the Registration of Apothecary Stores" (H. P. 973) (L. D. 1323) reported Leave to Withdraw.

Mr. Cressey from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Providing for the Rehabilitation of Alcoholics" (H. P. 210) (L. D. 278)

Mr. Gillian from the Committee on Judiciary reported same on Bill "An Act to Prevent Pollution of Part of Halfmoon Pond in Waldo County" (H. P. 1072) (L. D. 1459)

Mr. Dumont from the Committee on Labor reported same on Bill "An Act Repealing Application of Employment Security Law to Seasonal Employment" (H. P. 975) (L. D. 1325)

Mr. Boissonneau from the Committee on Legal Affairs reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Renewal of Motor Vehicle Operators' Instruction Permits" (H. P. 1077) (L. D. 1460)

Mr. Wight from the Committee on Towns and Counties reported same on Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of Judge of Probate of Aroostook County" (H. P. 862) (L. D. 1159)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Repealing Law Providing for a Fire Marshal for Aroostook

County" (H. P. 901) (L. D. 1211) which was recommitted.

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Cottrell from the Committee on Taxation reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Providing a Tax Abatement for Certain Elderly Persons" (H. P. 661) (L. D. 888)

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Cottrell from the Committee on Taxation reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Exemption of Veteran's Property from Taxation" (H. P. 981) (L. D. 1319)

Report was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Libhart.

Mr. LIBHART: Mr. Speaker, I move that we substitute the bill for the report and would speak briefly.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House now is on the motion of the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Libhart, that we substitute the bill for the report. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. LIBHART: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: My opinion of this bill that has come out of the Committee on Taxation unanimously "ought not to pass," one of these years must pass this Legislature. I would like to tell you briefly what the bill does and why sometime this Legislature must have the courage to pass it.

This bill would leave the presently existing veteran's exemption of thirty-five hundred dollars on property tax the way it is, regardless of pension, disability or what have you. Now this of course recognizes the fact, I believe, that we are much too late to recognize the very large cost of this exemption. We all know the State of Maine has one of the highest property tax rates in the United States. We all recognize the fact that our property taxes are too high, that our property taxes have

been one of the great discouragements for incoming industry. We all recognize the fact that incoming industry very frequently, illegally, are granted some kind of tax abatements. We found this necessary, to either wink at the law or ignore the law of equal property tax requirement in order to get these industries in.

Now sometime before long, we are going to have to have the courage to revise our property tax structure in the State of Maine. It needs serious study and there is a great deal we can do for it. Unfortunately this Legislature has not as yet seen fit to order this study and to commence the hard work of changing the system we now have. But this bill that I have presented is something we can do. This bill does this. It leaves the World War I Gold Star Mothers and so forth exactly as they are with their thirty-five hundred dollar exemption. It gives an exemption of seventy-five hundred dollars to veterans of wars later than World War I provided they have a total disability service connected.

It seems to me that there is a reason in all justice to give these totally disabled veterans a tax exemption on their real estate. Beyond that, although I asked the three hundred or so members of the various veterans organizations who appeared before the Taxation Committee when this bill was heard, why they as non-service connected disability veterans deserved a tax exemption in preference to using that money that could be raised by leaving the exemption on for our local schools.

To me we must, in the State of Maine, find a way to raise more money for education. This exemption as it presently exists, by conservative estimates, will cost the State of Maine a hundred and fifty million dollars in lost tax revenue, one hundred and fifty million dollars, ladies and gentlemen of the House. Why? Why is it necessary for us to give our veterans a bonus larger than any state in the Union if they happen to own real estate,

completely ignoring the veterans who do not own real estate?

Now one of the attacks on my bill was that it was not fair to all the veterans. It was discriminatory, because it left the World War I veterans the way they are, it gave the total service connected disability veterans of World War II, the Korean Conflict and I assume in the Viet Nam crisis and so on, a seventy-five hundred dollar exemption, and did nothing for World War II, Korean, Viet Nam, etc. if they did not have a service connected disability. I ask you. What is more discriminatory than giving veterans who happen to have enough money to own real estate an exemption which over their lifetime on predictability tables from the insurance companies would indicate a bonus, if you will — money is money no matter how it gets to the veteran, of two thousand dollars apiece and completely ignores the non real estate property owning veteran. Now, that is a minor argument in my opinion.

The real argument is why, ladies and gentleman of this House, why do we give these veterans this exemption? Now, I can see a reason for leaving the World War I veterans the way they are. They got a very small bonus but they got no GI bill from the federal government. The world War II people and the Korean veterans did not get a bonus from the State of Maine, it is true, but they did get a very great help in all of the various GI bill benefits that they have got. If they didn't go to college, they could get help for financing a house, vocational training and what have you. Most veterans took advantage of some aspect of the GI bill.

Now they got this from the federal government. I submit that this money came from our taxes. Now I am not against veterans. I am a member of the American Legion myself. I am a veteran of World War II and went back in in the Korean Conflict. I am still in the reserve and I am ready to go at any moment, and it looks like I may be going before this

session is over if the situation keeps up. I am ready and willing and I mean that honestly. And I for the life of me can't understand why it is not a privilege on the part of the veterans to join with other able bodied Americans in these wars we have, to protect the precious right that we have gained.

To me it is a privilege. It isn't something that we must be paid for for the rest of our lives. I consider myself completely paid for anything that I have ever done while I am on active duty, just for the privilege of being there. And I feel that one of the most important tasks I perform every year on the fifteenth of April is to pay my income taxes and I mean this sincerely; and Uncle Sam gets every penny from me that he is supposed to get.

Now I see no reason in logic or otherwise why we should continue this exemption. One of these years, we are going to have to face up to the fact that this has got to be done. I was certainly hopeful on a committee of ten able men that I would be able to find one of them with the guts to report this bill out "ought to pass." I didn't even get a divided report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Milbridge, Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. KENNEDY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise in opposition to the motion to substitute the bill for the report. I agree one hundred percent with the arguments as given by the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Libhart. They are sound. They are factual. I am in complete sympathy with them. However, I do not feel that this is the time for such a bill. The missionary work has been done in the 101st session and now in this 102nd session. The time is coming when we must pass such a bill. I would like to report to the House that probably I am the oldest veteran of World War II; however I am grateful for my youthful demeanor in comparison to the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Libhart. When such time does

arise that I become eligible if I am a member of either body of this Legislature, I will introduce a bill such as he introduced this session. I urge you not to support the motion to substitute the bill for the report, but to support your committee.

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

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to tell you that we were very much impressed by the thinking of Representative Libhart and the idea of the bill. We know that some action in this area has got to be taken. The action we took was to take no action and to hold the line. The veterans wanted an increase in their thirty-five hundred dollar exemption up to five thousand and there were many enthusiastic veterans here wishing that. We do have — I think you all understand the problem that besets this particular situation, is that maybe in some of our towns the tax rate is eighty, a hundred dollars, in others it is twenty-five dollars. So your veterans, depending upon where they happen to live, get a different tax exemption. You are going to try before the session is over to really supply the money for this fifty thousand dollar proposed survey of our assessment procedures. And we would hope that as a result of this survey, by next year perhaps we could take some more definite action to straighten up this growing problem. But, I hope that Mr. Libhart understands that we did give his bill great consideration and that we feel his contribution was a great one, this year in the Taxation Committee hearing on this matter.

Mr. Starbird of Kingman Township requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird, requests a division. All those in favor of substituting the bill for the report on Bill "An Act relating to Exemption of Veterans Property from Taxation," House Paper 981, L. D. 1319, will kindly rise and remain standing until the

monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Twenty having voted in the affirmative and eighty-two having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon the Committee Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Drigotas from the Committee on Taxation reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Municipal Excise Taxes on Boats" (H. P. 168) (L. D. 189) which was recommitted.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Tabled

Mr. Hanson from the Committee on Taxation reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Repealing Trade-in Credit for Motor Vehicles under Sales Tax Law and Payment of Tax" (H. P. 982) (L. D. 1320)

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Kennedy of Milbridge, tabled pending acceptance and unassigned.)

Mr. Martin from the Committee on Taxation reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Repealing from Sales Tax Exemption on Containers, Packaging and the Like" (H. P. 761) (L. D. 998)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Increasing Property Tax Exemption for Widows of Veterans" (H. P. 935) (L. D. 1272)

Mr. Wood from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Increasing Property Tax Exemptions for Veterans" (H. P. 860) (L. D. 1157)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Ought to Pass in New Draft New Drafts Printed

Mr. Baldic from the Committee on Health and Institutional Services on Bill "An Act relating to Records of Tests of Public Water Supplies" (H. P. 949) (L. D. 1285) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1113) (L. D. 1520) under title of

"An Act relating to Records of Tests of Water Samples" and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Haugen from same Committee on Bill "An Act relating to Definition of Disabled under Aid to the Disabled" (H. P. 690) (L. D. 927) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1114) (L. D. 1521) under title of "An Act relating to Definition of Aid and Disabled under Aid to the Disabled" and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Peaslee from same Committee on Bill "An Act Authorizing Use of Prisoner Assistance by Certain Charitable Organizations" (H. P. 805) (L. D. 1097) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1115) (L. D. 1522) under title of "An Act Authorizing Use of Prisoner Assistance by Charitable Organizations" and that it "Ought to pass"

Mrs. White from same Committee on Bill "An Act relating to Escape of Women Sentenced to the Maine State Prison" (H. P. 799) (L. D. 1076) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1116) (L. D. 1523) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Reports were read and accepted, the New Drafts read twice and assigned the next legislative day.

