

# MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the  
**LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY**  
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library  
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied  
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

LEGISLATIVE RECORD

OF THE

*Ninety-Second Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1945

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL

AUGUSTA, MAINE

**HOUSE**

Thursday, April 12, 1945.

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Mercer of Gardiner.

Journal of the previous session read and approved.

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

Mr. WARD: Mr. Speaker, I move that when we recess this morning, we recess to meet at two o'clock this afternoon.

The motion prevailed.

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

Mr. WARD: Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House: As you will recall, yesterday afternoon we adjourned at approximately four o'clock, and at that time there were a number of you who would have been willing to continue, but we were unable to do so due to the fact that we had reached the end of our specially assigned matters, and from here out it would be desirable and it would facilitate the business of the House if, when you have a matter to place on the table, you would table it and leave it unassigned, and in that way, when we get to a point the same as we did yesterday, we can continue along with our business. If we continue to table matters and postpone them several days ahead, we are apt to be here quite some time.

We have voted to recess until two o'clock this afternoon, and it has been suggested that it might facilitate this morning's business, if you have a matter which you feel would involve extended debate, to retable it this morning, and assign it for later in today's session.

**Papers from the Senate  
Senate Reports of Committees  
Final Reports**

Final Report of the Committee on Labor.

Final Report of the Committee on Temperance.

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, read and accepted in concurrence.

**Ought to Pass in New Draft**

Report of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to Powers of Attorney and Other Instruments by Persons in the Armed Forces" (S. P. 314) (L. D. 836) which was recommitted, reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 432) (L. D. 1148) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report of same Committee on Bill "An Act to Incorporate the 'General Mortgage Company'" (S. P. 140) (L. D. 345) which was recommitted, reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 434) (L. D. 1152) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report of same Committee on Bill "An Act relating to Public Administrators" (S. P. 242) (L. D. 642) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 433) (L. D. 1150) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report of the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act relating to School Superintendents" (S. P. 365) (L. D. 930) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 431) (L. D. 1151) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report of the Committee on Pownal State School on Resolve Providing for Purchase of Land for the Pownal State School (S. P. 293) (L. D. 718) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 436) (L. D. 1153) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Came from the Senate the Reports read and adopted and the Bills and Resolve passed to be engrossed.

Reports were read and accepted in concurrence, the Bills read twice, the Resolve read once, and tomorrow assigned.

**Tabled**

Report of the Committee on State Lands and Forest Preservation on Resolve Providing for a Special Interim Commission for the Study of Growing Wood and Timber and Measures to Conserve and Increase the Forest and Water Resources of the State (S. P. 294) (L. D. 717) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 435) (L. D. 1149) under title of "Resolve Providing for an Interim Commission to Study Methods to Assure Greater Productivity of the Forest Lands of the State" and that it "Ought to pass"

Came from the Senate, the report read and adopted and the Resolve passed to be engrossed.

(In the House, the report was read and accepted in concurrence, and on motion by Mr. Rollins of Greenville, tabled pending first reading.)

### Bill Substituted for Report

Report of the Committee on Ways and Bridges reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to Create the Town Road Improvement Fund" (S. P. 352) (L. D. 891)

Came from the Senate the Bill substituted for the Report and passed to be engrossed.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Clifton, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move we concur with the Senate and substitute the bill for the report.

It appears that it is time for the State to set up some program regarding the so-called dirt roads of the State. At the hearing on this bill, I am sure many of you were present, and many of you spoke in favor of some program of this kind. You will recall, as I do, that the Senate Chamber was filled with people that day, there was hardly standing room left, because it was felt throughout the State of Maine that there was need of such a program.

Now, probably, to start with, we recognize that these may not be ideal times to set up a program for spending a lot of money, but no one can argue that it is not time to start. I believe the majority of those folks at that hearing felt this was the time to start. Now, you are all aware—as I am—that the people, the taxpayers of the State of Maine, have been poking fun at the legislators for years and years over the special resolves. I hold no brief for special resolves. I think the money has probably been spent pretty well, probably as well as any highway money, but isn't it time, in 1945, for us to do away with some of these old political measures which have characterized legislatures in the past? This is the vehicle by which we can do that if we wish.

