

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

VOLUME II

MAY 17 - JUNE 4, 1965

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Monday, May 17, 1965

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

Prayer by Brigadier Alfred Davey of the Salvation Army, Augusta.

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

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

The SPEAKER: On behalf of the House the Chair would like to thank the forty members of the Edward Little High School Band of Auburn under the supervision of their music director, Albert Simons, for the very fine concert presented prior to the convening of the Legislature this afternoon. Ordinarily there are sixty members in this band but due to the early convening this week, the entire band was unable to be present. The Chair would like to note that what the band lacks in quantity, it makes up in quality. Recently they were on a four-day tour in Agawam and Boston on an exchange concert. Last year they toured in Cranston, Rhode Island, Lebanon, New Hampshire and many schools in Massachusetts. Of special interest is the fact that four years ago they were the only representative for the State of Maine to the Music Man Festival in Mason City, Iowa.

Your presence is also a personal satisfaction to me, as I notice that the band plays as well now as the band did when I was a student at Edward Little High School some twenty-five years ago.

Again the Chair would like to thank the members of the band for their performance and for their rendition of the Star Spangled Banner which is played on the first legislative day of each week. (Applause)

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

Papers from the Senate Senate Reports of Committees Leave to Withdraw

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Study of Air Pollution" (S. P. 375) (L. D. 1192) reporting Leave to Withdraw.

Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting same on Bill "An Act Authorizing Appeals by State in Criminal Proceedings" (S. P. 266) (L. D. 815)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

Ought Not to Pass

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Providing for Professional Immunity to Nurses in Emergency Cases" (S. P. 401) (L. D. 1226)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Lower the Voting Age to Twenty Years (S. P. 153) (L. D. 394) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "B" and Senate Amendment "B" in non-concurrence in the House on April 22.

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

In the House: On motion of Mr. Levesque of Madawaska, the House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act relating to Establishment and Operation of Regional Technical and Vocational Centers (H. P. 32) (L. D. 44) which was passed to be enacted in the House on April 27 and passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" on April 15.

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

In the House: On motion of Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston, the House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act Increasing Retirement Benefits under State Retirement System (H. P. 88) (L. D. 97) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 11 and passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" on May 4.

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

In the House: On motion of Mr. Anderson of Orono, the House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

House Reports of Committees Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Bishop from the Committee on Judiciary reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Percentage by Weight of Alcohol in Blood of Operators of Motor Vehicles" (H. P. 636) (L. D. 861)

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Davis from the Committee on Judiciary reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Driving a Motor Vehicle While Impaired by Consumption of Intoxicating Liquor" (H. P. 500) (L. D. 653)

Report was read.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, this bill was put in at the behest of the Maine Highway Safety Committee. It was a major part of their legislation for this session. They had a committee that spent hours, I might even say days, in drawing up this legislation. They had the State Police, they had

judges, they had attorneys, they had everybody that was supposed to know something about highway safety draw up this legislation. Every major newspaper in the State of Maine endorsed this bill. Now some gentleman in the House not too long ago made the remark that you couldn't get the ten lawyers on the Judiciary Committee to agree, but evidently there was no trouble here. It came out unanimous ought not to pass.

The purpose of this bill is to reduce the alcoholic content from point one five to point one 0, in the blood stream, and also of course the drys didn't like that. They thought well, you're getting away with murder there. But we reduced the sentence too, see, on the second offender now under this bill he would only get one day to eleven months in jail where before this he got ten days to eleven months in jail and the judges and the juries would not convict a man for the ten days because they felt that he would lose his job if he was taken out of circulation for ten days. That is why this provision was put in this bill.

This committee felt — before we go any further, I had nothing to do with this, I just sponsored it as a member of the Highway Safety Committee, better brains than mine conceived this legislation. The thinking being that now with the one day sentence for the second offender they could secure a great many more convictions. And I would like to move to substitute the bill for the report and request a division.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House now is on the motion of the gentleman from Brownville, Mr. Ross, to substitute the bill for the report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Thomaston, Mr. Kittredge.

Mr. KITTREDGE: Mr. Speaker, when the vote is taken I request a roll call.

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

Mr. BISHOP: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I don't have the bill right in front

of me but my recollection is that there are some glaring inconsistencies in this legislation which among other reasons was what impelled a unanimous ought not to pass here. I hope that you will vote to accept the majority report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Calais, Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: At the hearing there was considerable support for the bill from Highway Safety people and some others and the matter of alcoholic blood tests was discussed but no medical people appeared to testify. We had a certain amount of hearsay evidence which was given to us, but no doctor appeared to— which I think rather important on a matter of this kind that at least some medical testimony coming directly from that profession should have been given to us to indicate whether or not the changes that are proposed here would be wise.

Now, as the gentleman from Brownville, Mr. Ross has said, in many ways this bill actually lets down the bars. It's not really strengthening the drunken driving statute; in a good many ways it's weakening it. For one thing they completely eliminate the section which makes aggravated driving under the influence a felony. Now in some of our worst accidents we know that some of these drunken drivers have been really completely willful and unthinking and have driven down the highways and killed and maimed a good many people. Well they've taken that right out completely out of the statute, which I don't agree with whatsoever. Another thing, they have set up another crime known as operating while your faculties are impaired by the use of intoxicating liquor. Now this actually gives a drunken driver a chance to crawl out from underneath a charge of driving under the influence and to do it rather easily. Then he only pays a fifty dollar fine and loses his license for a much shorter time than the present one year.

And if any of you ladies and gentlemen have served on our juries you know that the present

statute for driving under the influence states that whoever is at all under the influence of intoxicating liquor, and that means to the very slightest degree, is guilty of the crime as now defined; and I don't believe that this bill actually does anything more than to perhaps confuse the situation even perhaps more than it is now. And that is why the committee, after hearing the testimony, such as it was, decided that it would be better to leave the present statute as it is. I go along with the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Bishop, and move acceptance of the committee report.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Brownville, Mr. Ross, to substitute the bill for the report. The gentleman from South Thomaston, Mr. Kittredge, has requested that the vote be taken by the yeas and nays. 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.

An insufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously less than one-fifth having arisen the yeas and nays are not in order. The gentleman from Brownville, Mr. Ross, has requested a division. All those in favor of substituting the bill for the report will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

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

Thereupon, the "Ought not to pass" Committee Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Ought to Pass Printed Bills

Mr. Bishop from the Committee on Judiciary reported "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act Increasing Clerical Assistance for Justices of Superior Court" (H. P. 415) (L. D. 527)

Report was read and accepted, the Bill read twice and tomorrow assigned.

Mr. Richardson from the Committee on Judiciary reported "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Jurisdiction of Municipal Police Officers in Fresh Pursuit" (H. P. 589) (L. D. 781) which was recommitted.

Report was read.

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: This bill originally came before our Judiciary Committee and as I recall at the time the Committee was deeply divided against passing this bill out favorably, because if you will look at L. D. 781 it would permit municipal police officers throughout the State of Maine to follow in fresh pursuit whenever, as the bill says, they have reasonable grounds to believe that someone has committed a felony or misdemeanor. It was the understanding of most of the members of the Committee that the police officers have this power as regards the much more serious crime of felony, but should not have the power with regards to misdemeanors, such as motor or traffic violations.

Because this type of bill which would allow municipal police officers to follow beyond the bounds of their municipality for traffic violations would actually mean that you could go, a municipal police officer could go from Eastport to Fryeburg and from Kittery to Fort Kent on a speeding charge. Now some of us on the committee felt that this would be a hazard to life, it would be a hazard to pedestrians, it would be a hazard to other traffic on the road; and therefore we were deeply opposed to it. The bill came to the House and for some reason or other it was recommitting back to the Committee on Judiciary and in the absence of several of us who were deeply opposed to the bill this bill was passed out favorably. Now I suggest to the House that it is far

more reasonable to protect the pedestrians and the other motorists in the State of Maine than allow municipal police officers the power of wild goose chases from Kittery to Fort Kent and from Eastport to Fryeburg, and for those reasons I would move for indefinite postponement of the bill.

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

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

Mr. BRENNAN: Mr. Speaker, I am also on the Judiciary Committee. I wasn't there when the vote was taken. I am opposed to this bill. I agree with the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Berman, that this would encourage high speed chases for misdemeanors which may result and have resulted in many serious accidents in this state in the past few years. For that reason, especially as regards to misdemeanors, I would support the indefinite postponement of this bill.

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

Mr. LUND: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: During some of the debate the other day on the Sunday liquor bill, I made reference to the problem of the need for legislation which would enable our police officers to deal more effectively than they can now with some of the highway safety problems that they have. This is one of the type of measures that I had in mind. At the present time if you have an Augusta police officer on duty outside of the State House here at eight or nine o'clock in the evening and he sees a car go by weaving from side to side and he takes out in pursuit of the car with his siren going, if the car manages to get to Hallowell before he can stop the car or if the car just refuses to stop and keeps on going to Hallowell and he makes an arrest beyond the line in Augusta, it is not a valid arrest. It is an improper arrest and he is

subject to suit. If he knows what the law is and stops at the limits of the municipality, the drunken driver can continue on his way because of the peculiar arrangement we have with our laws.

Now when we had some debate on the Sunday liquor bill there were people who spoke of the need for trying to curb some of the hazardous driving and the problems attendant upon drunken driving. And I suggest to all of you now who feel strongly about the matter of highway safety, that this is your opportunity to make your feelings known and to vote for a bill which will give some useful tools to our police and encourage them to try to curb the hazards upon the highway. At the present time, under the law here in Maine, a municipal police officer is limited in his power of arrest to the limits of the municipality. I suggest to you that this is ridiculous and it has no place in this modern day and age with our high speed means of travel. This may have made sense in the days of horse and buggy travel when the chances are that the officer could stop somebody within the limits of his town, but today I suggest that this makes no sense and would be an opportunity to give our police officers some weapons they need in order to enforce the laws we're asking them to enforce. I therefore hope you will vote in opposition to the motion to indefinitely postpone this bill.