Ought to Pass Printed Bills

Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Bernard from the Committee on Business Legislation reported "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Insurance on Public Buildings" (H. P. 852) (L. D. 1150)

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Berry of Cape Elizabeth, tabled pending acceptance and specially assigned for Thursday, May 13.)

Mr. Binnette from the Committee on Health and Institutional Services reported "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act to Revise the Laws Relating to the Support of Persons in State Institutions" (H. P. 691) (L. D. 928)

Mr. Levesque from the Committee on Labor reported same on Bill "An Act Providing for a Fair Employment Practice Act" (H. P. 896) (L. D. 1206)

Reports were read and accepted, the Bills read twice and assigned the next legislative day.

Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment

Mr. Dudley from the Committee on Highways on Resolve Authorizing Construction of Bridge to Quigg Island in Stevens Pond, Waldo County (H. P. 1095) (L. D. 1495) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Resolve read once.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1095, L. D. 1495, Resolve, Authorizing Construction of Bridge to Quigg Island in Stevens Pond, Waldo County.

Amend said Resolve by striking out the period at the end and inserting in place thereof the following:

‘; and be it further

Resolved: That the height and construction of said bridge to be approved by the State Park and Recreation Commission.’

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Resolve assigned for second reading the next legislative day.

Mr. Wight from the Committee on Towns and Counties on Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of Superior Court Messenger of Cumberland County" (H. P. 784) (L. D. 1037) which was recommitted, 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. 784, L. D. 1037, Bill, "An Act Increasing Salary of Superior Court Messenger of Cumberland County."

Amend said Bill in the next to last line by striking out the underlined figure "\$7,000" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure '\$5,500'

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill assigned

for third reading the next legislative day.

Mr. Blouin from the Committee on Veterans and Military Affairs on Resolve Designating Certain Bridges of the Interstate System as "Veterans Memorial Bridges" (H. P. 680) (L. D. 907) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Resolve read once.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 680, L. D. 907, Resolve, Designating Certain Bridges of the Interstate System as "Veterans Memorial Bridges."

Amend said Resolve by adding at the end the following: ‘, and be it further

Resolved: That the subject matter of this resolve be referred to the 103rd Legislature for appropriate naming of bridges after heroic Maine veterans of foreign wars or conflicts.’

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Resolve assigned for second reading the next legislative day.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Business Legislation reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to Establish Savings Bank Life Insurance" (H. P. 992) (L. D. 1373)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. BERNARD of Penobscot
BROWN of Hancock
CARTER of Kennebec
— of the Senate.

Messrs. McKINNON

of South Portland
FECTEAU of Biddeford
SCOTT of Wilton
LABERGE of Auburn
AVERY of Kittery
BERNARD of Sanford

—of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. HARRIMAN of Hollis
— of the House.

Reports were read.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill produced the best attended hearing of the session. Of the state's approximately fifteen hundred insurance agents, I guessed that nearly one-half of them tried to squeeze into Room 105. Nevertheless, numbers alone don't frighten me and I still believe that this is excellent legislation for the average working man and woman in the State of Maine.

I mentioned to one of our fellow legislators that I thought that this was going to be one of the most controversial bills to come before this session of the Legislature and he said to me, no, not at all. I said you don't really believe it is going to be controversial? He said no, I don't believe you could call it controversial because I don't believe that anybody is for it. Well, I find that hard to believe and at least the sponsors would like to present their case.

At the outset, let me state that I certainly have nothing against insurance salesmen or agents. Furthermore, I certainly do not want to take any irresponsible action that might be detrimental to their personal business. However, I do feel that there is a need and a place for the special service proposed today in the interest of our lower income families. I believe that everyone will admit that we should encourage this group to save wherever possible. Also, we should urge that they buy insurance for the added protection for their families. This bill purports to do just that with the introduction of low cost savings bank insurance.

However, aside from this point, we have one other aspect which we feel is important—an individual's freedom of choice. You may purchase all other forms of insurance directly from the company if you so desire. With life insurance they do not give you this choice. The agency system is the chosen

sales philosophy of the life insurance companies. I do not question but that this is normally the soundest method of conducting their business. Still I do maintain that a person should have the opportunity to choose the alternative method if he so desires.

The opponents had many arguments at the hearing. For instance, they said that we were trying to put them out of business, that it really was not low cost insurance, and that savings banks have no place in the insurance business. I think that this last statement is worthy of comment. If it were really true, then what are the big insurance companies doing in the banking business today? When I say "in the business" it may not actually be defined as such, but the two are certainly somewhat compatible in the many services offered. For instance—insurance companies encourage leaving money with the company even when the policy is paid up or upon death to earn interest. They suggest that dividends be left to also earn interest. They comprise one of the largest lending agencies in the U. S. today. I say these two businesses are very similar in their basic concepts. Insurance companies endeavor to earn enough on their investments to cover their interest and then pay claims when they are due. Savings banks strive to earn enough from their investments to cover their interest and pay withdrawals when these are presented. Saving is insurance of a sort and certainly life insurance is a form of saving.

The opposition suggested that this is just a scheme to take money out of their own pockets. Several years ago I believe that they used the same argument relative to Social Security. I also understand that later they said the same thing when National Service Life Insurance was proposed. Of course this did not materialize in either case. Here is an important premise which I believe they missed entirely. Both of these programs really tended to make the public more aware of insurance. In reality they stimulated the purchase of much additional coverage. I

have always contended that the more we make people insurance conscious the more it will help everyone's cause rather than be a deterrent.

To me, some of their arguments sounded strange. On one hand they said that it just cannot work, while on the other they maintain it will ruin their business. We must remember that the whole purpose of our plan is designed to benefit the low income group. I was most interested to have one of my agents tell me recently that his company was not the slightest bit worried about this proposal. He added that, of course, this was aimed at an entirely different group of customers. He stated that the end result would surely not raise havoc with either the industry or agents, since we were not luring present customers away but only striving toward a new market which had been neglected because it was not profitable enough to be attractive.

Not all insurance companies are fighting the plan. Some are forward enough thinking to view the proposal as a legitimate facet of the business, albeit small. In this instance the Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance Company has agreed to be direct insurer of the Connecticut Savings Banks Plan for Life Insured Mortgages. This company has extended its full cooperation to these savings banks in the development of this most worthwhile low cost insurance plan.

Much has been said about the Massachusetts Plan. However, at the present time there are thirty-six issuing banks and all but four of the remaining one hundred and forty-five are agency banks. The cost is definitely cheaper and the plan has been a decided benefit to all citizens. If the commercial companies have had to effect efficiencies to stay in competition, I doubt if any persons could really find fault with this basic concept of our free enterprise system.

The opposition mentioned other faults such as: They said that Massachusetts has been assisted in four or five areas. They said that New York is not actually cheaper and that their costs are not prorated accurately. As to the bill

itself, in committee they said it was hastily drawn, vague, contradictory, unconstitutional, redundant, repetitious and ridiculous.

Going through the bill they condemned it section by section, from re-insurance, fuzzy limits, advances to surplus fund to the purchase of stock in an organization called The Company. The proponents then argued that they were wrong or misinformed in each case. But, I would like to comment only on the last statement, the organization called The Company.

The Savings Bank Life Insurance Company has been organized as a part of the Interstate Plan to carry mortality risk and provide actuarial and medical service. This has been in operation over a year and now makes it possible for any Mutual Savings Bank to participate in the sale of over-the-counter insurance. Under the Interstate Plan of re-insurance provided by the company, the savings banks issue the policies and receive premiums from their policy holders. The savings banks retain the investment portion of the premiums and pay the company the mortality portion. When a policy holder dies, the bank releases the investment portion (called reserve) and receives payment from the company for the difference between the reserve and the face amount of the policy.

In summary, our primary interest is the lower paid workman. We only want to stimulate his savings habits. We do not expect the business to be too profitable. The whole idea is in line with our basic philosophy "savings banks should encourage thrift and saving, not only as a moral way of life, but a stimulant to character in the realization of increased security for one's family. Savings bank life insurance can only enhance these commendable ideals!"

I now move that we accept the minority report.

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

Mr. BERNARD: Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House: You have heard quite an orator this morning. We heard him too. We

heard Mr. Ross for an hour. We heard Mr. Trafton from Lewiston for two hours. Now he stands here on the floor of the House this morning and tells you that he is worried about the poor people of the State of Maine. Gentlemen, if he was worried for one second about the poor people in the State of Maine, this bill would never have been introduced in the Legislature. Now let's not talk about costs. He didn't give you any prices, how much this was going to be. He said it was going to be a saving. I say a saving to who? Now you know that most of the people who buy policies up to five thousand are poor people. I know that the people in the high income bracket don't worry about this. They buy policies of a hundred thousand, fifty thousand and they can't buy this from the bank. I would only ask the members of the House to consider just what is going to happen if the people of the State of Maine, the poor people, have to go to the banks to pay these insurance premiums weekly or monthly.