This is a very simple bill, in that it tries to establish the money for dirt roads of the State on an equitable basis, not on the basis of the amount of political pull you may

have in the halls of this Legislature, but on the basis that some particular town has a lot more miles of dirt roads than another, and therefore receives more dollars under this bill.

The program is set up according to the number of miles of unimproved roads which that particular town or city has, in comparison to the total number of miles of all the towns in the State. As it is set up, this bill does not state how much money, because that is a fluid condition which changes from year to year, but it is set up like other highway monies by the Committee on Ways and Bridges, because they know how much will be available for this particular work. Then that amount is distributed on the basis of the mileage of unimproved roads throughout the State. Isn't that a fair basis, rather than some of the others that we have had in the past? I have a lot of figures here I could quote if I wished to show you that the Legislature has not always set up these resolves on an equitable basis.

What the people who are so anxious for road money want is not a paved highway, not even a tarred surface, but they do want some kind of a road where through all seasons of the year they will be able to communicate with the outside world. If, today, you should take a ride through the country, either on a cement highway or on a tarred road, you will notice a good many dirt roads leading off to the side which would be impassable for a motor vehicle and maybe for a horse-drawn vehicle as well. That is what this is for: to enable them to put on gravel enough for traffic to pass over that road.

As far as the money is concerned, I have heard many say it isn't available, but I have been told, and have seen the budget, the tentative budget, of the Committee on Ways and Bridges, where they are setting up \$200,000 for roads under the whole set-up, but nothing permanent,—it might be done away with at any time. What we need is a permanent program, so that the people of the State of Maine will know they are going to be taken care of in regard to the dirt roads. There is also the amount of \$150,000 set up as a resolve. I am not asking you take that figure; if you want to, set up more. But the thing I believe we are asking today is indicated by the fact that this

vast group of people, in these hard days of travel, came and stayed here an afternoon to ask the Legislature, not a dozen, not a few, but literally hundreds—they wanted us to start on a program at this time. It is really a postwar program for the rural people of Maine, a likely start on the unimproved roads of the State.

Mr. DOW of Eliot: In the absence of the House Chairman, I would like to make a motion that this bill be tabled and especially assigned for tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Eliot, Mr. Dow, moves that this bill be tabled and specially assigned for tomorrow. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the bill was tabled pending the motion of the gentleman from Clifton, Mr. Williams, that the bill be substituted for the report, and specially assigned for tomorrow morning.

Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act to Regulate the Practice of Architecture and to Create a Board to Provide for the Examination and Registration of Architects (S. P. 103) (L. D. 178) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Came from the Senate the Report read and accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "B" (L. D. 1112)

In the House, report read and accepted in concurrence, and the bill had its two several readings.

Committee Amendment A read by the Clerk as follows:

Committee Amendment "A" to S. P. 103, L. D. 178, Bill "An Act to Regulate the Practice of Architecture and to Create a Board to Provide for the Examination and Registration of Architects".

Amend said bill by striking out all of the second paragraph of Section 17 thereof.

On motion by Mr. Payson of Portland, Committee Amendment "A" was indefinitely postponed.

Senate Amendment "B" which is L. D. 1112 was adopted in concurrence.

Mr. Snow of Auburn offered House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "B" which was read by the Clerk as follows:

House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "B" to S. P. 103, L. D.

178, Bill "An Act to Regulate the Practice of Architecture and to Create a Board to Provide for the Examination and Registration of Architects". (Senate Amendment "B" being L. D. 1112)

Amend said Senate Amendment "B" by adding at the end of Sec. 2 thereof the following:

**'Members of organized groups of architects shall not be elected to the board in greater proportion than the number of their members eligible to the board is in proportion to the number of architects in the state eligible to the board.'**

On motion by Mr. Allen of Portland House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "B" was tabled, pending adoption, and assigned for later in today's session.