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

Mr. MILLS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am very much interested in this bill and believe it ought to pass. Now years ago in the State of Massachusetts, we had a dividing line the same as Hallowell and Augusta here between Beverly and Salem. If we were in pursuit of a car we had to stop at that line. We had no jurisdiction in Salem. This applied in five cities and towns in that area. The result was that as the cars became more prevalent and these young hoodlums got the use of them it became a question of

how to curb them, how to stop them, how to prevent the crash accidents that were happening. Some of these cars were involved in five car crashes and some of them were involved in fatal crashes. The only way that it could be done was to put on police patrol cars, owned and operated by the city, with qualified police drivers. This thing continued and when these cars became available there was a great drop in the fatal accidents on the highways in the State of Massachusetts.

Now all that is being asked for in this bill here is to give the police of our state the authority to curb the hoodlums who are driving our highways. When you read a police report it's very concise, it's very definite. There is nothing elaborate about it, it doesn't explain what; it is a mere statement of facts. You don't get the real picture from a police report unless you talk with the police officer himself. Under this thing here, this bill, you are now giving an authority to your police department which will give them fresh pursuit and apprehension at point of contact with the people who are fleeing. Mr. Lund has talked in regard to the enforcement of the liquor law. Well just stop and consider your position, if you have somebody on the highway and they get across the line at the next place, the police officers have got to stop there and turn back. That person will continue on and may be involved in a very fatal accident because it's a known fact that alcohol and distance driving tend to blur the vision, and it can be the cause of somebody losing their life who is completely innocent. It very rarely happens to the one who is guilty.

I sincerely hope that indefinite postponement won't prevail, I sincerely hope that we pass this and give our police officers some authority to try and enforce the laws of common justice. Thank you.

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

Mr. LYCETTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I decry all these speeders but someone tried to remark some

time ago that there were police officers and there weren't police officers. And the key to a good police officer, if you will allow me to quote, give my opinion, is how much good judgment he's got. And I've worked with a good many police officers and a lot of them have got good judgment and some haven't. I don't think that a man should go down the highway at a hundred miles an hour trying to catch somebody on a misdemeanor. Thank you.

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly agree with my colleague from Houlton, Mr. Lycette, who has spent a great deal of his life being high sheriff of our county. At the present time the State Police have state wide jurisdiction and with that I have no quarrel. I am thoroughly in favor of it. The state police are well trained. They go through a common training course. The municipal police officers on the contrary, unfortunately, do not have this type of required basic training through the State Police Academy. Some of them may have gone through the Academy, some of them may not. I really think that the problem here so far as municipal police officers are concerned is better co-operation and better liaison between the communicating towns and for that reason I hope you will go along with the motion to indefinitely postpone.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Berman, that this Bill "An Act relating to Jurisdiction of Municipal Police Officers in Fresh Pursuit," House Paper 589, L. D. 781, and its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of this bill and its accompanying papers being indefinitely postponed will say aye, all those opposed will say no.

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

Mr. Bussiere of Lewiston then requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Bussiere, requests a division. 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.

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

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

Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment

Mr. Bishop from the Committee on Judiciary on Resolve Authorizing Estate of Grace Haskell to Sue the State of Maine (H. P. 339) (L. D. 442) 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. 339, L. D. 442, Resolve, Authorizing Estate of Grace Haskell to Sue the State of Maine.

Amend said Resolve by striking out in the 8th line from the end the figure "\$15,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure "\$4,000"

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

Mr. Levesque from the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act relating to Employment of Minors under 16 Years of Age" (H. P. 342) (L. D. 445) which was recommended, 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. 342, L. D. 445, Bill, "An Act Relating to Employment of Minors Under 16 Years of Age."

Amend said Bill, in the 5th line, by striking out the underlined words and punctuation **"construction activity, woods operation,"**

Further amend said Bill by inserting before the last sentence the following new sentence:

'No minor under 16 years of age shall be permitted to work as the operator of power equipment in construction activity or woods operations.'

Further amend said Bill by adding at the end before the single quotation mark the following new sentence:

'This section shall not apply to any such child who is employed directly by, with or under the supervision of either or both of its parents or legal guardian.'

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

Tabled and Assigned

Mrs. Wheeler from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Providing for Registration of Land Surveyors." (H. P. 925) (L. D. 1215) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Peaslee of Farmingdale, tabled pending acceptance of the Committee Report and specially assigned for tomorrow.)

Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Providing Funds for Municipal Building at Old Orchard Beach" (H. P. 31) (L. D. 43)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. BROWN of Hancock
HARDING of Aroostook
— of the Senate.
Messrs. HEALY of Portland
BRAGDON of Perham
DUNN of Denmark
BIRT of East Millinocket
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. DUQUETTE of York
— of the Senate.
Messrs. ANDERSON of Orono
BISHOP of Presque Isle
JALBERT of Lewiston
— of the House.

Reports were read.

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

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker, I move that this bill be tabled until tomorrow pending acceptance of either report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Cote, moves that this matter lie upon the table, assigned for tomorrow, pending acceptance of either report.

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

Mr. BISHOP: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask that this be tabled to May 20.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Bishop, now moves that this matter lie upon the table until Thursday, May 20, which is the motion that has priority. Is it the pleasure of the House that this matter lie upon the table until May 20 pending acceptance of either report?

The motion prevailed.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Labor reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Protecting the Right of Public Employees to Join Labor Organizations" (H. P. 741) (L. D. 978)

Report was signed by the following members:

Mrs. CHISHOLM of Cumberland
Mr. SMITH of Cumberland
— of the Senate.
Mr. KITTREDGE of South Thomaston
Mrs. BAKER of Winthrop
Messrs. BENSON of Southwest Harbor
GAUVIN 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. O'LEARY of Oxford
—of the Senate.

Messrs. DUMONT of Augusta
BEDARD of Saco
LEVESQUE

of Madawaska
—of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor, the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act Qualifying the State for Full Participation in Vocational Education Act of 1963" (S. P. 78) (L. D. 223)

Bill "An Act Providing for the Formation of Sanitary Districts" (S. P. 275) (L. D. 855)

Bill "An Act relating to Information Against Attorneys" (S. P. 285) (L. D. 847)

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

Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act Revising the Rural Electrification Cooperative Law" (S. P. 538) (L. D. 1528)

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 Thursday, May 20.)

Bill "An Act relating to the Sale of Fireworks" (H. P. 708) (L. D. 946)

Bill "An Act Amending Certain Provisions of the Charter of the Town of Old Orchard Beach" (H. P. 1109) (L. D. 1515)

Bill "An Act to Create the Community Life Insurance Company" (H. P. 1129) (L. D. 1544)

Bill "An Act relating to Positions of Deputy Secretary of the Senate and Deputy Clerk of the House" (H. P. 1131) (L. D. 1546)

Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Changing the Tenure of Office of Senators to Four-Year Terms (S. P. 537) (L. D. 1527)

Resolve Authorizing Fred P. Haskell to Bring Civil Action Against the State of Maine (S. P. 541) (L. D. 1539)

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

Amended Bills

Bill "An Act Affecting Certain Statutes Pertaining to Court Process and Procedure in Criminal Cases and to Kindred Matters" (S. P. 356) (L. D. 1140)

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

Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act Amending the Banking Laws" (S. P. 379) (L. D. 1216)

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

(On motion of Mr. Boissonneau of Westbrook, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for tomorrow.)

Bill "An Act Providing for Questionnaires to be Propounded to Prospective Jurors" (H. P. 142) (L. D. 165)

Bill "An Act Authorizing Conversion of Augusta Mutual Insurance Company to a Stock Company" (H. P. 394) (L. D. 506)

Bill "An Act Providing for an Additional Trial Term for York County" (H. P. 560) (L. D. 730)

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.

Passed to Be Enacted Emergency Measure

An Act relating to Roadside Beautification (S. P. 499) (L. D. 1476)

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

Emergency Measure

An Act relating to Inspection of Certain Farm Trucks (H. P. 1104) (L. D. 1508)

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. 114 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.

Finally Passed Emergency Measure

Resolve Providing Increases in Retirement Allowances for Certain Retired Fish and Game Wardens (H. P. 248) (L. D. 316)

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. 114 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Resolve was finally passed, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act Creating a Second Assistant County Attorney for Penobscot County (S. P. 50) (L. D. 221)

An Act to Control and Eradicate Salmonella Infections (S. P. 173) (L. D. 539)

An Act relating to Amount of Aid to Aged, Blind or Disabled (S. P. 261) (L. D. 810)

An Act relating to Operation of Motorcycles While Learning to Drive (S. P. 371) (L. D. 1138)

An Act relating to Investigation in Divorce Cases Involving

Child Custody (S. P. 410) (L. D. 1306)

An Act relating to Condemnation of Land for Highway Purposes (S. P. 498) (L. D. 1477)

An Act relating to Coercion in Placing Insurance on Real and Personal Property (S. P. 510) (L. D. 1480)

An Act Imposing Limitation Upon Holding Both Permit for Common Carriers and Contract Carriers (S. P. 512) (L. D. 1483)

An Act Reactivating the Governor's Committee on Children and Youth (H. P. 387) (L. D. 500)

An Act relating to Definition of Aid and Disabled under Aid to the Disabled (H. P. 1114) (L. D. 1521)

Finally Passed

Resolve Discharging Town of Brooks from Part of the Indebtedness to State for Preparation of Agreement for Dissolution of School Administrative District No. 3 (H. P. 419) (L. D. 531)

Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Location of Vocational Educational Institute in Northern Kennebec County or Southern Somerset County (H. P. 1097) (L. D. 1494)

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

Orders of the Day

The Chair laid before the House the first item of Unfinished Business:

HOUSE REPORT — "Ought not to pass" — Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Resolve, Appropriating Funds for Recreational Aid for the Mentally Retarded at Pineland Hospital and Training Center. (H. P. 608) (L. D. 800)

Tabled — April 29, by Mr. Anderson of Orono.