The people are starting Christmas Clubs now. Half of them let them go. The people in the State of Maine, the poor class of people, most of the time when their premium is due they have to tell the insurance man, I'm sorry I can't pay you a \$1.20 this week, will you come next week? That same insurance man comes the following week, maybe in the afternoon. He goes back at night. He is not only worried about the amount that he is going to receive in commission, he is worried about the lapse on this insurance. I say to you members of the House, if this bill goes through you will have thousands of poor people in the State of Maine after six months that won't even have an insurance policy to bury a member of their family.

If we are worrying about the people, the working people of the State of Maine, we have fifteen hundred brokers in the State of Maine, licensed insurance men. We have a hundred—he mentioned one company, one company that would go along with this, we have a hundred and forty insurance

companies in the State of Maine. I don't know how most of the people in this House feel, but I just want to tell you ladies and gentlemen not to worry about the difference in price. Worry about, are the people going to have insurance or not after six months?

I move, ladies and gentlemen, that this bill and all its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair at this time would like to recognize in the balcony of the House twenty-seven pupils of the seventh grade and twenty-two pupils of the eighth grade History Class at Greene Central School, in Greene, Maine. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Jack B. Lee and Mr. Richard Gorman and their chaperone Mrs. David Wheeler and Vicky. They are the guests of the gentleman from Webster, Mr. Wood. On behalf of the House the Chair welcomes this group and we hope that your visit will be both educational and enjoyable. (Applause)

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

Mr. SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I am amazed at some of the statements made here in this House. I have had experience selling insurance, but this morning I want to agree with that very smart, friendly, liberal progressive Republican, probably one of the future governors of this state, the learned gentleman from Bath.

The SPEAKER: The House will be at ease for a few moments.

House at Ease

Called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Before proceeding the Chair would like to recognize in the balcony of the House one hundred five pupils of the fifth, sixth and eighth grades of the Poland Community School, accompanied by their teachers, Mr. F. Yates, Mrs. Meserve, Mr. Cassidy, and Mrs. Knudson, and their chaperones, Mrs. Jones, Mrs. Jor-

dan, Mrs. McCleary, Mrs. Dunn, Mrs. Ross, Mrs. Strout, Mrs. Sawyer, Mrs. Culleton and Mrs. Mathews. They are the guests of the gentleman from Mechanic Falls, Mr. Benson. On behalf of the House the Chair welcomes this group and we hope that your visit will be both enjoyable and educational. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Sullivan, may continue.

Mr. SULLIVAN: May I ask the Clerk if he has that down.

I want this to go down for posterity. The gentleman I agree with one hundred per cent, Mr. Ross, from Bath. I happened to have been born in that great State of Massachusetts and that saving bank insurance has been in effect there for many years and is very successful. And I know something about having been poor. I went to work at thirteen for three bucks a week and when some of those representing the insurance companies come in there and make many statements that were slanted, camouflaged and distorted and many of them proved to me that they didn't know what they were talking about.

Now, then, I am going to take a little of the other side of it to reply to some of their remarks. The insurance companies have piled up tremendous amounts of surplus and reserves and I have given some of them over the years one hundred cent dollars and I am going to get back probably about forty cent dollars. They have piled up such tremendous reserves that the insurance stocks have increased in value more than any other group in the stock market. Now I have nothing against them, but let's get them back to something that is just, fair and equitable. Back as I remember it in Grover Cleveland's administration, that great, smart, liberal Democratic president, he asked for an investigation of the insurance companies. As a result poor people are getting more for their money. They took away from them before that time everything

they paid in without giving them anything in return.

Now, I suggest to you people, that you go down and there is an investment company on the street floor of the Eastland Hotel, and they have had for at least a couple of years, maybe longer—it's still up there, advising people how much money they could have made, as I recall the figures generally if they put in a hundred dollars, it is now worth something like forty thousand dollars. Why? Because they haven't lowered their rates. I am talking now about life insurance. So maybe what we need is an investigation of the insurance companies.

Now to get back to that bill. That bill in an unusually good bill and just because as we have in many instances here in this House these strong, vested interests who as far as I have been able to observe are always in for more. They get too selfish, greedy. So I ask, and this particularly affects this savings banks bill, particularly affects lower income people, and there are probably three times as many of those low income people in the Democratic Party. So if you are anxious to do something for the lower income people, and that generally speaking is the policy of the Democratic Party, you will follow Mr. Ross and have this savings bank bill go through. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mexico, Mr. Fraser.

Mr. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I want to ask what the people would think of an insurance company if they left their surplus tied up in a cement box some place and did not reinvest it. They have to invest, otherwise the insurance rates would be much higher than what they are.

I wish to concur with my friend from Sanford, Mr. Bernard, in his remarks regarding conservation. I spent thirty-six years of my life in the debit life insurance business. All people who are acquainted with life insurance know that the biggest part of the debit insurance man's life is spent

among these so-called low income people. I believe that between twenty-five and fifty percent of people who do get into the banks to buy life insurance will allow their policies to lapse within two years. They will end up with lapsed policies. The bank won't make any money, because it costs money to issue these policies. The policy holder will lose money because he has paid premiums on policies which are no more any good. So, these same low cost income people will end up losing money rather than saving it.

We have heard also in the hearing that one of the ways that banks will sell insurance at a lower premium is by eliminating the agent's commission. To me that is ridiculous. Because in eliminating the agent's commission you also have to eliminate the agent. He certainly isn't going to work for nothing. He can't. To replace the agent you are going to need somebody on the other side of that counter who knows something about life insurance. He will also have to know about the many plans that are available to a prospect. That kind of a person isn't going to work for the minimum wage that we argued about here a week ago, at a dollar and a quarter an hour. He is going to need to be paid.

While he is interviewing the prospect someone else comes in and wants to pay a premium, there will have to be somebody there to take that premium, receipt for it, give him credit on the books and account for the money. Those two people behind the counter will more than offset the savings from the agent's commission. So, that lets that out. The rest of the administrative costs are practically the same, just plain overhead, so that over a period of twenty years there aren't more than a few cents difference in net cost of all policies sold.

Therefore, I want to go along with the gentleman from Sanford in hoping for this bill to be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Graham.

Mr. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have the honor to be the co-sponsor of this bill. This is not a hairbrain theory that we want to test, but a tried and true procedure that has proved itself over the years and in many places. The savings banks of Massachusetts have been selling life insurance since 1908, other states, since World War II. Nearly a million people have savings bank life insurance. Despite wars and depressions no savings bank life insurance agency has ever failed. Nowadays we buy all kinds of insurance over the counter. Why not life insurance? The bank employees who handle the life insurance will have to pass the same examination as the regular life insurance agents have to pass.

Opponents of this bill shed crocodile tears over the threat that savings bank life insurance offers their depositors in savings banks. Let them save their tears. There is absolutely no danger, because this law provides that a bank's ordinary deposits must be kept separate from its life insurance deposits. There will be the argument that the savings bank life insurance will be so good that it will run the agents out of business. This is absurd. More than fifty years in business in Massachusetts savings bank life insurance total less than five percent of the insurance policies in force. In the other states the percentage is even smaller than the savings bank insurance policies have of the total life insurance in force.

The truth is, that this cheap, safe, over-the-counter insurance has a top limit of five thousand and it is for the thrifty of modest means who probably wouldn't be interested in ordinary life insurance anyway. In other words, it taps a market that has been largely neglected. In short, ladies and gentlemen, we the proponents of this bill believe that the savings bank life insurance will

be a godsend to thousands and thousands of Maine people. To deny it them will be to favor a special interest at the expense of the public good, but nobody, absolutely nobody will be hurt by this bill and the people of Maine will benefit enormously. Are we going to consider the people of Maine or obey the orders of a single lobby? I urge you to kill the motion of the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Bernard and give this bill a chance.

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

Mr. BENSON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: If the banks are expected to do no more business than has been indicated by the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Graham, it would be hardly worth their while to repaint the counter and prepare to sell the insurance in the first place. I think the other co-sponsor, the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, has already given us all of the adjectives that I could possibly drum up which would describe the bad features of the bill and therefore I won't attempt to duplicate that.

I hope that you listen carefully to the remarks of the gentleman from Mexico, Mr. Fraser. I think that was a very clear, concise explanation of this situation represented in this savings bank life insurance bill. Insurance bought over-the-counter is not serviced by a full time agent and therefore the lapse rate would be atrociously high. This bill would permit Maine savings banks to operate a life insurance business as a mere side line to their banking business, without forming a true life insurance company, without being clearly subject to the Maine insurance laws, without adequate capitalization to independently meet their own insurance obligations and without the same state regulation which applies to the life insurance companies. This is neither in the public interest nor is it fair to the one hundred and thirty life insurance companies now serving the Maine public and

the fifteen hundred life insurance agents now earning a living in Maine.