#### Non-Concurrent Matters Conference Asked

Bill "An Act to Simplify Finances of the Department of Education" (S. P. 191) (L. D. 490) which was indefinitely postponed in the House on April 10th.

Came from the Senate with that body voting to insist on its former action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and asking for a Committee of Conference.

In the House:

Mr. LORD of Camden: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede and concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Camden, Mr. Lord, moves the House recede and concur with the Senate.

Miss DEERING: Mr. Speaker, I move that we insist upon our former action and join in a Committee of Conference as requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER: There are two motions before the House. The gentleman from Camden, Mr. Lord, has made a motion that the House recede and concur, and the gentleman from Bath, Miss Deering, has moved that the House insist and join in the Committee of Conference. The motion of the gentleman from Camden, Mr. Lord, to recede and concur has precedence. All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Camden, Mr. Lord, that the House recede from its former action whereby this bill was indefinitely postponed will say yes, those opposed no.

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

Thirty-one having voted in the affirmative and 75 in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, on motion by Miss Deering, a viva voce vote being taken, the House voted to insist on its former action and join in a Committee of Conference.

Bill "An Act to Accomplish Conformity to State School Building Standards" (S. P. 197) (L. D. 487) which was indefinitely postponed in the House on April 10th.

Came from the Senate with that body voting to insist on its former action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed and asking for a Committee of Conference.

In the House, on motion by Mr. Thompson of Brewer that body voted to insist on its former action and join the Committee of Conference.

#### Non-Concurrent Matters

Bill "An Act Amending the Unemployment Compensation Law as to Unemployment Compensation Fund" (H. P. 1253) (L. D. 878) which was recalled from the Governor, and which was passed to be enacted in the House on April 3rd and passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" on March 26th.

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

In the House, on motion by Mr. Ward of Millinocket, the House voted to reconsider its former action of April 3rd whereby the bill was passed to be enacted; and on further motion by the same gentleman, the House voted to reconsider its former action of March 26th whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed, as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

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

Senate Amendment "A" to H. P. 1253, L. D. 878, Bill "An Act Amending the Unemployment Compensation Law as to Unemployment Compensation Fund."

Amend said Bill by adding at the end thereof the following underlined words: **'provided, however, that on June 30th of each year all monies in excess of \$1,000 in this fund shall be transferred to the unemployment compensation fund.'**

Thereupon, Senate Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence, and the bill as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and Senate Amendment "A" was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Bill "An Act relating to Relief During the Emergency for Businesses in Financial Distress Because of Wartime Conditions" (S. P. 422) (L. D. 1104) which was passed to be engrossed in the House as amended by House Amendment "A" on April 9th in non-concurrence.

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

In the House, Senate Amendment "A" read by the Clerk, as follows:

Senate Amendment "A" to S. P. 422, L. D. 1104, Bill "An Act Relating to Relief During the Emergency for Businesses in Financial Distress Because of Wartime Conditions."

Amend said Bill by inserting in the 2nd line of section 1 of said bill, after the word "mortgage", the following: 'and which were owned by members of the armed forces of the United States, or which are owned by partnerships, corporations or fiduciaries, more than 50% interest of which is owned by a member or members of the armed forces of the United States'

On motion by Mr. Ward of Millinocket, the House voted to reconsider its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A"; and on further motion by the same gentleman, the House voted to reconsider its former action whereby House Amendment "A" was adopted.

House Amendment "A" was indefinitely postponed in concurrence.

Senate Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence, and on motion by Mr. Perkins of Boothbay Harbor, the bill was tabled pending passage to be engrossed, and tomorrow assigned.

#### Orders

On motion by Mr. Downs of Rome, it was

Ordered, that Mr. Rankin of Bridgton, be excused from attendance today in order to attend a funeral service, and that Mrs. Lord

of South Portland, be excused from attendance today and Friday because of business. Also that Mr. Martin of Eagle Lake, be excused from attendance yesterday and today because of illness.

On motion by Miss Deering of Bath, House Rule 25 was suspended for the remainder of today's session in order to permit smoking.