Pending — Acceptance. (Specially assigned for Thursday, May 13th)

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

Mr. HAUGEN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would move that the resolve be substituted for the report and would speak briefly on my motion.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House now is on the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Haugen, that we substitute the resolve for the report and the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. HAUGEN: This bill is to provide a recreational aid to the blind at Pineland Hospital and Training Center. This is one of Representative Carswell's bills, who you all know is ill, and it is recreational aid for the blind children. There has been a program in existence at Pineland and what this would do would be to rate this as a position. The appropriation for the biennium is \$5,250 and with your indulgence I would read you a letter from Mrs. Elizabeth H. Nevin, Director of Volunteer Services at Pineland concerning this Mr. Ford who has been working in this program.

"Dear Mr. Johnson:

I thought you might be interested in receiving a copy of the final report for the school year sent to me by Mr. Trafton, our principal, regarding Edward Ford. It is as follows:

'Edward Ford: No further comment is needed on Edward's contributions to this program for the blind. With his background in Braille and through his dedication and devotion to the children and the group, the efficiency of the program has certainly more than doubled. Time has meant little or nothing to him, as he has frequently stayed after regular school hours to do extra things or serve some child in a more specific way. He seems to have the personality and emotional stability to work with most any type of patient even under the most adverse circumstances. His patience appears to be almost inexhaustible, yet he seems to have the respect and obedience of all the children in the group, including the most disturbed and difficult ones. Con-

sequently, I would still like to have his services as a paid assistant or aide if this could be feasible and provided nothing better or more constructive evolves from the current planning of his rehabilitation program.'"

I would hope that each and every one of you would take this under consideration when you do vote and when the vote is taken I request a division.

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

Mr. BISHOP: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It is with reluctance that the committee has had to report several worthy measures "ought not to pass." It is not that we are not in sympathy, but we feel that we had to pick and choose between the merits of all the very worthy proposals.

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

Mr. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I consider this a most worthy measure and I think it is the least we can do for the blind and I would like to support most wholeheartedly the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Haugen.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Denmark, Mr. Dunn.

Mr. DUNN: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: For the committee's report, I would say that for the first year of the biennium, Pineland was allotted two million six hundred and six thousand dollars and the second year it's two million six hundred and I think thirteen thousand, and a little bit more money in the supplemental. And we believed that another two thousand one way or the other would not make very much difference in a program of that size.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: Listening to the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Graham's remarks, one would think that the members of the Ap-

propriations Committee are not looking too kindly toward the blind. I think that that is the other way around. We voted for several measures that would aid the School for the Blind. As far as this measure is concerned, I mean it means absolutely nothing; I mean it, if we were going to go into, it's not even the beginning of a program. The bill merely reads the sum of twenty-two hundred and fifty dollars for the first year and the three thousand dollars for the second year for the position of recreational aid for the mentally retarded and blind patients at Pineland Hospital and Training Center. My Lord, according to this measure, if we are going to divide it by the attention this bill would give to each child or patient at Pineland it would be about three cents a year. So that is why the committee took the position that it took.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Farmingdale, Mr. Peaslee.

Mr. PEASLEE: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: As a member of this Health and Institutional Services Committee, I have had the opportunity to visit the Pineland Training Center and I know that there is not a more worthy cause than what this money is supposed to be appropriated for and I hope that you will all support the motion to substitute the resolve for the report.

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

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I rise in support of the position of the Appropriations and Financial Affairs Committee and the comments that Mr. Dunn made about the amount of money. They presently have 573 personnel at Pineland. We talked this over quite extensively within the committee and they felt that this program could be adequately adjusted within the program as presently laid out with the amount of money for personnel they had at Pineland.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Haugen, that

we substitute the resolve for the report and he has requested a division. All those in favor of substituting the resolve for the report 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 seventy-five having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon the Committee "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the second item of Unfinished Business:

Bill, "An Act to Create a Department of Rehabilitation." (H. P. 1075) (L. D. 1455)

Tabled—April 30, by Mr. Ross of Bath.

Pending—Passage to be Engrossed. (Specially assigned for Thursday, May 13th)

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I tabled this out of courtesy. However, I did attend the public hearing on this legislative document and I am extremely interested in the entire subject of rehabilitation. But since this is a committee redraft, I would rather that one of the committee members would explain it to the House. However, at this time, I will trace the action of this bill so far in the House for the information of the members. It first appeared out of committee on our calendar on April the 9th. It was tabled three times. The committee redraft is L. D. 1455, a redraft from the original L. D. 108. The sponsor was the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Carswell. Notwithstanding the absence of the sponsor, I would hope that some member of the committee could justify their action because they reported nine to one in favor of the redraft. Those reporting in favor of the redraft—Senators Stern, Maxwell and Willey; Representatives Pitts, Dostie, Edwards, Starbird, Berry and Libhart, and

the opposition Representative Katz. The price tag is sixty-three thousand dollars for the first year of the biennium and seventy-two thousand dollars for the second.

But I certainly hope that a member of the committee could explain their action to this House.

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

Mr. BERRY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I don't believe that we really need to justify our actions to the House as the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, said. Nine people on the committee feel this is an excellent bill. The problems of rehabilitation today are severe. They are oriented in the direction of specialization. The committee felt that this subject was not getting a proper amount of attention from the Department of Health and Welfare. I believe the nine members of the committee are set against forming a new department in and of itself. The sixty odd thousand dollar appropriation is not new money. It will be appropriated and transferred in large part from the present appropriation of the Department of Health and Welfare.

The opposition comes primarily from a desire to keep the Department of Health and Welfare in this field and there perhaps is a certain amount of justification. The director of the department said that he would be losing a few men in the legal and medical field if this transfer were made. However, these people will be available and this does not seem really to be a valid objection. I would not want to go through the document page by page or section by section. It calls for the transfer from the Department of Education of certain of their functions which are now in the field of rehabilitation. The prospect of consolidating all efforts, education, treatment of alcoholics and the blind in one department under vocational rehabilitation does present itself as progressive legislation and nine members of the committee feel that it would be a very desirable move.

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

Mr. KATZ: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: As the lone dissident I don't think it's a good bill. We are not doing a good job on rehabilitation in the State of Maine. Those of you who are interested in alcoholism should know that we are spending forty-seven thousand dollars a year on alcoholism and alcoholic control in the State of Maine, which is a pitance. You should know that if this bill is passed we will be the only state in the Union where we have set up a separate department of rehabilitation with alcoholism and no one, no one at the hearing convinced me the slightest bit that alcoholism belongs in a department of rehabilitation. In some states it is in Health and Welfare, in some states it is Mental Health, but the marriage of rehabilitation and alcoholism does not seem to be a compatible marriage to me.

Now living in Augusta, perhaps I am a little sensitive about the idea of creating a new department. There is nothing that cannot be done by additional appropriations that you can do by creating a new department. It is true that perhaps we have some personnel problems. It is true that there has been a little inactivity and I feel very badly opposing this, but I honestly have such severe reservations about the need for creating a new department that I shall vote against this and I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlemen from Bath, Mr. Brewer.

Mr. BREWER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Before this debate gets too far, I think probably you should hear from the committee report, not the committee that heard this bill, but the committee that studied this problem.

Now this is the result of an Interim Study Committee that was set up in the last Legislature, to study the needs and desirabilities of forming a department of rehabilitation. Now, there has been a lot of work and thought gone into this and it's not an overnight stab at establishing a new department. Now the committee consisted of eight members. One

member each from the Senate and one from the House and I was fortunate enough to be chosen as the House member. The Senate appointee was former Senator Hines, who was the Chairman of the Committee. Now six persons were appointed by the Governor and I want you to know who they were. Mr. Richard Arnzen, Director of the Hyde Rehabilitation Center, Mr. Elmer Mitchell of the Division of Vocational Rehab., Dr. Niles Perkins of the Maine Medical Center who is also a member of the Committee of Health and Welfare, the advisory committee; Judge Harold Towle, Chairman of the Industrial Accident Commission; Mr. Robert Taylor from South Portland, Mrs. Ruth Aiken who are well known for their interests in Maine's rehabilitation problems.

Now, in carrying out its duties, the committee investigated Rehab. services of varying degrees, and met with representatives of several state agencies considered to be most directly concerned with problems arising from disablement. One public meeting was held and was attended by representatives from the Veterans Facility at Togus, a rehab. specialist from the Thayer Hospital and members of various other organizations interested in different phases of rehabilitation.

Finally, the committee met on separate occasions with two experts from outside the state, one a specialist in physical medicine, who was invited to review Maine's needs from his professional vantage point. The other a specialist in the field of rehabilitation from Northeastern University to discuss desirable programs and trends. And this doctor from the Northeastern University is the one that set up or helped set up the Department of Rehabilitation within the State of Massachusetts and they both agree that there is a need for a separate department involving certain phases of our rehab. programs.

The committee's findings and recommendations were outlined in detail in a report placed on your desks some time ago, the time has gone by with this bill being tabled

out of courtesy to its sponsor. But in brief, testimony revealed a certain amount of duplication of services among the several agencies providing some form of rehabilitation and some confusion resulting from the varying policies. This confusion resulted in the varying policies through the hospitals that provide rehab. services for the State of Maine.

The study committee is of the opinion, as well as many that appeared before it, that we are not meeting the needs of our citizens in the area of rehabilitation and further, that a vigorous and successful program is a distinct benefit to the state. Rehabilitants of such a program include many who are welfare recipients as well as others who would become recipients if it were not for assistance received.