I would urge you to support the motion to indefinitely postpone. Thank you.

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

Mr. SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: A couple of individuals in this Legislature who want this bill killed as far as I know, and from their statements here I believe that none of them—the two gentlemen, I am referring to Mr. Fraser and the gentleman from Sanford, I wonder if they can read a statement. I don't believe they can and already in this Legislature I have heard about using approximately half of the reserve of the State of Maine, or would you want to call it reserve or surplus, to do what is necessary to do in this state. And the same thing applies to these insurance companies.

I suggest to Mr. Fraser and Mr. Bernard that they get the statements of these insurance companies, and they have reserves sometimes all the way from a hundred to five hundred times the reserve of the State of Maine and if it is good business, and it is, to use half of the reserve surplus in the State of Maine instead of putting on additional taxes, the same thing applies to these powerful insurance companies. They are piling up so much money in reserve, they are piling up so much money in surplus, and they are adding so fast to the already tremendously high salaries of their presidents and Board of Directors, and very, very frankly I am going to try to have introduced in Congress an investigation of these big insurance companies. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Woolwich, Mr. Harvey.

Mr. HARVEY: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I hadn't intended to get entangled in this this morning, but being with John Hancock for fourteen odd years before I resigned from the com-

pany, I believe I would be a little remiss if I didn't say a few words.

First, life insurance isn't set up to be a savings although it is, it can be considered in many cases a savings — it is protection. Now if the banks are limited to five thousand dollars they will have to pay a reasonable premium somewhere near five thousand dollars worth of premium in comparison with the insurance companies. However, with a regular insurance company a person for a lot less money could buy a twenty-five thousand dollar policy and be protected up to ten thousand dollars. They say that this group is the neglected group up to five thousand dollars worth of protection. Ladies and gentlemen, this group is the best service group, not only in Maine but in the United States.

The years I had that old, big debit book underneath my arm going back for a quarter, twenty-five cents, a buck, if they couldn't pay one week — but I had enough care for those people to make the repeat trip at the expense to me and my automobile. Every two years you have got to buy a new automobile and this is spent not just in collecting premiums but in service. About seventy percent of the debit agent's time is spent in service, not selling. That is why a debit agent will never get rich selling life insurance.

Now my big objection, I sold an awful lot of insurance because of bank loans. A person goes to a bank in this lower class, the loan must be insured and the insurance must be on the applicant's life. Now you give me a plush chair at a bank and a lever like a man coming in for a loan, the first question is who do you have your insurance covered with and how much? Well, if he has got ten thousand dollars, in two minutes I can show him where he needs another five. Give me one year with a bank, with that chair in the bank and a lever of people coming in for loans to insure those loans, and I will make my ambition come true, sell a million dollars worth of life insurance in one

year. That is an unfair lever to any agent.

Now, in the past, the bank or the applicant for a loan calls up his local insurance agent, or if you are on a debit you will contact him, you can go down and go over his plans, go over his income and if he can't afford a five thousand dollar policy, you can sell him a thousand dollar policy and attach a rider giving him seven thousand five hundred dollars worth of protection for a lot less money than the original five thousand dollars the bank can sell him of straight life insurance.

Now the banks can't give this service. If these people get in a tight spot, they can't make three or four premiums to the bank, the bank isn't going to get into their automobile and get out to the house of this class of people, knock on the door and see why they can't go out and sell a few beer bottles to get another fifty cents to keep their insurance from lapsing. They are going to send a notice and after four weeks they are going to lapse it. And those people will not go to the bank and reinstate it. I have worked with them for fourteen years, I know.

So, I think it is unfair to the agent, especially the debit agent, and where that class of people are the best service in Maine and the United States, I go along with the motion to indefinitely postpone this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Saco, Mr. Bedard.

Mr. BEDARD: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I didn't intend to say too much in regard to this bill. When they stand up and tell us here that the collector will come to your house and collect your insurance he will protect you. I want to remind you gentlemen that I have been insured with Metropolitan Insurance Company for fifty years and forty years of it I have gone to the office and paid my premium. Another thing that was mentioned here, the bank will be like anybody else, they won't let a customer down. And right now, the

Metropolitan Insurance Company will not take a weekly premium insurance. My daughter has an agent that comes to her house to insure her boy for five hundred dollars and he said we are not taking any more weekly premiums on five hundred dollars. Why does the insurance company worry about the gentleman going to the bank and paying his premium? I am already doing it. The insurance company now has put the step in that they will not come and collect your insurance, so why should we worry about it? I am in favor of the bank insurance.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to rise on a bill of this nature. I probably am not as able a speaker as the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Sullivan. However, I do have a few comments and one question. First of all let me say that I am not in the insurance business, I am also not in the banking business, but I am in business and I do welcome competition; and for that reason I would tend to support the bill and not the motion to indefinitely postpone. I feel as though if I had anything to sell it would be something like the question I would ask would be of this House, is insurance good? And I am quite sure the answer would be yes, insurance is good. Now, if the answer was yes that insurance is good, I would be of the opinion that the more people sold it the better off the people in the State of Maine would be. I would make an illustration similar to Proctor and Gamble, got to be quite a company, and we will say a popular soap like Lux or something, it is sold in every store, the store across the street has it. I don't think it hurts competition because it has made the name quite popular. I think insurance is the same. If you had more agents, you'd have more people insurance-minded and it wouldn't put anybody out of business, it might even expand the insurance business. My question that I had to ask and it hasn't been answered here. I understand that these companies

that want to sell insurance would have to be licensed and I understand the fee is twenty-five dollars. Am I thinking right when I say that these new companies that would be under this bill selling insurance would pay the same fee as the others? And that would be my question. Thanks.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Winthrop, Mrs. Baker.

Mrs. BAKER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: If this bill would help the people in the lower income bracket as my colleague, the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, states, then I must certainly represent this wonderful group of people in my four towns. I have had more correspondence on this bill from constituents in my four towns than on any one other single bill. All of them want this bill to pass. Some of the letters are from families that enjoyed this privilege in another state and had wished to continue the same plan in this state. Shouldn't we abide somewhat by the wishes of the rank and file citizens of this state?

I emphatically agree with the sponsors of this bill and hope you will defeat the motion to indefinitely postpone this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Graham.

Mr. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I would like to answer a few questions that have been raised on this. This bill does subject the savings bank life insurance agencies to all the insurance laws of the state and all the insurance taxes of the state. Savings banks selling life insurance would pay the same taxes as the insurance companies. Another thing, we have heard complaints about the surrenders that would go on, the holders that would have to surrender their policies. Let me point out that the savings banks have a record of paying the highest surrender values of any insurance company. Second, that the Massachusetts Life Insurance Company has the lowest cost of any life insurance in the world. The argument against the bill really boils down to two things which

are self-contradictory, that this program will fail and drag the savings banks down with it and two, it will be so successful that it will drive all the insurance companies out of business. Neither one is true.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes gentleman from Hollis, Mr. Harriman.

Mr. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: As a signer of the minority report, I want to justify my position. Somebody spoke this morning about the banks, about being worried about the poor people. The mutual savings banks originally were organized for the lower income groups, that is the purpose of their existence. That has been the purpose of their existence through the years.

They talk about insurance policies lapsing quicker at the bank than they would with an insurance company, this I cannot buy. If you will notice that in the records of all of the savings banks that there are very few mortgages which have to be foreclosed. This is because of an amortization plan. Now, they talk about the cost of insurance. I think that the public should be given a choice. If they don't want to pay for the service, I don't think they should have to. I have before me a paper comparing the cost of thirteen leading insurance companies. Out of these thirteen there was only one that is less than the cost of savings bank life insurance in the State of Connecticut. They run from a low of \$2.21 per thousand, per cost yearly on the basis of dividends, cash value and so forth, up to a high of \$9.01. Now, the lowest is the Northwestern Mutual with \$2.21. The second is the Connecticut Savings Bank with \$2.28 and if I remembered correctly the only reason Northwestern Mutual is lower is because I think they have a minimum policy of ten thousand dollars. It think it is a good bill. I think the public should have a choice. And I hope that it goes through.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wilton, Mr. Scott.

Mr. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think you are getting away from the bill. There is much emphasis being placed on the savings to the poor working man. The way this bill is drawn the responsibility is divided between the insurance department and the bank commissioner. Neither one is responsible for the overseeing of this legislation if it goes through. The sponsors have told us that the savings bank life insurance is a tested and tried experiment. The fact remains that this bill is untested and the Connecticut Life Insurance Company which is so deeply a part of this bill is only two years old and even now is in some danger of not being able to fulfill the commitment under the bill. For this reason, I hope that you go along with the motion for indefinite postponement.