### House Reports of Committees Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Cobb from the Committee on Aeronautics reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to the Aeronautical Fund" (H. P. 615) (L. D. 279)

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

### Covered by Other Legislation

Miss Deering from the Committee on Education on Resolve in favor of Coburn Classical Institute (H. P. 807) reported "Ought not to pass" as it is covered by other legislation.

Same member from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Patten Academy (H. P. 806)

Mr. Hamilton from same Committee on Resolve in favor of Litchfield Academy (H. P. 632)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Parsonsfield Seminary (H. P. 505)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Limington Academy (H. P. 504)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Greeley Institute (H. P. 726)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Corinna Union Academy (H. P. 418)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Lincoln Academy (H. P. 1178)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Leavitt Institute (H. P. 1064)

Mr. Marsans from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Monmouth Academy (H. P. 633)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in

favor of East Corinth Academy (H. P. 1124)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

### Ought to Pass in New Draft

Mr. Hamilton from the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act relating to Aid to Academies from State School Fund" (H. P. 936) (L. D. 539) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1475) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Downs from the Committee on Public Health on Bill "An Act Requiring School Employees to File Health Certificates" (H. P. 843) (L. D. 436) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1476) under same title and that it "Ought to pass".

Reports were read and accepted and the new drafts ordered printed under the Joint Rules.

### First Reading of Printed Bills

Bill "An Act relating to Pollution in Cobbosseecontee and Annabessacook Lakes" (H. P. 1471) (L. D. 1173)

Resolve in relation to Status of Certain Persons in re Teachers' Retirement Association (H. P. 1472) (L. D. 1175)

Resolve relating to Appointment of Special Committee to Study Proposals to Establish Technical and Vocational Institutes (H. P. 1473) (L. D. 1176)

Resolve Authorizing the Forest Commissioner to Grant Permits for Setting and Maintaining Poles and Wires on a Public School Lot in Webster Plantation (H. P. 1455) (L. D. 1177)

Resolve Authorizing the Forest Commissioner to Convey Certain Interest of the State in Land in Piscataquis County to Harry Greenleaf, of Norway (H. P. 1474) (L. D. 1178)

Bill was read twice, Resolves read once, and tomorrow assigned.

### Passed to be Engrossed

Bill "An Act relating to Salary of Justices of the Supreme Judicial and the Superior Courts" (H. P. 1466) (L. D. 1167)

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

Mr. Rollins of Greenville offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" read by the Clerk as follows:

House Amendment "A" to H. P. 1466, L. D. 1167, Bill "An Act Relating to Salary of Justices of the

Supreme Judicial and the Superior Courts."

Amend said Bill by adding at the end thereof the following:

**'Sec. 4. Duration of act.** This act shall remain in force for a period of 2 years only. It is the intent of the legislature to change the present statute for a period of 2 years only, after which period the present statute shall return to full force and effect.'

(On motion by Mr. Downs of Rome, tabled pending adoption.)

#### Amended Bill

Bill "An Act to Provide a Tonnage Tax on Commercial Fertilizer" (H. P. 1338) (L. D. 989)

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

#### Passed to be Enacted

An Act to Increase Salaries of Somerset County Officers (S. P. 267) (L. D. 620)

An Act relating to Free Hunting and Fishing Permits for Veterans (S. P. 363) (L. D. 962)

An Act relating to Employment of Minors and Females (H. P. 332) (L. D. 111)

An Act relating to Exception to the Licensing of Steam Engineers and Firemen (H. P. 330) (L. D. 435)

An Act relating to Employment of Children (H. P. 963) (L. D. 529)

Resolve in favor of the town of Smyrna (H. P. 1229) (L. D. 853)

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

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

Mr. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I move that we reconsider our action of yesterday whereby we passed to be engrossed H. P. 1131, L. D. 678, Bill "An Act relating to Closed Time on Deer in the Counties of Hancock and Washington."

The SPEAKER: Is the gentleman aware that the gentleman who argued the matter yesterday is absent?

Mr. ANDERSON: No, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman wish to withdraw his motion?