A vigorous co-ordinated program combining eye care and special services and alcoholic rehabilitation from the Department of Health and Welfare and the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation from the Department of Education would eventually save the state money from within its welfare funds. It is also the opinion of the committee that the Department of Education, concerned as by law they must be, with the tremendous and expanding problems of general education, cannot be expected to give adequate attention and emphasis to the needs of a program which is administratively under its control but whose function and operation are far from the main street of its everyday business.

At the public hearings before the Committee on State Government, many persons appeared to speak in favor of this bill including representatives of hospitals providing rehab. services, blind persons, members of Alcoholics Anonymous, and other voluntary agencies. I believe that by combining these services under a separate department we will receive more value from each dollar spent as well as providing more adequate services in the area of rehabilitation.

While I am on my feet, the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross,

mentioned the cost of each biennium. Some of these funds, of course, are coming from departments involved with this transition. Of the sixty-three thousand dollars in the first year of the biennium, forty-two thousand dollars of that is federal funds. Of the seventy-two thousand dollars in the second year of the biennium, forty-six thousand dollars involves federal funds. In other words, in the rehab. program the Federal Government participates to the extent of two-thirds of our costs. I would hope that this bill would receive passage.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I am not going to speak for or against this bill. I am not going to make any observation today other than to state that I know that the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, and the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Brewer, and the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Berry, will be around when we pick up the tab for this stuff.

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

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: During the hearing before our Committee on State Government, primary opposition to this bill stemmed from Dr. Dean Fisher in the Department of Health and Welfare. Under questioning, his primary objection seemed to be that if he were to lose these services from under his control, he would be placed on a priority list with the needs of the rest of the state, and he has probably quite properly from his position placed the needs of his department over those of the rest of the state. I think that you should take this into consideration. We are here representing the entire state and not the Department of Health and Welfare.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I

don't know whether I speak against the bill or for it, but in glancing through it, I note that you create eleven new positions. I also find that glancing it through that you probably do not eliminate more than one or two and that you transfer very little money from other services. I just simply point this out so that those who vote either way will know which way we are heading.

The SPEAKER: Is it now the pleasure of the House that this bill be passed to be engrossed and a division has been requested.

All those in favor of this Bill "An Act to Create a Department of Rehabilitation," House Paper 1075, L. D. 1455, being passed to be engrossed will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had. Eighty-three having voted in the affirmative and twenty-three having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

Sent to the Senate.

The Chair laid before the House the third item of Unfinished Business:

HOUSE REPORT — "Ought to pass" as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" — Committee on Towns and Counties on Bill, "An Act Authorizing County Commissioners for York County to Make a Loan for Construction of a Sewage Treatment and Disposal System for its Courthouse and Jail," (H. P. 571) (L. D. 741) (C. "A" H-153)

Tabled — May 4, by Mr. Pendergast of Kennebunkport.

Pending—Motion of Mr. Bernard of Sanford to Indefinitely Postpone Report and Bill. (Specially assigned for Thursday, May 13th)

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Carroll of Limerick, retabled pending motion of Mr. Bernard of Sanford to indefinitely postpone Report and Bill and specially assigned for Monday, May 24.

The Chair laid before the House the fourth item of Unfinished Business:

Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Establishment of an Area State

Operated Vocational Technical High School in York County and the Issuance of Not Exceeding One Million One Hundred and Fifteen Thousand Dollar Bonds of the State of Maine for the Financing Thereof." (H. P. 673) (L. D. 900)

Tabled—May 6, by Mr. Bedard of Saco.

Pending — Passage to be Engrossed. (Specially assigned for Thursday, May 13th)

On motion of Mr. Bedard of Saco, retabled pending engrossment and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 25.

The Chair laid before the House the fifth item of Unfinished Business:

Bill, "An Act Appropriating Funds for Classroom Building at Erskine Academy." (H. P. 444) (L. D. 598) (C. "A" H-283)

Tabled — May 6, by Mr. Avery of Kittery.

Pending — Passage to be Engrossed. (Specially assigned for Thursday, May 13th)

On motion of Mr. Levesque of Madawaska, retabled pending engrossment and specially assigned for Wednesday, May 19.

The Chair laid before the House the sixth item of Unfinished Business:

DIVIDED REPORT — Majority (9) — "Ought to pass" as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" — **Minority** (1) — "Ought not to pass" — Committee on Labor on Bill, "An Act relating to Payments Under Employment Security Law for Dependent Children." (H. P. 828) (L. D. 1056) (C. "A" H-150)

Tabled — May 6, by Mr. Levesque of Madawaska.

Pending — Acceptance of Either Report. (Specially assigned for Thursday, May 13th)

On motion of Mr. Levesque of Madawaska, retabled pending acceptance of either report and specially assigned for Friday, May 21.

The Chair laid before the House the seventh item of Unfinished Business:

HOUSE REPORT — "Ought not to pass" — Committee on State Government on Bill, "An Act Establishing the Maine Insurance Advisory Board and Reserve Fund for Uninsured Losses." (H. P. 851) (L. D. 1176)

Tabled — May 7, by Mr. Berry of Cape Elizabeth.

Pending — Acceptance. (Specially assigned for Thursday, May 13th)

On motion of Mr. Berry of Cape Elizabeth, retabled pending acceptance and specially assigned for Thursday, May 20.

The Chair laid before the House the eighth item of Unfinished Business:

HOUSE REPORT — "Ought to pass" — Committee on Business Legislation on Bill, "An Act relating to Insurance on Public Buildings." (H. P. 852) (L. D. 1150)

Tabled — May 7, by Mr. Berry of Cape Elizabeth.

Pending — Acceptance. (Specially assigned for Thursday, May 13th)

On motion of Mr. Berry of Cape Elizabeth, retabled pending acceptance and specially assigned for Thursday, May 20.

The Chair laid before the House the ninth item of Unfinished Business:

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

Tabled — May 7, by Mr. Evans of Freedom.

Pending — Passage to be Engrossed. (Specially assigned for Thursday, May 13th)

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Avery.

Mr. **AVERY**: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill does some strange things in the health and accident field. The motives of the bill are excellent. They want to stop the practice of buying large numbers of policies

and then perhaps collecting unusually large amounts. Fine, this sounds good. But, I think they are going to catch more small people who are unaware of the fact that they are overinsured in this bind than they are the crooks. For instance, a man may definitely want a little more insurance or a lot more insurance on his accident and health program for the purpose for instance if his wife should become ill, of helping to pay for the costs of caring for his house and for his children which he may not be able to do if he is going to keep working in the meantime.

The bill calls for a one hundred and ten percent settlement on the basis of the actual incurred expense and a return of premiums to the insured beyond this point, but how is the individual who buys a little over-insurance who doesn't have a claim, who pays back his premiums? Or does he continue to pay for them only until he has had a claim? These things make for questions in my mind and I would move the indefinite postponement of this bill and all its accompanying papers.

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

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

Mr. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Avery, has explained this very well. There isn't—at the hearing there wasn't sufficient evidence brought out that there was any need for this type of legislation in the State of Maine at the present time. There is very little racketeering and I concur with him on indefinite postponement.

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

Mr. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: Now, I am not going to repeat myself. I gave all the arguments for it last week. I would just like the

House to know that as far as I am concerned this is a good bill. It's permissive legislation. The insurance companies do not have to use it if they do not want to. It is—it has had its blessing by the department. All the major insurance companies were here for the bill. There were no insurance companies locally that I can remember of that were against the bill. All it simply does is protect the little fellow, so that he will not have to pay for the extra amount of money that somebody gets who is over insured and probably doesn't need the money in the first place. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Avery, that this bill and its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of this bill and its accompanying papers being indefinitely postponed, will say aye; those opposed will say no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

Sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the tenth item of Unfinished Business:

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

Tabled—May 7, by Mr. Bragdon of Perham.

Pending—Passage to be Engrossed. (Specially assigned for Thursday, May 13th)

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill was presented by the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Bishop and I had opportunity to discuss it with him the other day previous to having it tabled. I think that we are in accord in regard to not favoring disposal of state property at this time. However, out of deference to the gentleman, I will allow him to make the motion that he thinks should properly be made.

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

Mr. BISHOP: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: The proposal which prompted this bill did not materialize and for that reason I now move the indefinite postponement of this measure.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Bishop, that this Resolve and its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

Thereupon the Resolve and accompanying papers were indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the eleventh item of Unfinished Business:

Bill, "An Act Increasing Salary of Superior Court Messenger of Cumberland County." (H. P. 784) (L. D. 1037) (C. "A" H-298)

Tabled—May 11, by Mr. Conley of Portland.

Pending—Passage to be Engrossed. (Specially assigned for Thursday, May 13th)

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

The Chair laid before the House the twelfth item of Unfinished Business:

SENATE REPORT—"Ought not to pass"—Committee on Business Legislation on Bill, "An Act relating to Advisory Board on Examinations of Life Insurance Agents." (S. P. 411) (L. D. 1307).

Tabled—May 12, by Mr. Bernard of Sanford.

Pending—Motion of Mr. Scott of Wilton to Indefinitely Postpone. (Specially assigned for Thursday, May 13th)

On motion of Mr. Cottrell of Portland, retabled pending the motion of Mr. Scott of Wilton to indefinitely postpone and specially assigned for Wednesday, May 19.

The Chair laid before the House the thirteenth item of Unfinished Business:

DIVIDED REPORT — Majority (9)—Committee on Labor on Bill, "An Act to Provide for Fair Minimum Wages for Construction of Public Improvements." (H. P. 743) (L. D. 980) reporting same in New Draft (H. P. 1124) (L. D. 1534) under same title, and that it "Ought to pass"—Minority (1)—"Ought not to pass."