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

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: It might be helpful to see just what this savings bank life insurance is doing in the other states. I think probably you know that in Massachusetts it was promoted by a very fine humanitarian, Louis Brandeis, who later was to become one of our fine Supreme Court Justices of the United States. At that time he was acting as a lawyer for the Policy Holders Protective Association, as they were having an investigation of the whole insurance industry called the Armstrong Investigation in 1905 in New York State. The particular investigation centered on this debit business, house to house business. And there were some inequities there that had to be straightened out and they were. So, he returned to Massachusetts and became interested in doing something for the poor people in the matter of insurance. And finally with the help of the state, this savings bank life insurance was started in Massachusetts, with issuing a policy with five hundred dollars maximum amount, five hundred dollars.

It has been successful in Massachusetts. They now are selling to any individual in Massachusetts

thirty-eight thousand dollars of life insurance. One of the reasons for its success in Massachusetts was the fact that it was heavily subsidized by the state. The state house was the home office. They had a medical director there. They had instructors that went from the state house out into the populace to stir up and advertise this business. And the state—this business started in 1907, and the state subsidized it until 1934.

In New York, Louis Brandeis's granddaughter got a group together, entered a bill in the New York Legislature in 1934. It was opposed by the insurance industry because of the bill, not the idea. As far as I can read, the insurance industry has never opposed savings bank life insurance if it is set up on the same basis of competition that the life insurance business is itself.

So what has happened to the savings bank life insurance in New York State? Twenty-five percent of the savings banks in New York State have not joined it and ninety-five percent of the business done by savings bank life insurance in New York State is done by a few large banks in the area of New York City.

Connecticut, and these are the only three states that have this savings bank life insurance, Connecticut, New York and Massachusetts. All the other states that have savings banks have turned it down. In Connecticut forty percent of the banks are not affiliated with the savings bank life insurance. The four large savings banks in Hartford, Connecticut have never joined the association. Today, after fifty years, the total volume of savings bank life insurance is about the same volume of life insurance of a rather small company, that's Union Mutual Life Company of the State of Maine. So it hasn't become a terrific success and it's demonstrable that where it has had its success is in the large population areas and centers.

Now, here is the New York Times, some pages from the Sunday financial section of the New York Times and they were talking

about the insurance business. And they are a little worried about the insurance business in New York State at this time, because since 1950 there has been a great proliferation of new companies, fifteen hundred companies have started since 1950. Fifteen hundred new life insurance companies and out of that number six hundred and thirty-one no longer exist. The commissioner of insurance in New York is considering raising a reserve from five hundred thousand to seven hundred and fifty thousand.

No insurance man is afraid of competition and no insurance man would be afraid to compete against the savings bank life insurance in Maine. The point is if I were a director of a savings bank I would consider very carefully before I got into that business at this time in the State of Maine. Maine is not a heavily populated area and if it was successful in Maine it would violate the experience of savings bank life insurance in other states. But, I think what the insurance man is opposing is this type of a bill. Because it is just a front for an insurance company in Connecticut, a stock insurance company which was set up two years ago, and in the Legislature of Connecticut right now is Senate Paper 690 introduced by a senator to restrict the reinsuring of this Connecticut stock company of risks outside the state.

We have on our desks this morning, I got a notice of a hearing to see about setting up the Community Life Insurance Company, a new company that wants to open in Maine. Now, if they are granted a charter they will have to put up two hundred thousand dollars to start out, in reserve. As a home company, they would be entitled to a tax exemption or a tax break. Domestic companies, and we have two, are taxed at one percent of their premiums. All foreign companies, these hundred and thirty-three foreign companies that do business in the State of Maine, are taxed at two percent. If we set up this front according to this bill, for the savings banks of Maine, they you see would not be insuring their own risks, they

would simply transfer twenty thousand dollars from their bank department to their insurance department and they would be in business and that would entitle them also to have a one percent tax on their premiums instead of two.

Now, if the bill is reviewed and here is a fifty page brief put out by the insurance company, here is a fifty page brief put out by the savings bank life insurance proponents. I have another brief here which goes through the bill section by section and there are many questions about this particular bill. And I can imagine why in 1934 the President of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company opposed the New York Savings Bank life insurance bill, but did accept the bill and approve it in 1938 after it was written and all the factors in it brought the competition up on the same level.

I don't think I am going to change your mind. I don't think perhaps any of the other speakers have changed your minds. I think perhaps you decided how you were going to vote on this when you came in this morning, but as to the cost. I have some figures here which are taken from your flip graph which is the trade bible book, record and it shows that John Hancock, Massachusetts Mutual, Northwestern Mutual are all lower costs than savings bank life insurance. I might mention this one thing, it would be possible the way this bill is written for an individual buying group insurance also, which is not sold over the counter, but which will be taken to the industries and sold, it would be possible for one individual to get upwards of sixty thousand dollars through the Maine savings bank. I think I am going to sit down.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Phillips, Mr. Palmer.

Mr. PALMER: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I am not going to debate this question one way or the other but there are some facts that I would like to give you. Any insurance company wishing to do business in the State of Maine that will meet with the laws and rules and regulations

of the department, will be issued a charter so that they are in business. Mr. Sullivan spoke of reserves and surpluses. There is a distinct difference between the two. I think this is where it comes in. The savings bank life insurance as has been pointed out will only sell a very small part of the percentage of life insurance sold, but on the reserve end, this is the amount of money set aside for the payments of losses. This is the thing that the banks of Maine are concerned with because twenty percent is set aside for future payments and I have been told by some bank officials that they aren't concerned with the amount of life insurance sold so much as they are with the money that will be left with the banks that they might use.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wilton, Mr. Scott.

Mr. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We have had good debate on this bill and I don't think we'll change any minds. I now move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Wilton, Mr. Scott, now moves the previous question. For the Chair to entertain the motion for the previous question, it must have the expressed desire of one-third of the members present. All those in favor of entertaining the motion for the previous question will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than one-third having arisen, the motion for the previous question is in order. The question before the House now is shall the main question be put and this is debatable for no more than five minutes and the merits of the bill are not debatable. All those in favor of the main question being put now will say aye; all those opposed will say no.

A viva voce vote being taken the motion prevailed.

Mr. Bernard of Sanford requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Bernard, requests a division.

Mr. Graham of Freeport requested a roll call.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Graham, requests that when the vote is taken that it be taken by the yeas and nays. The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Bernard, that this bill and its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one-fifth of the members present. All those in favor of having the vote taken by the yeas and nays 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 of the members having arisen the yeas and nays are not in order. The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Bernard, that this bill and its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed and he has requested a division.

All those in favor of this Bill "An Act to Establish Savings Bank Life Insurance," House Paper 992, L. D. 1373, and all its accompanying papers 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.

Eighty-two having voted in the affirmative and forty having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed. Sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Ross of Bath was granted unanimous consent to address the House briefly.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I would just like the House to realize that we the sponsors are certainly not angry. We know the banks will not be angry. They will forgive those who voted against it. I am sure they will be delighted to accept your savings nevertheless and

grant mortgage money within legal limits.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would at this time like to recognize in the balcony of the House twenty-eight pupils of the seventh and eighth grades of the Minot Consolidated School at Minot. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Kennett and Chapcrones Mr. D'Amour, Mrs. Charlene Nason and Mrs. Jones. They are the guests of the gentleman from Mechanic Falls, Mr. Benson. On behalf of the House the Chair welcomes this group and we hope that your visit will be both educational and enjoyable. (Applause)

Mr. Gillan of South Portland presented the following Order out of order and moved its passage:

WHEREAS, Captain J. Edward Marks has completed forty years of service with the State Police Department, and

WHEREAS, his service has been in keeping with the highest traditions of dedicated law enforcement, and

WHEREAS, his determination, fearlessness and leadership have enabled the State Police Detective Bureau to compile a most enviable record; now, therefore,

BE IT ORDERED, that this body pay proper tribute to Captain Marks and his many years of meritorious and faithful service, and that the Clerk of the House be directed to send an attested copy of this Order to Captain Marks.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would like to inform the members of the House that Captain Marks is the only remaining member of the original State Police. He has been with the organization since the Department was formed. And I understand that Captain Marks is in the rear of the House. Would he kindly stand? (Prolonged Applause, the members rising)

The Order received passage.

Mrs. Ruby of Bangor was granted unanimous consent to briefly address the House.

Mrs. RUBY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am ask-

ing the House to suspend any and all rules to especially honor the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. "J". I realize that this is an unusual request, but feel that Mr. "J" is like a fixture of the House, having served for so many sessions faithfully and honestly. This state and the members of this House can be very proud to have such a devoted man within its walls.

Whereupon the Honorable Louis Jalbert was presented with a birthday cake and gift amid applause.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Thank you very kindly, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I was talking to someone this morning concerning my birthday, and years ago, the honor or dishonor used to go to Judge McGlauffin of Portland, and every time that he wished me a Happy Birthday and went into a long dissertation about the virtues of Louie Jalbert, five minutes later he was on the Floor clobbering me on another measure.