The gentleman can make his motion and then table it, if he so desires.

Mr. ANDERSON: I should like to make that motion, Mr. Speaker.

Thereupon, the motion for reconsideration was tabled, and tomorrow assigned.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the first tabled and today assigned matter, House Report "Ought to Pass" of the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act to Permit Establishment of Area Schools" (H. P. 938) (L. D. 541) which was recommitted on March 16th, tabled on April 2nd by Mr. Judkins of Woodstock, pending acceptance of the report, and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. JUDKINS: Mr. Speaker, I move that this item, L. D. 541, be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Woodstock, Mr. Judkins, moves that this bill be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Camden, Mr. Lord.

Mr. LORD: Mr. Speaker, I offer House Amendment "A" and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The amendment is not in order at this time. The bill is not before the House. The only question before the House at this time is the motion of the gentleman from Woodstock, Mr. Judkins, for indefinite postponement of the "Ought to Pass" report.

Mr. JUDKINS: Mr. Speaker, I request that there be a division of the House.

The SPEAKER: The question is upon the motion of the gentleman from Woodstock, Mr. Judkins, that the House indefinitely postpone the "Ought to Pass" report of the Committee, and the gentleman has asked for a division.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Camden, Mr. Lord.

Mr. LORD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: If the motion of the gentleman from Woodstock, Mr. Judkins, does not prevail, I would like to offer an amendment to the bill. The amendment is an attempt to take care of what appears to be one of the major reasons for indefinitely postponing the bill.

It seems to me that there is more or less feeling against the head of the Department of Educa-



tion, in that several of these measures that have come before us, some of which I feel are good legislation, place too much power in the hands of the Commissioner of Education, and the amendment that I would like to offer adds in line 27 the words, "And the Governor and Council."

Now, the purpose of that amendment, as I said, is to take away that power that some feel is in the hands of the Commissioner of Education, and that it grants too much power in one place. I have conferred with the Governor, and the Governor is willing to go along with this program if the Legislature wants to pass it. Now, Mr. Speaker and members of the House: This bill, L. D. 541, I think is good legislation, and I hope that the members of this House will be willing to give it fair and just consideration, without prejudice against any person. I dislike very much to bring in personalities as a matter of debate, so much so that I refuse to do it. I want, however, to call your attention to some of the reasons why we think this is good legislation.

The Legislature of 1933 authorized the Governor to appoint a committee to study the financing of the public schools in the State of Maine. That was reported in November, 1934. The Chairman of that Committee was Dr. Kenneth Sills, president of Bowdoin College. I want to read a list of the members of that committee, appointed by Governor Brann:

Hon. John E. Blanchard, Wilton.  
 Mrs. Lillian Burnham, Biddeford.  
 Hon. James Cassidy, Bangor.  
 Mr. Harry B. Crawford, Houlton.  
 Mrs. Daniel S. Dexter, Lewiston.  
 Miss Helen Hanson, Calais.  
 The late Supt. William B. Jack, Portland.  
 Hon. Andrew Jackson, Portland.  
 Hon. Leslie E. McIntire, Watford.  
 Mr. William S. Nutter, Sanford.  
 Mrs. Lorena F. Sawyer, Bangor.  
 The late Hon. L. Eugene Thayer, Waterville.  
 Hon. Harvey A. Thompkins, Bridgewater.  
 Hon. Robert J. Wiseman, Lewiston.

It has been said, in this House, that interim committees have been appointed to study certain matters, and that when the reports are given, nothing is done about them. So

far, to my knowledge, nothing has been done about the report that was given by this committee, and I want to take just a few moments to read just a few passages from that report, to show you what is back of the legislation that is before us.

The report says, "Consolidation of Schools. One of the chief potential sources of economy in Maine is in consolidation of schools. In the last forty years the number of school buildings was reduced by 45%. But now, as formerly, the small town district still hampers the proper development of school organization. It is too small to provide a well-rounded school system. It is a cause of choppy transportation routes. It includes a great proportion of the towns too small to have a high school of their own. The people of Maine will realize that town lines must be ignored when they conflict with the proper operation of schools.