Tabled—May 12, by Mr. Starbird of Kingman Township.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Levesque of Madawaska to accept Majority "Ought to pass" Report. (Specially assigned for Thursday, May 13th)

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Stoutamyer.

Mr. STOUTAMYER: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I move that we accept the Minority "ought not to pass" report.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque, that we accept the Majority "ought to pass" report.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. STOUTAMYER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: What this bill says is that any municipal project of over five thousand dollars, wages will have to be paid at the rate for that type of work which is the prevailing wage in the state. This, I believe, would work a hardship on all of our small towns, in the depressed areas. In the larger towns they already pay these wages anyway. They don't need it.

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

Mr. BENSON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I don't know just how serious this bill could be on both the large cities and small towns, but I have an idea that it could be extremely serious. This would take in projects, proposed projects on airports, sewers, highways, buildings, hospitals. It would include the entire sweep of construction and it could mean the abandonment of many, many pieces of construction of varying natures in

both cities and the small towns. I would move that this bill and all its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House now is on the motion of the gentleman from Southwest Harbor, Mr. Benson, that this bill and its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Levesque of Madawaska, tabled pending the motion of Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor that the bill and accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 18.

The Chair laid before the House the fourteenth item of Unfinished Business:

Resolve, Authorizing Director of Bureau of Public Improvements to Convey Certain Land in Hallowell. (H. P. 552) (L. D. 723) (C "A" H-220)

Tabled—May 6, by Mr. Haugen of South Portland.

Pending—Passage to be Engrossed. (Specially assigned for Friday, May 14th)

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

Mr. BINNETTE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that we indefinitely postpone L. D. 723 and all its accompanying papers.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House now is on the motion of the gentleman from Old Town, Mr. Binnette that this bill and its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Manchester, Mr. Gifford.

Mr. GIFFORD: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise in opposition to the motion to indefinitely postpone L. D. 723. This is a matter which was reported out of Committee on State Government with a majority "Ought to pass" report, and this report was accepted by this House by a substantial majority. This action took place some weeks ago and from that time to the present day this matter has rested upon our table awaiting the return to

the legislative halls of its principal opponent, the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Carswell. I would hope that the House this afternoon would vote as it did on a previous occasion and send along toward enactment this bill which will be of considerable benefit to the City of Hallowell in opening up attractive land which is currently unavailable. I oppose the motion to indefinitely postpone.

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

Mr. BINNETTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House: After hearing the remarks of the gentleman from Manchester, I have been thinking quite a bit about it. It is true that this has been on the table for quite some time, but there is something in that that didn't appeal to me very much, is the fact that this land is to be conveyed to a member of the Highway Committee, I mean a Highway Commission who is an engineer. And I don't think that is proper. I think it is for his own benefit that this land is being conveyed to him and therefore I am going to take up that this director of Stevens Training School, who claims that she needs that land, where it is flat land in order to utilize it to the greatest advantage, I still maintain that we should indefinitely postpone that act. I request a division when the vote is taken.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Manchester, Mr. Gifford.

Mr. GIFFORD: Mr. Speaker. Members of the House: This bill as amended and reported out of committee would convey the land to the City of Hallowell for purposes of a street to provide access to a parcel of land. The land would not be conveyed to an individual.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think this same piece of legislation has been debated before us here in the halls of con-

veying this land to the City of Hallowell. Although, in all due respect to the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Carswell, who has fought this bill on the Floor of the House against the turning over of this land to the City of Hallowell because of the fact that land is becoming more and more valuable and it has been her contention all along that in the eventuality that the Stevens Training Center might need additional land or the State of Maine might need additional land, I am very much opposed that this land would be turned over to the City of Hallowell.

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

Mr. KATZ: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: You know sometimes I listen to the debate and I am not quite sure that we are all debating on the same issue. First, I heard that we are going to convey a certain piece of land to an employee of the State Highway Department. Then I hear that we are going to be stripping land away from the state school. Neither of these is true. It is a very, very, simple attempt to convey about one acre of land to the City of Hallowell in exchange for which the state school will be receiving back two acres of land. We are going to give Hallowell one acre, and we are going to give the state school two acres and the only possible devious purpose is to permit the City of Hallowell to open up a very large acreage, and it is physically a very small city, a very large acreage for home development. Now if this is insidious, if this is chipping away at state institutions, my heavens, explain it to me.

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

Mr. BERRY: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: There certainly is some devious work going on here. The fact of the matter is that a gentleman by the name of Stubbs, who as was indicated is a full time employee in the right of way section of the State Highway Commission, bought some land

in Hallowell and after he got it, he found himself in a box where he can't get to his land and he has to come to the state to have the state grant him an easement across other land to his land.

The fact that anybody who is in the right of way department of the State Highway Commission can find himself in a situation like this is really amazing. We could enlarge on some of the amazing things in the State Highway Commission I suppose too, but we had better leave that one for right now.

Actually, I think we all recall we had on our desks a week or so ago a letter from the Director of the Stevens Training Institute saying she was against this transfer and putting in very plain understandable language why she was. We are not doing anything to help the City of Hallowell. We are doing something to bail an individual out of a situation and while there may be some merits to the case, I certainly don't see it. I think this is very bad specific legislation that ought to be defeated.

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

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: I think perhaps I will try to draw a verbal picture of what we're talking about here.

Picture a large rectangle and that's the land held by the Stevens Training Center. Now we'll take a narrow strip off one edge of this rectangle and not for the whole length of it, but for a short section of it, wide enough to put a road through. This is the land we're conveying to the City of Hallowell. Now we'll take around the corner on the other side of the rectangle where the Bureau of Public Improvements has laid out a master plan for buildings and right at the back door of one of these buildings which is on the edge of the existing property we're giving the school two more acres of land. Nothing on the proposed buildings plan shows any construction in the vicinity of the proposed right of way, so by making this exchange, you make it possible for the City of Hallowell,

which as I understand it is heavily overburdened now with State property where they can receive no taxes, you make it possible for them to develop a large area of land and make it tax revenue producing property. I see nothing wrong in this whatsoever.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Limerick, Mr. Carroll.

Mr. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I took one of my free afternoons and went over to the girls training center and walked over this land. Now when I go out and buy a piece of property I usually look it over to determine if there is a right of way and if there is not a right of way I usually take steps to procure or purchase a right of way. Now I know when I talked to the Bureau of Public Improvements they explained this to me. They said this is just trading an old piece of pastureland for another piece of pastureland. Now gentlemen I'm a little farm boy and I have to look at things, so I went down and looked it over and I inquired why this street didn't go straight instead of putting a yank in it to take this land from the Stevens Training Center. I was told a man wanted 30,000 dollars for that piece of property to straighten out that road, so I can see that we're not trading a little piece of pastureland for another piece of pastureland. They are asking us to give a piece of property, which the State owns away which is valuable because it is going to be a right of way to a piece of property which will be extremely valuable if you give it to them.

So I believe, gentlemen, that we should be fair traders and good citizens and realize that we are working and represent all the people of the State of Maine and not just the people in the City of Hallowell. Therefore I move gentlemen, that this gentleman and his people who are with him who are trying to promote this little deal go home and think up a good fair price, come back here to this House and make an offer of cash on the barrel head and we'll talk business. Otherwise I move for indefinite postponement and I don't like this bill, it smells.

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

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think the gentleman from Limerick, Mr. Carroll, has just pointed up the problem here. I'm not a farmer, but it seems awfully hard for me to imagine an acre of pastureland that's worth 30,000 dollars. Because some private individual is trying sheer piracy on the man who is trying to develop this land. This is what's happening. It becomes obvious and if we don't pass this bill we'll become a party to that piracy, we will help that man get 30,000 dollars for an acre of land that I'm sure isn't worth one tenth that much.

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

Mr. KATZ: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: Hallowell is not in my constituency and I'm sure Mr. Carroll did not mean to impugn anyone's motives in this. My part in this is that I was approached by the City of Hallowell, by the mayor, by Mayor Raymond Rideout, Jr., by the members of the City Council of Hallowell and I'm not pushing this for any one individual, I'm pushing it for the City of Hallowell. Now this has been so confused that I throw my hands up in the air but there's no bill on which I voted that I think is cleaner or makes more sense than this.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Old Town, Mr. Binnette that this bill and its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed and he has requested a division. All those in favor of this Resolve Authorizing Director of Public Improvements to Convey Certain Land in Hallowell, House Paper 552, L. D. 723, 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.

Sixty-nine having voted in the affirmative and forty-three having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

Sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the fifteenth item of Unfinished Business:

Bill, "An Act Exempting Liquor Bottled or Manufactured in Maine from Additional Taxes." (S. P. 326) (L. D. 1048) (H. "A" H-286)

Tabled — May 7, by Mr. Kennedy of Milbridge.

Pending — Passage to be Engrossed in Non-concurrence. (Specially assigned for Friday, May 14th)

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the sixteenth item of Unfinished Business:

SENATE REPORT — Committee on State Government on Bill, "An Act Increasing Compensation of Members of the Legislature." (S. P. 460) (L. D. 1396) reporting same in New Draft (S. P. 520) (L. D. 1497) under title of "An Act Increasing Compensation of Members of the Legislature, the Governor, Court Justices and Certain Department Heads," and that it "Ought to pass"

Tabled — May 12, by Mr. Levesque of Madawaska.

Pending — Acceptance in concurrence. (Specially assigned for Friday, May 14th)

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Thomaston, Mr. Kittredge.