I sincerely want to thank you very kindly. I believe I am not at a loss for words, but I take my legislative duties somewhat seriously. I kick up a little dust once in a while, but believe me, the Legislature is part of my life. I once was not a member during my twenty years, and I was lobbying, I was doing very well, successfully both ways, financially and successfully, and I was enjoying it, but I quickly gave it up and got my circulation papers out and ran again. The Legislature is certainly a great deal of my life. I want to thank you very, very kindly.

The SPEAKER: The Chair at this time would request the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, to open his present so it will satisfy the curiosity of all of us.

Mr. JALBERT: A seat belt !! (Applause)

The SPEAKER: The House will be in order. We will continue with the business of the day.

Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Taxation reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to Establish a Voluntary Contributions Commission" (H. P. 161) (L. D. 183)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. MAXWELL of Franklin
WILLEY of Hancock
— of the Senate.

Messrs. WOOD of Webster
COTTRELL of Portland
HANSON of Gardiner
CURRAN of Bangor
DRIGOTAS of Auburn
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. LETOURNEAU of York
— of the Senate.

Messrs. ROSS of Bath
MARTIN of Eagle Lake
— of the House.

Reports were read.

(On motion of Mr. Levesque of Madawaska, tabled pending acceptance of either Report and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 11.)

Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Taxation reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Increasing State Tax in Unorganized Territory" (H. P. 605) (L. D. 797)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. MAXWELL of Franklin
WILLEY of Hancock
LETOURNEAU of York
— of the Senate.

Messrs. MARTIN of Eagle Lake
CURRAN of Bangor
DRIGOTAS of Auburn
ROSS of Bath
COTTRELL of Portland
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WOOD of Webster

HANSON of Gardiner
—of the House.

Reports were read.

(On motion of Mr. Levesque of Madawaska, tabled pending acceptance of either Report and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 11.)

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act to Increase Cigarette Tax Two Cents" (H. P. 606) (L. D. 798) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. LETOURNEAU of York
WILLEY of Hancock
—of the Senate.

Messrs. DRIGOTAS of Auburn
COTTRELL of Portland
CURRAN of Bangor
WOOD of Webster
MARTIN of Eagle Lake
HANSON of Gardiner
ROSS of Bath
—of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. MAXWELL of Franklin
—of the Senate.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Levesque of Madawaska the Majority "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. 606, L. D. 798, Bill, "An Act to Increase Cigarette Tax Two Cents."

Amend said Bill in section 3 by striking out in the last line the underlined figure "2¼%" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure "2½%"

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Taxation reporting "Ought

not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Definition of Farm Tractor under Sales and Use Tax Law" (H. P. 718) (L. D. 956)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. MAXWELL of Franklin
LETOURNEAU of York
WILLEY of Hancock
—of the Senate.

Messrs. CURRAN of Bangor
HANSON of Gardiner
WOOD of Webster
DRIGOTAS of Auburn
ROSS of Bath
—of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. COTTRELL of Portland
MARTIN of Eagle Lake
—of the House.

Reports were read.

(On motion of Mr. Dunn of Denmark, tabled pending acceptance of either report and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 11.)

Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Taxation reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Sales Tax on Farm Machinery and Equipment" (H. P. 856) (L. D. 1153)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. MAXWELL of Franklin
LETOURNEAU of York
WILLEY of Hancock
— of the Senate.

Messrs. CURRAN of Bangor
HANSON of Gardiner
WOOD of Webster
DRIGOTAS of Auburn
ROSS of Bath
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. COTTRELL of Portland
MARTIN of Eagle Lake
— of the House.

Reports were read.

(On motion of Mr. Levesque of Madawaska, tabled pending acceptance of either Report and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 11.)

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act to Reactivate Maine Committee on Problems of the Mentally Retarded" (S. P. 527) (L. D. 1505)

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

Bill "An Act relating to Sterilization of Bedding and Upholstered Furniture" (H. P. 343) (L. D. 446)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Poulin.

Mr. POULIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill L. D. 446 would be detrimental to approximately half a dozen very small businesses in this state. The last two lines of the bill would more or less force them to build a sterilization room, put in sterilizing equipment which would be unnecessary except for the inspectors' satisfaction. Most of these small businesses are using all new material, due to the fact that it is a lot cheaper than to mess around with used materials. When building a mattress they have the padding all cut out, it is all set up, and if you try to use old material you can't do a decent job.

Now I don't believe there is enough upholstered furniture manufactured in the State of Maine, there might be, there might be in the kitchen sets and things like that. Now they do have a bill on the books right now that states that you have to label your product, stating what the contents are, so they are liable to a law to govern the type of material that they use. So therefore, I move for indefinite post-

ponement of this bill and all accompanying papers.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Poulin, that this bill and its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Dumont.

Mr. DUMONT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This L. D. 446 was supported in Committee by the Retailers of Maine and many others. Mr. Poulin of Skowhegan was the only opposition. The bill received a unanimous ought to pass report from the committee.

Much has been said in this House supporting committee reports as strong as this one, and I hope the House will not support the depth charge just launched by Mr. Poulin, and that you will vote against his motion to indefinitely postpone this document, and when the vote is taken, I request a division.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Poulin, that this bill and its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of the indefinite postponement of this Bill "An Act relating to Sterilization of Bedding and Upholstered Furniture," H. P. 343, L. D. 446, will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Twenty-eight having voted in the affirmative and eighty-four having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Turner, Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. GILBERT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have it tabled until next Wednesday.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Turner, Mr. Gilbert, now moves this matter be tabled and specially assigned for next Wednesday pending its passage to be engrossed.

Mr. Dumont of Augusta requested a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested. All those in favor of this matter being tabled until next Wednesday will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Sixteen having voted in the affirmative and eighty-one having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

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

Bill "An Act relating to Trial Terms of Superior Court in Washington County" (H. P. 416) (L. D. 528)

Bill "An Act relating to Definition of Aid to Dependent Children" (H. P. 625) (L. D. 832)

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

Bill "An Act Creating a Second Assistant County Attorney for Androscoggin County" (H. P. 867) (L. D. 1164)

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

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

Mr. BUSSIERE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill L. D. 1464 calls for a second assistant county attorney. At the time of the hearing the county attorney mentioned that he didn't want no raise, but he would be pleased if we would give him a second assistant which he doesn't need.

I understand that the committee has gone along and knowing what is going on in Androscoggin County there, that would give him more time to work for urban renewal. In the Attorney General's office there is an increase in salary of \$1500 which the gentleman in question said that he didn't want no raise, but just the same he is going to get a raise of \$1500, and also \$1500 for the assistant county attorney.

I know for a fact there is no need of the second assistant. It's a waste of the taxpayers' money. The gentleman in question knew what the job was paying, and if he has got too much to do, well it is up to him either to give up urban renewal or the county attorney's office and I will now move that this bill be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Bussiere, that this bill be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Libhart.

Mr. LIBHART: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have made a look into the situation here and from everything I can find, there is a definite need of a second assistant in this county. There is a great deal of politics being played here at the expense of the present county attorney. He needs the help. He can't be in three places at once, he can't be in two places at once, and this is very frequently called for in these areas. You know we are in the process of giving the county attorney in Penobscot a second assistant for this very reason.

Now these people are being underpaid, all of them, and the least we can do for them is to give them enough help so that they can be in the various courts and won't have to try to be in three places at once. I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Drigotas.

Mr. DRIGOTAS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I personally know of this particular need of help for the county attorney. Now perhaps my nice colleague and wonderful friend from Lewiston believes otherwise, but I don't think that he has been in close association with him, and I earnestly urge, because of the necessity of this need, that the House would do this.

As he has pointed out, the respectful Representative Bussiere pointed out, he didn't ask for a raise himself, he just asked for assistance, and he needs it, and he is a capable fellow, and so

certainly I urge that this measure be passed.

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

Mr. BUSSIÈRE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I questioned that second assistant a few times and someone suggests to me why don't you go along and we will make another job for somebody, a good Democrat there. I don't agree wasting the taxpayer's money just to make another job. It is not necessary. Let him stay on the job. He will have plenty of time and if he has got too much work to do, he knew what the job was calling for when he ran for re-election last fall. It was up to him not to run. I don't blame Mr. Drigotas for fighting for the bill because he is the sponsor of the bill, but I am interested in saving the taxpayers money. It is a waste of money. Let him stay on the job. He will have still plenty of time left to do other things except sticking his nose where it don't belong.

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

Mr. MILLS: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Mills, moves the previous question. For the Chair to entertain the previous question it must have the expressed desire of one-third of the members present. All those in favor of entertaining the previous question will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously, more than one-third having arisen, the previous question is in order. The question before the House now is shall the main question be put now? This is debatable for no more than five minutes and the merits of the bill are not debatable.

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

Mr. LUND: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think perhaps that this matter is worthy of a bit more debate than

we have given it this morning, because I think the problem is one which is not simply the problem of Androscoggin County, but one which we have all over the state. It is difficult to discuss the matter of time of debate without going into the merits, but I do want to point out that we do have a pay bill on the last group of documents on our desks, and I think some consideration should be given to the total pay which will be paid to the county attorney's staff in Androscoggin County if this goes through. I think this is a matter which we should consider in the light of considerable interest that we have in this state for full-time county attorneys as opposed to part-time county attorneys, so I, for one, am opposed to ending debate at this time.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is shall the main question be put now? All those in favor of the main question being put now will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being doubted by the Chair, a division of the House was had.