"The Commission recommends that a step be taken toward voluntary adoption of larger school districts. Towns comprising a supervisory union should be given legal powers to formulate a district covering the whole union. Powers should be transferred from the town committee to the union school committee. Nor would this be out of keeping with practice in most of the communities in the United States, a division between school and town government."

Again, reading from the report, "One of the outstanding potential sources of economy in Maine, not only in the money spent but in the improvement of services rendered, is in the consolidation of schools. In 1785 Maine was carried along with Massachusetts in the school district plan of local government for schools. This may have served some important end in the pioneer period in Maine, guaranteeing as it did school facilities wherever there were people. But there are indications that it had begun to hamper the proper development of schools rather early in the second half of the nineteenth century.

"While there will always be instances where small schools are necessary in the State of Maine, and while every effort should be made to build these schools into acceptable educational institutions, there is still a long distance to go before the most effective type of school building organization exists

in the State. Interestingly enough, the very barrier which stood in the way of desirable school development in 1890—the district too small for proper organization—often stands in the way today.

"It was recognized more than thirty years ago that the town district was inadequate for supervisory purposes. For this reason the union superintendent was created. Discussion elsewhere in this report shows that the town is also too small for other administrative functions, such as budgeting and accounting and transportation. It is certainly too small to provide a well-rounded school system, even to the extent that it exists in Maine today. This is reflected in the fact that transportation routes are exceedingly short in Maine. It is true also that large numbers of towns are too small to provide high schools subject to their own control. Sooner or later the people of Maine must realize that town lines, when they conflict with the proper operation of schools, must be ignored for both economical and efficient operation."

Now, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I have read from that report simply to show that there is a background for the legislation that is proposed. I think it is a credit to the Department of Education that there is a man there with foresight enough to suggest to the Legislature improving our school program and attempting to have the Legislature pass acts that will permit that more easily to be done.

This is a simple and rather short bill. It sets up the machinery whereby the towns and cities—if they choose, and it is wholly permissive, there is nothing in the law that is compulsory or anything that be read into it that it is compulsory, but it does give the towns and cities an avenue whereby they can get together and formulate larger school districts. This particular bill applies to high schools only, including six year high schools, from the seventh grade up.

You are all familiar with the fact that a large percentage of our high schools in the State of Maine are small high schools, two and three teacher high schools. Obviously, in those high schools it is impossible to offer a variety of courses for the children. First of all, the high schools must offer the courses that take care of the small percentage—10%, it is said—who go to college.

The other children in school must take what is left, or part of those courses, whatever is left and get what they can from something else.

Now, it would seem to me that this bill is almost wholly a rural program. It is for the rural people of Maine. It permits them to organize an area school program, governed by an area school committee that is chosen from the school committees of the several towns which vote to adopt the plan, and that area school committee has the power to purchase property, to build and remodel, to receive monies, and to conduct the affairs of that area school. It means that a few towns, adjacent towns, may get together, if they so choose, and erect a school building that will take care of several hundred children for high school work; and if that is done, obviously a wider program of courses can be offered. Children can be brought into that school from the several towns, to participate in the activities that would go on in a larger school district, that are so much superior to those in the smaller school district.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is particularly what the bill calls for. I realize that it is easy to read into much of our legislation things that are not there, and particularly if one has a mind prejudiced against the Commissioner of Education, in this case, or against some other department in other cases. But it seems to me that this is very simple. There is nothing dangerous in this bill that I can see. If there were, I would be one of the first to be opposed to it. The bill has had its hearing; no objection has been presented before the Committee at the hearing. No objection that I can remember has been raised in Committee; and I supposed the bill was presented favorably, "Ought to Pass," by unanimous consent of the members of the Committee.

However, several of the bills, as you know, have emanated from the Department of Education—Some of them. I think, are good and should have had more consideration by this House. The same sentiment seems to exist in this House in relation to this particular bill. I mean, it doesn't affect me—my work—as far as I know—it might some day,—but it would seem to me that it is fair for us to allow the towns and cities in the State of Maine to combine

in this area program, if they wish, and that is what this bill does. And I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Woodstock, Mr. Judkins, to indefinitely postpone, will not prevail so that I may offer this amendment.