Mr. KITTREDGE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Last night and this morning I have received a number of phone calls from some of my constituents who were rather elderly people getting old age assistance from the state, and I must say I've been rather delinquent in my duties, or I should say derelict in my duties, because I don't know very much about old age as-

sistance. What I would like to do, because they seem to tie this in to a pay raise for the legislature, I would like to have someone table this bill for one day.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I move that this bill be tabled until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon now moves that this matter lie upon the table assigned for tomorrow pending the acceptance of the Committee Report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The Chair laid before the House the seventeenth item of Unfinished Business:

HOUSE REPORT—"Ought to pass" as Amended by Committee Amendment "B"—Committee on Taxation on recommitted Bill, "An Act Repealing Property Tax Exemption for Pleasure Boats in the State for Storage or Repair." (H. P. 760) (L. D. 997) (C. "A" H-315)

Tabled—May 12, by Mr. Cottrell of Portland.

Pending—Acceptance. (Specially assigned for Friday, May 14th)

Report was read and accepted and the Bill read twice.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "B" to H. P. 760, L. D. 997, Bill, "An Act Repealing Property Tax Exemption for Pleasure Boats in the State for Storage or Repair."

Amend said Bill in the Title by striking out the word "Repealing" and inserting in place thereof the words "Relating to"

Further amend said Bill by striking out everything after the enacting clause and inserting in place thereof the following:

"R. S., T. 36, § 655, sub-§ 1, H, amended. Paragraph H of subsection 1 of section 655 of Title 36 of the Revised Statutes is amended to read as follows:

'H. Pleasure vessels and boats in the State on the first day of each April whose owners reside out of the State, and which are

left in this State temporarily by the owners for the purposes of repair or storage and for a consideration brought into this State for the purposes of repair or storage.”

On motion of Mr. Cottrell of Portland, Committee Amendment “B” was indefinitely postponed.

Whereupon, Mr. Cottrell of Portland offered House Amendment “A” and moved its adoption.

House Amendment “A” was read by the Clerk as follows:

HOUSE AMENDMENT “A” to H. P. 760, L. D. 997, Bill, “An Act Repealing Property Tax Exemption for Pleasure Boats in the State for Storage or Repair.”

Amend said Bill in the Title by striking out the word “Repealing” and inserting in place thereof the words ‘Relating to’

Further amend said Bill by striking out everything after the enacting clause and inserting in place thereof the following:

“R. S., T. 36, § 655, sub-§ 1, H. amended. Paragraph H of subsection 1 of section 655 of Title 36 of the Revised Statutes is amended to read as follows:

‘H. Pleasure vessels and boats in the State on the first day of each April whose owners reside out of the State, and which are left in this State temporarily by the owners for the purposes of repair or storage and for a consideration except those regularly kept in the State during the preceding year.’”

House Amendment “A” was adopted and the Bill assigned for third reading tomorrow.

The Chair laid before the House the eighteenth item of Unfinished Business:

Bill, “An Act relating to Uniforms for Deputy Sheriffs.” (H. P. 260) (L. D. 330) (S. “A” H-151)

Tabled—May 13, by Mr. Levesque of Madawaska.

Pending—Motion of Mr. Bernard of Sanford to reconsider Receding and Concurring with the Senate. (In Senate, Senate voted to Insist and Ask Committee of Conference) (Specially assigned for Friday, May 14th)

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

Mr. BERNARD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I moved last week to reconsider receding and concurring with the Senate because of an error on the calendar. On the calendar it says that they insisted and asked for engrossment. I now move Mr. Speaker, that we concur with the Senate and join in the Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Bernard, moves that we reconsider our action whereby we receded and concurred with the Senate.

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

Mr. BUSSIERE: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I’d like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, if the motion would be in order for indefinite postponement of this bill.

The SPEAKER: The only motion in order at this time is a motion to reconsider our action whereby we receded and concurred.

Mr. BUSSIERE: Mr. Speaker, I request a division on that motion.

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

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hope that the House understands that there are provisions on the statutes that say that only four uniforms can be bought for the purpose of traffic, that the county commissioners may buy all the uniforms that they wish. I’ve explained this once to the House and I think this is the prime reason that the unmentionable body came back with this report. Uniforms to any number may be bought as the County Commissioners see fit. The only reason that this change was made on this particular matter in Towns and Counties Committee was to allow a legitimate, straightforward bill on the books so that they could buy uniforms as they see fit under this particular provision. Now if I’ve confused you more that’s about all I can say but

there is now a statute on the book that's very confusing and this would certainly straighten it out.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Levesque of Madawaska, tabled pending the motion of reconsideration and tomorrow assigned.

The Chair laid before the House the nineteenth item of Unfinished Business:

Bill, "An Act relating to Payment by Dealers to Producers for Milk Purchased." (H. P. 1037) L. D. 1408) (H. "A" H-139)

Tabled—May 13, by Mr. Levesque of Madawaska.

Pending—Further consideration. (In Senate, Passed to be Engrossed without Amendment) (Specially assigned for Friday, May 14th)

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

Mr. HUNTER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I was asked by one of the sponsors of this bill last Friday as we were leaving here, and he explained to me that he wasn't going to be here today and he says if you want, get rid of this bill, I'm tired of it. Mr. Speaker, I make a motion that this bill and all of its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House now is on the motion of the gentleman from Durham, Mr. Hunter, that this bill and all its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed. Sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the twentieth item of Unfinished Business:

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

Tabled—May 13, by Mr. Levesque of Madawaska.

Pending—Passage to be Enacted. (Specially assigned for Friday, May 14th)

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

Mr. DRIGOTAS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I now move that this be sent along to finally be enacted.

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

Mr. BUSSIÈRE: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: There will be another bill here tomorrow about the same in regard to the same County Attorney and I'd like to mention here at the time the gentleman in question mentioned that he didn't want a raise for himself or his assistant. What he was interested in was a second assistant. I am willing to go along with this, but I'm not willing to go along with this double raise there because the gentleman doesn't want a raise. So I'd like to have someone table this until tomorrow.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Levesque of Madawaska, tabled pending passage to be enacted and tomorrow assigned.

The Chair laid before the House the twenty-first item of Unfinished Business:

SENATE DIVIDED REPORT—Majority (9)—Committee on Transportation on Bill, "An Act relating to Length of Certain Motor Vehicles." (S. P. 300) (L. D. 914) reporting same in New Draft (S. P. 489) (L. D. 1452) under same title, and that it "Ought to pass"—Minority (1)—"Ought not to pass"

Tabled—May 13, by Mr. Gifford of Manchester.

Pending—Motion of Mr. Crommett of Millinocket to accept Majority "Ought to pass" Report in non-concurrence. (Specially assigned for Friday, May 14th.)

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Manchester, Mr. Gifford.

Mr. GIFFORD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise in support of the pending motion to accept the "ought to pass" report. If it is accepted this afternoon, it is my intention upon third reading to offer an amendment which will return

this bill to its original substance. As originally proposed, this legislative document did not call for increasing the length of trucks operating upon Maine highways. It simply asked that truckers be permitted to overhang their loads beyond the legal length by not more than five feet. Very few trucks are here involved inasmuch as most trucks cannot overhang their loads in any event. I find it most difficult in the industry in which I participate involving liquid petroleum products to overhang the load as much as a single inch.

The carriers, however, who do haul automobiles from the factories in Detroit and other places to Maine dealers scattered over the State of Maine do here have a real problem. They must leave an automobile off the load simply because it would overhang beyond Maine's legal limit. Leaving this automobile off increases the unit cost of getting your car and mine here to the state and ultimately the cost of that automobile to us. As reported out of committee, however, the bill goes far beyond the original intent and would permit truck lengths of all trucks to be increased five feet beyond the present legal limit. This change in our trucking laws was not intended by the original legislative proposal and I personally am opposed to it. I would, however, support the original bill and would hope for acceptance of the "ought to pass" report at this time in order that I might offer the amendment to return to your consideration, the original proposal.

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

Mr. PIKE: Mr. Speaker, here's another one of those things. I think this makes five or six, I can't count very accurately, of so-called tolerances.

Now I had intended when this original bill came up to allow lengths of trucks to go up to 60 feet to save the next legislature a little trouble and offer a tolerance of 10 percent for 9 months out of the year and an additional 15 percent for January, February, and March just for the purpose of your seeing how ridiculous some of these

things are that we have passed, and some of them have been signed. This whole business of tolerances, and I must submit to you that tolerances soon become the uniform method of loading, they are for the sole interest of the five or ten percent of the vehicles on the road which crowd our present regulations. I often wonder if when we go along with these things if we're something like the people who went along with Hitler in the 30's. He said that's all we want, then the next legislature comes up and they want some more. I don't know where the limit is. There is no logical limit to these things. We're already up to or beyond what most states and the federal limit will allow, and I must rise in protest again. I move that this bill and all its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House now is on the motion of the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Pike that this bill and all its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Manchester, Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Gifford of Manchester requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Manchester, Mr. Gifford, requests a division. 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.

Fifty-three having voted in the affirmative and fifty-five having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted in non-concurrence, the Bill read twice and tomorrow assigned.

The Chair laid before the House the twenty-second item of Unfinished Business:

DIVIDED REPORT — Majority (8) — "Ought not to pass"—Minority (2) — "Ought to pass" — Committee on Taxation on Bill,

"An Act relating to Definition of Farm Tractor Under Sales and Use Tax Law." (H. P. 718) (L. D. 956)

Tabled — May 13, by Mr. Payson of Falmouth.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Dunn of Denmark to accept Minority "Ought to pass" Report.

Mr. Levesque of Madawaska requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque, requests a division.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Denmark, Mr. Dunn.

Mr. DUNN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring out one point and that is this, should the amount of sales tax paid on an article be governed by the purpose for which it is purchased? If I go out and buy two automobiles and have two trade-ins, one to be used for a personal car and one to be used for a taxi, should I get different treatment on the sales tax? That is exactly what is done on some of these tractors.