Eighty-five having voted in the affirmative and thirty-five having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House now is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Bussiere, that this bill "An Act Creating a Second Assistant County Attorney for Androscoggin County," H. P. 867, L. D. 1164 be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. Libhart of Brewer requested a division.

The SPEAKER: All those in favor of this bill and its accompanying papers 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.

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

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

Mr. BUSSIÈRE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table this bill until next Tuesday.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Bussiere, now moves this bill be tabled until Tuesday next pending passage to be engrossed.

Mr. Drigotas of Auburn requested a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested. All those in favor of this matter being tabled until next Tuesday will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

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

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

Third Reader Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act relating to Optional Provisions in Individual Accident and Health Insurance Policies" (H. P. 972) (L. D. 1322)

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

(On motion of Mr. Evans of Freedom, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Thursday, May 13.)

Bill "An Act relating to Examinations as Registered Pharmacists by Assistant Pharmacists" (H. P. 1111) (L. D. 1517)

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

Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Require a Roll Call Vote Upon all Bills on Final Passage (H. P. 377) (L. D. 479)

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

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

Mr. BERRY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I don't want to take any time, but I think we didn't quite finish our little discussion yesterday on this bill.

The wording of the bill which calls for a vote by the people to require a roll call on final passage will go in effect — will provide for the bill to go in effect mandatorily upon the vote of the people in an affirmative manner next fall. Now if we do not provide the money for the electronic equipment, the 103rd Legislature will meet next session and there will be a mandatory roll call on every vote, and this will be done by our good Clerk of the House on an oral basis. I firmly believe the bill is an excellent bill, but we have got to provide \$125,000 to get the equipment installed before the 103rd Legislature meets. Now this is the question. I would support the bill if we would provide the money, but if we don't provide the money, we are going to force the 103rd Legislature to go through a roll call orally until the money is provided. Now if the 103rd could somehow dig up \$125,000 and not get the equipment installed, once we have met I can see the House held up here for a couple of weeks. It seems to me that this has got to be done before the 103rd meets.

There is no provision in this bill to make this — to permit the Legislature to say we will wait until the 104th and we will appropriate the money now in the 103rd. We have got to go ahead and do it. If we can't do it, this means a roll call, as the gentleman from Lewiston said yesterday, which takes fifteen minutes. I don't know how many bills we will pass, but if we pass eight hundred bills times fifteen minutes we are going to be in quite a bind. Accordingly, I regretfully would move for the indefinite postponement of the bill. I think the principle is wonderful, but we are up against a practical problem.

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am very glad to hear the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth say that the bill is a wonderful bill. I certainly agree with him.

Now I don't pretend to know all the ins and outs about state government. As a matter of fact as time goes on, I find I know less about it, but I do know that if the good people of the State of Maine decide that they would like to know how each and every one of us vote on final passage which would require an electronic device, there is a very substantial contingent fund with which the Executive Department is provided and I feel reasonably confident that if the people of the State of Maine want to know how each and every one of their representatives vote on final enactment, that the Executive Department would have more than enough out of the contingent fund to provide the source.

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

Mr. BUSSIERE: Mr. Speaker, I think I will go along in getting this roll call machine. I think we saved enough money by knocking out the one-armed bandits that we should go along with this.

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

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to pose a question to anybody who can answer it. Wouldn't it be possible if this bill were passed in this session to put out a conditional order providing the necessary funds for this?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Edwards poses a question through the Chair to any member of the House who may answer if they so desire.

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

Mr. BERRY: Mr. Speaker, I would say it would be possible; this would be up to the leadership to put in a joint order or provide for the money. I don't agree with the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Berman, that we should throw a known possible contingency of \$125,000 onto the unappropriated surplus of the next biennium. I think the matter should be tied

up this session in a package and I certainly would go along with it if it were done.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think if this piece of legislation is passed, that it certainly is the intention of the leadership to make sure that this bill will be improvised for the incoming Legislature if this bill receives your final passage.

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

Mr. PIKE: Mr. Speaker, I just hate to throw a skunk into this lawn party, but frankly, I am not always so proud of my own votes and I am not too anxious to have them all on the record.

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

Mr. KATZ: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: There goes an honest man, and I can assure you that if I do come back, there will be many occasions when I rue my comments on this, but we are not looking for \$125,000 and I am not quite sure when the referendum would be. Actually, we are not sure whether it is going to be this fall or next fall, but the amount of money that will be required will be \$25,750 when the equipment is operative as the first payment, and if the leadership says that they will implement this with legislation to provide the money, that's good enough for me.

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

Mr. BINNETTE: Mr. Speaker, I have heard about the costs of this equipment, but I have yet to hear what it would cost to install it. I would like to have anyone on that committee give me some figures in regard to that.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Old Town, Mr. Binnette, has posed a question through the Chair to any member of the com-

mittee and any member may answer if they so desire.

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

Mr. BERRY: Mr. Speaker, the estimated cost of the equipment is around \$89,000 to \$90,000 and the cost of installation is estimated at something from \$15,000 to \$25,000. We are talking a maximum figure of \$125,000 and maybe a minimum of \$115,000.

I am inclined to, as I say, withdraw my objection, if the leadership is going on record saying that they will appropriate the money. I think perhaps it ought to be in the form of a joint order before we just accept the spoken word for it.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Berry, that this Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Require a Roll Call Vote upon all Bills on Final Passage, H. P. 377, L. D. 479 be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of this bill and its accompanying papers being indefinitely postponed will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion did not prevail.

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

Third Reader Tabled and Assigned

Resolve Authorizing Disposal of Northern Maine Sanatorium (H. P. 676) (L. D. 903)

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

(On motion of Mr. Bragdon of Perham, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Thursday, May 13.)

Amended Bills Third Reader Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act relating to Working Capital of Liquor Commission" (S. P. 377) (L. D. 1194)

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

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

Mr. LUND: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Item 10 would appropriate in its amended version four million dollars additional for the Liquor Commission to use as its working capital. I believe that last summer sometime the Liquor Commission listed some one hundred or more new brands of liquor or new listings. I would like to have an opportunity to find out how much inventory has been tied up in these new items, and I hope that somebody would table this matter until Thursday next.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Bernard of Sanford, tabled pending engrossment and specially assigned for Wednesday, May 12.

Bill "An Act relating to Educational Qualifications for Barbers" (H. P. 56) (L. D. 68)

Bill "An Act relating to Term of Office of Mayor of Lewiston" (H. P. 349) (L. D. 452)

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

Third Reader Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act Establishing the Fire Fighters Arbitration Law" (H. P. 742) (L. D. 979)

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

(On motion of Mr. Levesque of Madawaska, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 11.)

Bill "An Act Increasing Amount of Property of Bethlehem Lodge, No. 35." (H. P. 1027) (L. D. 1397)

Bill "An Act to Provide Adjustments in Pensions Being Paid to Members of the Police and Fire Departments of the City of Portland" (H. P. 1071) (L. D. 1458)

Resolve Appropriating Funds for Operation of Advisory Com-

mittee on Education (S. P. 160) (L. D. 490)

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 as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

Third Readers Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act Exempting Liquor Bottled or Manufactured in Maine from Additional Taxes" (S. P. 326) (L. D. 1048)

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

(On motion of Mr. Kennedy of Milbridge, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Friday, May 14.)

Bill "An Act relating to Use of Moneys Received from the Potato Tax" (S. P. 490) (L. D. 1453)

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

(On motion by Mr. Rackliff of Easton, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 11.)

Passed to Be Enacted Emergency Measure

An Act Providing for New Ferry Landing at Forest City Landing, Peaks Island (H. P. 113) (L. D. 137)

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

Constitutional Amendment Failed of Final Passage

Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Providing

for Annual Legislative Sessions (S. P. 44) (L. D. 215)

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

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

Mr. ROSS: As I have mentioned before in this House, I do not like to talk twice in the same day but sometimes that is the draw of the calendar. In speaking on this item first today, I hope that I am not going to engender another marathon debate as we had on savings bank life insurance.

I doubt if any of the opponents of this bill can present any arguments which I personally have not used in various debates over the past 15 years. These would include:

If we had annual sessions, we would not be able to induce the same high calibre candidates to run for office since they would not feel that they could take time off from their business each and every year. The cost would be a major factor since approximately one million dollars is expended in the over-all operation of a regular legislative session. If we met every year, the departments would put in for yearly increases, thus substantially inflating our already exorbitant budget. In a state the size of ours there is really no need for annual sessions with their tendency to attract professional politicians. Any emergency, either budgetary or otherwise, can well be taken care of with short special sessions.

Those are the reasons normally used against annual sessions.