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

Mr. **WEEKS**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: On several occasions in the past, when these educational bills have been presented, I have had the urge to make a few remarks but I have resisted until this morning, which I suppose means that my resistance has decreased. What I have to say, to my mind, will apply equally well to several of the other bills which we have been considering on educational matters. My subject, if it needs a subject, will be "Home Rule and Education."

In order that I may not be personal, let us take the town—"X", and let us assume that the citizens of the town, "X", wish to paint their town hall, their city hall, and they decide it would be desirable to start at the bottom and paint one band a foot wide of yellow, and above that another band of black, right over the windows and everything; then a band of blue, and one of red, going right up, bands one foot apart, clear to the top of the chimney.

Now, you or I, as members of some other community, might not particularly like that style of decoration, but we do not of necessity perhaps have to go to that town, and if we do, we may possibly avoid this unsightly spectacle. If we do have to pass by, we can dismiss it by saying, "Here you have home rule at its best, or at its worst." Also we will assume in the town of X that they have a school and that the school committee—I hope it has three members, if it is in a school union—decided that, "After all, many of the things that we teach are rather optional. And why not start the first word in a sentence with a small letter? After all, mathematics depends on certain assumptions. Why not say two and three are four as well as five? Spelling is very arbitrary. Why not spell "cat," "T-A-C?" And so forth and so on.

Now, you will say my illustration is absurd, is extreme; I grant it. I tell you it is. But I have placed it

in these terms so that all may see; it is drawn in, in large letters. I simply want to infer from this that to my way of thinking there is a difference between the color which we may wish to paint our town hall and the color of the ideas which we wish to instill into our children, and I maintain there is a difference between that and education because it is not localized. Your town hall remains for the most part where it is built. The products of your school do not remain in your town; they go out into other towns in the State and to other states. Education is universal.

Therefore, I believe that they should receive this help from the town, that we should cooperate with other towns, in the establishment of area schools, forgetting home rule, remembering only that the purpose of the school is that it exists for the individual child.

It seems to me that in many of our discussions in the past, at least, I have been led to believe from the discussions that the local community might be working for one thing and the Department of Education for another, and you had to choose between Home Rule and State Rule. It seems to me that they should be working for the same end, and that is the education of our children. Therefore I hope that this motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail, in order that the amendment may be offered.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Casco, Mr. Cole.

Mr. **COLE**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: "Fair play, and may the best man win!" also, "He who reads and reads, and does not what he knows is like him who ploughs and ploughs and never sows," are two mottoes engraved in the stonework in the college at Brunswick, which I have always treasured and which I have believed to be a sane and sensible guiding star in my life.

We have seen, as has already been indicated by the gentleman from Camden, Mr. Lord, in the report that he referred to, that there has been a commission set up to study this general school problem in the State of Maine, and you have heard their recommendations. I hope that you all heeded what was said in that report.

We are confronted and faced with the problem of education in the State of Maine in such a way that

it demands the best intelligence and the best minds and our most careful consideration that we can possibly give it. When we go off half-cocked upon any issue which involves the lives of the boys and girls in the State of Maine, I say we are committing an irreparable loss and perhaps an irreparable crime. This bill which has been called for indefinite postponement this morning, to be lightly tossed aside, to be cast into the wastebasket, and what is best for the boys and girls in the State of Maine would thereby likewise be dumped into the wastebasket.

I have labored for 18 consecutive years in a small two-teacher high school. I should be prejudiced in favor of the small high school. I am not. During the years of the depression we did get up to the magnificent number of 65 in our high school and then we employed a third teacher. We were pretty big when we had three teachers. But we could not do any more for the students with three teachers than before. We were overloaded; we were overburdened; we had a 50% overload in our school, and we were no better off.