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

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: There were two of us on the Taxation Committee that voted that this ought not to pass simply on the principle that if we do not tax or simply if we exempt the trade-ins from sales taxation on automobiles, we think that you shouldn't do it on these types of tractors. There is another bill coming up on farm tractors too. And we two again voted on the "ought not to pass" report simply for the same reason. Now, in our opinion let's exempt trade-ins on automobiles from taxation and not keep it on tractors and farm tractors, the woods tractors. If you want to go along with exempting the sales tax on trade-ins on automobiles, I'm for it. On the Taxation Committee we're trying to get a little uniformity. In a sense, not pick on the smaller guys. That's the reason we came in as we did on that.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of

the gentleman from Denmark, Mr. Dunn, that we accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report on Bill "An Act relating to Definition of Farm Tractor Under Sales and Use Tax Law," H. P. 718, L. D. 956. All those in favor of accepting the ought to pass report will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

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

Thereupon, the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the twenty-third item of Unfinished Business:

DIVIDED REPORT — Majority (8) — "Ought not to pass" — Minority (2) — "Ought to pass" — Committee on Taxation on Bill, "An Act relating to Sales Tax on Farm Machinery and Equipment." (H. P. 856) (L. D. 1153)

Tabled—May 13, by Mr. Ross of Bath.

Pending — Acceptance of Either Report. (Specially assigned for Friday, May 14th)

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I now move that we accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross now moves that we accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" report.

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

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, I move that this matter be tabled until May 19.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from China, Mr. Farrington moves that this matter lie upon the table assigned for May 19 pending the acceptance of the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

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

An Act to Provide Funds for the Continuing of Maine's Participation in the New England Pavilion at the New York World's Fair. (H. P. 616) (L. D. 825)

Tabled—May 13, by Mr. Levesque of Madawaska.

Pending—Passage to be Enacted.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker, I now move this item receive final passage.

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

Mr. BUSSIÈRE: Mr. Speaker, I think to go further with spending the taxpayers' money for something that don't produce any result is a shame. I will now move that this bill be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would remind the gentleman that this is an emergency. It takes two-thirds for an emergency. Does he still want his motion to indefinitely postpone?

Mr. BUSSIÈRE: Yes.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt.

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, I spoke on this the other day, and I would just reiterate my comments that this is a program that we went into two years ago. I don't think it has worked out too unsuccessfully. I think from the reports of the DED and some of the reports of the amount of recreational money that was spent in the state two years ago, that they had one of the best years that they had ever had, and it was felt that the results could very well have been partially on account of our participation in the World's Fair, and at the present time this is only a small amount of money, there is only \$20,000 involved in this. It also requires the participation of

the other five New England States. I think certainly if we were to back out of this thing now, we would look like an awful bunch of pikers, and I would hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Like Mr. Birt of East Millinocket, I hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone will not prevail. When this matter came up originally two years ago, I wasn't for spending half a million dollars on the World's Fair, but now that we are committed to the World's Fair, I think that we really should go along and give them the \$20,000 they need for Maine's share of the program.

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

Mr. BUSSIÈRE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to withdraw my motion, but I am going to vote against this unnecessary expense.

Thereupon, this being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a division was had. 116 voted in favor of same and 2 against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

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

Bill, "An Act Regulating Fly Fishing in Certain Portion of Kennebec River." (S. P. 425) (L. D. 1360) (S. "A" S-97) (S. "C" S-189)

Tabled—May 14, by Mr. Ross of Brownville.

Pending — Adoption of Senate Amendment "C" in concurrence.

Thereupon, Senate Amendment "C" was adopted in concurrence and the Bill assigned for third reading tomorrow.

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

HOUSE REPORT — Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill, "An Act for Licensing Private Detectives and Watch, Guard and Patrol Agencies" (H. P. 963) (L. D. 1298) reporting same in New Draft (H. P. 1130) (L. D. 1545) under same title, and that it "Ought to pass"

Tabled—May 14, by Mr. Roy of Winslow.

Pending—Acceptance.

On motion of Mr. Levesque of Madawaska, retabled pending acceptance and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 18.

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

Bill, "An Act relating to Construction and Operation of Intra-state Natural Gas Pipelines." (H. P. 845) (L. D. 1146) (H. "A" H-328)

Tabled—May 14, by Mr. Danton of Old Orchard Beach.

Pending — Adoption of House Amendment "A."

On motion of Mr. Bernard of Sanford, retabled pending adoption of House Amendment "A" and specially assigned for Thursday, May 20.

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

Bill, "An Act relating to Discrimination in Rental Housing." (H. P. 1112) (L. D. 1518) (H. "C" H-330)

Tabled—May 14, by Mr. Bishop of Presque Isle.

Pending — Adoption of House Amendment "C."

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

Mr. BISHOP: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: If I understand the purposes of this amendment, I do not believe that they are particularly objectionable. On the other hand, I don't feel that they are necessary, and in one instance I feel that it is contrary to the intent of the bill and perhaps the intent of the proponent.

Taking them one by one the first proposal is to insert after the word employee, in the fifth line, the

words "by authority" which would then read: "by authority of the owner." I don't think this is necessary because a person acting as agent or employee if he discriminates should be held accountable. The next proposal is inserting in the eighth line after the words against any, the words: "law abiding," which would make it read: "against any law abiding person by refusing, withholding" and so on. This is laudable that only law abiding persons should be granted the protection of the law. On the other hand, it would leave it to the acting person in every instance to determine whether or not he was dealing with a law abiding person, and I think that this is imposing a duty on any person attempting to comply with this law that is impossible.

The last proposal is the one that disturbs me most, which adds at the end of each section the words: "providing such person is a citizen of the United States and is not affiliated with any subversive group." In effect, this would provide that if a person was not a citizen of the United States, that you could then discriminate against him because of his race, color, religious sect, creed, denomination and so on. If the intent were that you could discriminate against him because he was not a citizen of the United States, and was affiliated with a subversive group, this might or might not be acceptable to you, depending on how you feel about these things, but to give—to make it permissible to discriminate against a person because of his race, color, creed and so on merely because he was not a citizen of the United States, I think would be a worse situation than what we have at present. For this reason, I would move the indefinite postponement of this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House now is the motion of the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Bishop, that House Amendment "C" be indefinitely postponed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Mr. Kittredge of South Thomaston offered House Amendment "B" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "B" was read by the Clerk as follows:

HOUSE AMENDMENT "B" to H.P. 1112, L. D. 1518, Bill, "An Act Relating to Discrimination in Rental Housing."

Amend said Bill by inserting at the end of section 1, before the single quotation mark, the following underlined paragraph:

'This section shall not apply to ownership by a single individual. It shall apply only to ownership by 2 or more persons or by one or more corporations.'

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. KITTREDGE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There has been no legislative proposal of greater significance to come before the 102nd Maine Legislature than L. D. 1518. Someone called it a declaration of conscience. I wish it were a declaration of conscience and not a proposed law because if it were a declaration, it would receive unanimous approval of this House. But it is my belief that L. D. 1518, as it now stands, violates two basic rights of the individual — the right of ownership and the right of contract. I am sure that no one in the House likes this amendment. I do not like this amendment myself and I do not like L. D. 1518.

The purpose of this amendment is to reduce L. D. 1518 to its simplest form. One individual versus another individual. At what point do the thoughts of one individual take precedence over the thoughts of another individual? At what point can society put a person in jail simply because he differs in belief over the use of his own property?

When the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of Mississippi were convicted of civil contempt due to their interference with a court order involving the admission of James Meredith to a State university, I was proud of our system of government. But when the Reverend Martin Luther King openly defied a Federal court

order and our government did nothing about it, I was not proud of this episode because I had always been led to believe that in the United States, no man was above the law.

I am an insignificant individual from a small town in Maine. The Rev. Martin Luther King is a national figure. I own a cottage at Owl's Head, Maine. If the Reverend Martin Luther King ever wants to rent that cottage, I shall reserve the right to refuse him, but if he challenges my right I will invite him to stay in my home with me while the matter is being decided in a court of law. In short I believe that the motivating force in our government should be equality under the law and not mass emotion.

Now under this proposed law, if I am wrong, if I as an individual do not have the freedom of choice in the use of my property, society is going to put me in jail for thirty days for what I believe. And even if I had not been so unwise as to voice these opinions today but I still refused to rent my cottage to the Reverend Martin Luther King, you would make me prove under L. D. 1518 that I was not guilty of discriminating thoughts. This shifting of the burden of proof is itself a contradiction of the history of American jurisprudence.

Many times in this House I have heard voiced that the Democrat Party was the champion of the young people, of the old people, of the Negro, and of the poor people. If the Democrat Party wants to champion minority groups, they are welcome to it. But I urge this House to champion the rights of the individual in a classless society with equal rights under the law because to set one minority group against another is to contribute to the destruction of our society and our state.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: My friend the gentleman from South Thomaston, Mr. Kittredge, must

want to amend this bill very badly, because I noticed that last Thursday he had distributed both House Amendment "A" and House Amendment "B" over his signature, filing numbers 321 and 322. When I saw them, I first thought that they were identical. House Amendment "A" applied only to ownership of two or more persons or two or more corporations, and then as I reread House Amendment "B" I saw that he was willing to give in a little bit but not very much, because this applied to ownership of two or more persons but he was willing to say that it didn't need to be two corporations, it could just be one corporation. In short, both of these cuts the teeth out of the proposed legislation and I now move indefinite postponement of this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House now is the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, that House Amendment "B" be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of this House:

I am on record as of last week as being opposed to this legislation. I still, although I am in sympathy with the aims of this bill, do not feel that this is the proper vehicle to accomplish it, and yet this bill was debated on its merits and the majority of the members of this House decided that I was wrong. I am willing to abide by this decision, and I object to these underhanded tactics of trying to obscure the issue with ridiculous amendments in order to kill the bill. I second the motion for indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Thomaston, Mr. Kittredge.