However, let us not forget that today we are talking about limited annual sessions of different duration. Situations of necessity must change with the increased complexity of state government. This is borne out by comparing the length of time past legislatures have been required to stay in Augusta. In 1945 they adjourned on April 21; ten years ago, during my first session, we were released on May 21, and last year it was June 22. Although we had hoped for

an early adjournment this year, the date may be well into June. Furthermore, it is infinitely more expensive and complicated to run the state now than it was in the past.

In 1945 the total budget for the biennium was 35 million dollars for current services with an additional 3 million for capital expenditures. In 1955, ten years later, current services totaled 75 million with 5.2 million for capital. In 1963 this had once again doubled to 151 million with 4.5 for capital and an additional 8.4 million bond issue.

I, for one, am flexible enough to admit that at certain times changes, even though constitutional, are justified. Of course, we should not change for change sake alone, but now I have come to the conclusion that there is a real need to meet more often than once every two years. As long as these sessions are limited, I believe that this suggested change is in the best interest of efficient state government. I feel there are several basic reasons for this statement.

Of course, it will be a bit more expensive, but we often hear that an expensive item is well worth the cost because of its superior quality. With limited 60 and 30 day sessions, the added expense would not approximate the value received from the added experience of our state legislators.

In this respect, any new legislator finds himself in the midst of a maze of unfamiliar details, duties and procedures. Unfortunately, some very well qualified persons are elected for only one term. If we could shorten their first year's agenda and then give them a concentrated second year term, the chances are that every segment of our economy would benefit from their added experience.

This additional knowledge would certainly be conducive to better legislative planning. For those who question present legislative efficiency, I would hazard the guess that this change might well be the starting point. There are many details which could either be eliminated or streamlined if

we were able to plan in this suggested manner.

As an example of the foregoing statement, let's consider the areas relative to fishing regulations, legislative claims and municipal affairs. All of these could be left to the discretion of the departments involved or communities, but under the present system, it would accomplish nothing. We must still wait for the extended consideration of taxation and appropriation matters. The elimination of these other items would not save time with our present biennial session, but would be considered with limited annual sessions.

If we were to have annual sessions, we would be working toward a definite goal and every legislator would then be better informed and able to act with the competence requisite to more efficient government. In the final analysis, I now sincerely believe that this is sound legislation, and I support the amended bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Milbridge, Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. KENNEDY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise in opposition to the final passage of this constitutional amendment. The arguments have been presented this morning by the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, relative to limiting legislative sessions. I can visualize, as many in this House can, as to what might happen with limited sessions. We might not accomplish the work that had been passed to us in that length of time. We would of necessity adjourn the Legislature and within a day, two days or a week the Governor would call us back into special session to expedite the business that we had not taken care of.

I would call to your attention that the population growth of the State of Maine is just about static. We still have less than a million people, and these million people, at least I feel a majority of these people have apprehension relative to this legislature convening annually. They are in a state of fear and trembling each

time that we convene even on a two year basis, knowing that they will be assessed another major tax. I still stand firmly in favor of the sessions as now, the biennial session. I certainly hope that this Constitutional amendment will fail in passage.

The SPEAKER: This Resolve having had its two several readings in the House and having been passed to be engrossed and having had its two several readings in the Senate and having been passed to be engrossed and the Committee on Engrossed Bills having reported it truly and strictly engrossed, is it now the pleasure of the House that this Resolve be finally passed? This being a Constitutional amendment, under the Constitution it requires for its final passage the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the House. All those in favor of this Resolve, Constitutional Amendment being finally passed will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Mr. Levesque of Madawaska requested a roll call.

The SPEAKER: In order for the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one-fifth of the members present. All those in favor of the vote being taken by the yeas and nays will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than one-fifth having arisen the yeas and nays are in order.

The question before the House is shall Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Providing for Annual Legislative Sessions, Senate Paper 44, L. D. 215 be finally passed as a Constitutional Amendment? If you are in favor of this resolve receiving final passage, when your name is called you will say "yes"; if you are against this being finally passed when your name is called you will say "no." The Clerk will call the roll.

ROLL CALL

YEA—Anderson, Orono; Baldic, Beane, Benson, Mechanic Falls; Bernard, Binnette, Bishop, Boissonneau, Bourgoin, Bradstreet, Brennan, Buck, Bussiere, Carroll, Champagne, Childs, Conley, Cookson, Crommett, Curran, D'Alfonso, Danton, Dostie, Doyle, Drigotas, Drouin, Dumont, Edwards, Eustis, Faucher Fortier, Fraser, Mexico; Fraser Rumford; Gaudreau, Gauvin, Gillan, Glazier, Graham, Harvey, Bangor; Harvey, Windham; Harvey, Woolwich; H a u g e n, Hawes, Hunter, Durham; Jordan, Keyte, Kilroy, Knight, Laberge, Lent, Levesque, Lowery, Martin, McKinnon, Mills, Mitchell, Palmer, Pitts, Poulin, Ross, Bath; Roy, Ruby, Sawyer, Searles, Starbird, Stoutamyer, Sullivan, Wheeler, Whittier, Wuori.

NAY — Anderson, Ellsworth; Avery, Baker, Orrington; Bedard, Benson, Southwest Harbor; Ber- man, Berry, Birt, Bragdon, Brew- er, Burwell, Carter, Cottrell, Cressey, Cushing, Davis, Dudley, Dunn, Erwin, Evans, Farrington, Gifford, Gilbert, Hammond, Han- son, Gardiner; Hanson, Lebanon; Hawkes, Haynes, Huber, Hunter, Clinton; Jewell, Katz, Kennedy, Kittredge, Lewis, Libhart, Lincoln, Littlefield, Lund, Lycette, Meis- ner, Millay, Mosher, Payson, Peaslee, Pendergast, Pike, Prince, Rackliff, Richardson, Cumberland; Richardson, Stonington; Roberts, Ross, Brownville; Storm, Susi, Truman, Waltz, Watts, Wight, Presque Isle; Wood, Young.

ABSENT — Baker, Winthrop; Blouin, Carswell, Cote, Crosby, Dickinson, Fecteau, Harriman, Healy, Hoy, Jalbert, Lane, Lang, Lebel, Nadeau, Norton, Sahagian, Scott, Ward, White, Guilford.

Yes, 70; No 61; Absent 20.

The SPEAKER: Seventy hav- ing voted in the affirmative and sixty-one having voted in the neg- ative, with twenty being absent, seventy being less than two-thirds, this constitutional amendment fails to receive passage.

Sent to the Senate.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I realize the hour is getting late and we have stayed here a pretty long while; however, I would like to ask permission — I would move that we reconsider our action taken earlier this morning whereby we tabled item 18, Bill "An Act relating to the Use of Moneys Received from the Potato Tax."

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman wish to reconsider a tabling motion?

Mr. BRAGDON: Yes.

The SPEAKER: The motion is not in order.

Mr. BRAGDON: Not in order, sorry.

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act relating to Discontinuance of Highways and Town and County Roads (S. P. 488) (L. D. 1451)

An Act to Authorize Corporations Without Capital Stock to Commingle Funds (H. P. 279) (L. D. 361)

An Act relating to Organization of Lewiston Fire Department (H. P. 351) (L. D. 454)

An Act relating to General Powers of Cities (H. P. 642) (L. D. 867)

An Act relating to Amending Provisions of Charters and By-Laws of Corporations Relating to Preemptive Rights (H. P. 644) (L. D. 869)

An Act Appropriating Money to Supplement Federal Vocational Funds for Area Education Programs for Apprentices and Other Adult Workers (H. P. 674) (L. D. 901)

An Act Establishing a Commercial Standard for Maine White-Cedar Shingles (H. P. 947) (L. D. 1283)

An Act Appropriating Funds to Aid in Dredging the Harbor at Owl's Head (H. P. 1059) (L. D. 1441)

An Act Increasing Salaries of Secretary and Assistant Secretary of the Senate and Clerk and As-

sistant Clerk of the House of Representatives (H. P. 1103) (L. D. 1502)

Finally Passed

Resolve Appropriating Funds for Maine's Share of Financing a Permanent Secretariat to the New England Governors' Conference (H. P. 617) (L. D. 826)

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.

On motion of Mr. Birt of East Millinocket, the House voted to reconsider its action of earlier in the day on item seventeen, page five, whereby Bill "An Act Authorizing Use of Prisoner Assistance by Charitable Organizations," House Paper 1115, L. D. 1522, was assigned for third reading.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Levesque of Madawaska, the Bill with accompanying papers was tabled pending assignment for third reading and specially assigned for Wednesday, May 12.

Mr. Levesque of Madawaska was granted unanimous consent to briefly address the House.

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Two years ago on a day in June I stood up before we adjourned on a Friday and I moved that the House give respect to the fathers on Father's Day, and I think I was rolled over the coals just thirty minutes after we adjourned by the ladies of the House for not having given them the same respect. So this day two years later, it is my sincere pleasure to wish each and every mother in the House and also to extend to all the mothers of the State of Maine, a very happy and prosperous Mother's Day.

(Off Record Remarks)

On motion of Mr. Levesque of Madawaska,

Adjourned until Tuesday, May 11, at ten o'clock in the morning.