Mr. KITTREDGE: Mr. Speaker, first because of the importance of this thing, I would like to speak briefly off the record on one point which the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross mentioned.

(Off Record Remarks)

I would respectfully submit to this House that we are not talking about discrimination in this bill. What we really mean in this bill when we say discrimination, is persecution. The meaning of the word discrimination has been changed in the last few years. Discrimination used to mean such things as distinction, judgment, discernment, insight,—to weigh carefully. But no longer. Discrimination has become a dirty word. We no longer say that a man is a person of discrimination. We say he is guilty of discrimination. Ladies and gentlemen, discrimination is a basic human right. A person cannot live without the right to discriminate. A baby discriminates the minute he comes into this world between warmth and cold. But a baby does not persecute. I believe that the individual has the right to discriminate but he does not have the right to persecute. And as long as you have equality under the law, human persecution is a state of mind.

I would give anything to know whether this change that is coming over our language is a normal evolutionary process or is it a process of conditioning. We have made the word discrimination a dirty word. Will we some day make the word "vote" a dirty word too? Because to vote is the most exact form of discrimination I know. And if we ever make the word "vote" a dirty word, then the words which were written on the stone that the Queen of England dedicated at Runnymede last week, will become meaningless. If we ever deny the right of the individual to discriminate on his ballot, the name John Fitzgerald Kennedy will be about as meaningful as Ozymandias.

Now in addition to L. D. 1518 being called a declaration of conscience, the passage of L. D. 1518 has been called for as a test of conscience. I would like to offer to the House a test of conscience on this proposed law. Please remember that I said I believe the individual has the right to discriminate. But I don't think that the law should discriminate between two individuals in matters

of property where one owns the property and the other does not. I don't think that the "due process" concept was ever meant to be extended to the point where the State could take away one man's property and give it to another simply because the other man wanted it. I thought that principle was settled at that place called Runnymede seven hundred and fifty years ago. And it will be ironic if this legislature passes this law and then it adjourns on the 15th of June.

Maybe I am entirely wrong in this. But if I am wrong, perhaps we should make L. D. 1518 cut across every stratum of society and not just discriminate against landlords. It would be a rather easy thing for someone to add an amendment to this bill which would say that no mortgage, loan, or any form of credit will be denied to anyone in the State of Maine on the grounds of race, creed, color, or ethnic group. Personally, I cannot see the difference between the rental of money and the rental of land or any other form of property. Such an amendment, I think, would be a very good test of the conscience of this House.

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

Mr. BINNETTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: After hearing all these kind offers of the gentleman from Thomaston, I am more than inclined to believe that I am going to go along with the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, to indefinitely postpone these amendments.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think I am going to say a few words on behalf of the Democratic Party, not only in the State of Maine, but probably throughout the entire country. I don't think the Democratic Party here in the State of Maine or anywhere else in the Country is having the prerogative or privilege of going around soliciting minority groups, be they Jewish, be they

Catholic or be they Protestant or any other religion. I believe that the Democratic Party believes in the philosophy of trying to help as many people as are in need of help.

In the area of discrimination, if the State of Maine is in the need of necessary legislation against discrimination, then I believe that the Democratic Party in the State of Maine believes that we should give them need for help. If you or any other group would have been through the second World War and found out what had been going on in Stalag 11, Stalag 11B and Stalag 7, you would have found there that there was only one kind of person there or one nationality of person. There were all kinds of persons. They were not being discriminated against. They were prisoners. They were there not by their choice, they were there because they had no defense.

Whether it be fortunate or unfortunate, I happened to be in Stalag 12. There was no discrimination there. We were all being used alike, all being fed the same thing. If we need to discriminate, let's try to see that the other people are not discriminated against by giving them what is rightly theirs. If they need a rent, let us make sure that we provide them with a rent. If they need help, let us make sure that we provide them with help to get a rent, not only in this state but any other state in the Union. Thank you.

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

Mr. BUSSIÈRE: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I don't agree with the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross. I think it's a pretty good amendment. I am speaking for myself and not for the party here. I don't like this section here, shall not apply to ownership by a single individual. That should be included in the amendment too. So this way we get rid of that bill. And I am going to vote against this indefinite postponement because we don't have any discrimination here in the state and I invite anyone here in this House to go around and take

a look at the City of Lewiston where we have about seven to eight hundred empty rents. There are plenty of rooms, but no tenants. This here, anyone in this House here who did attend the hearing where the opponents were ten to one. I don't know what happened in that committee between that time. It is very surprising to see a committee report like that. I hope that you don't vote to kill this amendment, this is a good amendment.

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

Mr. KENNEDY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I must rise at this time to differ with my good friend from Lewiston, Mr. Bussiere. There is discrimination in the State of Maine. I am acquainted with this in several areas of our state. And I, nor the Republican Party, believe in discrimination because of race, creed or color. I feel that this is a good bill. There are some facets of it that perhaps might be dangerous in some areas of the United States, but I don't believe it's dangerous in the State of Maine. I will support the bill in its entirety without any amendments because I think and believe that this is the philosophy of most people whether they be Republican or Democrat, that this bill is a workable bill for the State of Maine. Therefore, I will support it without amendments.

Mr. Ross of Bath requested a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested. All those in favor of House Amendment "B" to Bill "An Act Relating to Discrimination in Rental Housing," House Paper 1112, L. D. 1518, 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-five having voted in the affirmative and twenty-seven having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

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

Mr. BUSSIÈRE: Mr. Speaker, in order to have time to prepare an amendment, I would suggest that someone would table this bill until Thursday. I have a pretty good amendment to present and I hope that someone would table this bill until Thursday.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Falmouth, Mr. Payson.

Mr. PAYSON: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: This bill is generated in an emotional climate which makes it difficult for anyone to examine it objectively. I have tried to do this and I have talked to several in the legal profession, one of whom at least would be expected to take a liberal view. I have arrived at the conclusion that it may be a deceitful bill, that it gives no more opportunity to those it is supposed to than they have now, that it is unenforceable, that it may be unconstitutional. It is certainly no cure all. On the basis that it is, to say the least, misleading I shall vote against it with the realization that there will be violent criticism from some quarters. No matter how good the intentions of the backers of this bill may be, I cannot vote for a mere sop for guilty consciences. I am in favor of indefinite postponement.

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be engrossed.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I now move that we reconsider our action whereby we passed this bill to be engrossed and I hope that everybody in this House will vote against me.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque, now moves that we reconsider our action whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed.

Mr. Bussiere of Lewiston requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Bussiere, requests a division.

All those in favor of reconsidering our action whereby this

was passed to be engrossed 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 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Sent to the Senate.

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

Bill, "An Act relating to Working Capital of Liquor Commission." (S. P. 377) (L. D. 1194) (C. "A" S-171)

Tabled — May 14, by Mr. Bishop of Presque Isle.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Lund of Augusta to Indefinitely Postpone.

On motion of Mr. Bishop of Presque Isle, retabled pending the motion of Mr. Lund of Augusta to indefinitely postpone and specially assigned for Wednesday, May 19.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Millay, and inquires for what purpose does he rise?

Mr. MILLAY: Mr. Speaker, I now move that we reconsider our action on the nineteenth item of Unfinished Business, page 9, where we indefinitely postponed L. D. 1408.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Millay, now moves that we reconsider our action whereby we indefinitely postponed House Paper 1037, L. D. 1408, Bill "An Act relating to Payment by Dealers to Producers for Milk Purchased."

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Millay.

Mr. MILLAY: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I will explain my action here. I have gone over this bill and I consider this a good bill. There is a definite need for this. It requires that dealers will never owe their producers for more than thirty-five days. I happened to be acquainted with two or three instances where

certain dealers have gone on, small dealers, and have not been able to pay their producers, so they have paid them part of it, and in doing so they have built up a deficit of some five thousand dollars in one case that I know of. Now this did a favor to neither the producer nor the dealer. So I think there is need for this type of legislation and I certainly would support the passage of this bill.

Mr. Hunter of Clinton requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Hunter, requests a division. All those in favor of reconsidering our action whereby this bill was 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-six having voted in the affirmative and fifty-one having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

On motion of Mr. Levesque of Madawaska, the House voted to take from the table the third tabled and unassigned matter:

HOUSE ORDER Relative to Attorney General Reporting Status of Investigation Pertaining to Liquor Law Enforcement.

Tabled—April 20, by Mr. Levesque of Madawaska.

Pending—Passage.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker, I now move the indefinite postponement of this House Order.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque, now moves this order be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Thomaston, Mr. Kittredge.

Mr. KITTREDGE: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: Needless to say, this caught me by a bit of surprise. This is the particular order which requested the Attorney General to report to the House his opinion of conditions in Maine. I know we have that white paper which I am looking for frantically right now and also a letter which

I wrote to the Attorney General last week concerning a particular bit of concrete information he wanted in that letter. So, I would hope that somebody would table this particular motion for indefinite postponement until I can prepare myself properly for this motion.

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

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Falmouth, Mr. Payson.

Mr. PAYSON: Mr. Speaker, I move it be tabled until Friday.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Mills, that the previous question be entertained. In order for the Chair to order the previous question it must have the consent of one-third of the members present. All those in favor of the previous question being taken, will now 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? Which is debatable for no more than five minutes by any one member and the merits may not be debated. 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.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House now is the motion of the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque, that this order be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. PAYSON: Mr. Speaker, may I move to table until Friday now?

The SPEAKER: The motion is not in order at this time.

Mr. Farrington of China requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from China, Mr. Farrington, requests a division. All those in favor of this order 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 having voted in the affirmative and forty-six having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

(Off Record Remarks)

On motion of Mr. Levesque of Madawaska,

Adjourned until nine o'clock tomorrow morning.