Through the years, I have been, in my "Problems of Democracy" classes, trying to teach this idea in respect to education: that it is much better for us to have larger schools, and larger communities, where there is opportunity for more competition in scholarship, athletics, whatever activities there are connected with the school, than it is to try to get along with your small community high school. As good as it may have been, it has, I think, outlived its usefulness and is going out, by the pressure of evolution, if you please, not because there will necessarily be any pressure brought to bear from the upper stories in our Department of Education, but through the process of evolution. But we can help ourselves, and help our communities, if we will just lend a helping hand here and pass the enabling legislation which will permit us to go ahead, and that is all this bill calls for. I hope you will see it that way.

As I said the other day, there should be no fear. Why should we be afraid to go ahead in this matter? Mr. Speaker, I hope the motion of the gentleman from Wood-

stock (Mr. Judkins), as much as I like him, does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bethel, Mr. Boyker.

Mr. BOYKER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do not believe at this time and under the present conditions we should experiment with an area school system. Already during this session we have taken steps forward in the education of our children. If we can give more attention, more energy and more thought in going out into more fields, let it be on our maimed and crippled soldiers who are at this moment bleeding on foreign battlefields.

I hope the motion of the gentleman from Woodstock, Mr. Judkins, for the indefinite postponement of this bill prevails.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oakland, Mr. Morse.

Mr. MORSE: Mr. Speaker, for the first time in nearly two sessions of the Legislature I rise to address you. I have had both a professional and a personal interest in many of the educational bills we have acted upon and therefore I have refrained from entering into the discussion of them on the floor of this House. I am glad to say that in most cases your conclusions have coincided with my desires. Now we have an educational bill before us that seems to me very important and in which I have no direct personal interest. It is for the good of our school system and the children of our State.

I do not address you to defend in any way the Commissioner of Education or the Department of Education, that is not the question. The Department and Commissioner must and will stand on their record. Let us consider this matter purely and entirely on the merits of the bill and to me it seems something as follows: First, it costs the State no extra money; second, it gives no man of the department any more power than they now have, and third, it makes it possible for the towns to join if they so wish to give their boys and girls a better opportunity for education. It is said that towns can do that now but with an organized and workable plan it will be much simpler, and much easier for the towns to accomplish their purpose.

I therefore hope that the motion of the gentleman from Woodstock (Mr. Juckins) will not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Miss Deering.

Miss DEERING: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I agree with the gentleman—let's leave all personalities out of the discussion of this bill. In my mind the question before the Legislature at the present time is of extreme importance to our future citizens. This bill is a permissive bill—yes. This bill says that towns may be concurrent on an act creating an area school. The only difference is if it says "shall," they should start out immediately and do it. At the present time we do not know whether or not Federal funds are ready at the moment.

It is interesting to note how far back this movement has been.—1933 is an interesting date. Gradually up through we have had Federal aid superimposed on us in various matters. It so happens that just about a year ago at this time I went to a large meeting where they took action that night to sign a petition for Washington asking all of our congressmen and senators to push through a bill to obtain the federal aid for schools. An interesting remark made was, "The State of Maine cannot do another thing to help the schools in the State; they cannot give another cent to support the schools. Help your teachers."

Notice what we have just recently done. Two years ago was the first time we asked the State to give our teachers more money—we received it. This year we asked the State to give our teachers more money—we received it. We asked the State to help take care of some of our older teachers, the non-contributory group—we received it. Is there anything we have asked for that we have not received? And yet on the other hand they turn around and say, "We can't do anything. We must have the Federal government come in and do something."

Let me cite you one example of what the Federal government does to help out. One woman went into one of our academies in the State which is doing a wonderful job—the boys and girls bring food in from their farms in a cooperative way. One man raises eggs; one man raises hens; another man raises potatoes, they bring those; that lowers the tuition rate. One

of the Federal women came here and asked about the women in the kitchen of that school who was preparing the food. She said, "Is she a college graduate?" "No." "What is her background?" "She is the mother of six children, all of whom are grownup". She had done a fine job; she knew how to prepare good nutritious food for the children. "Well, you will have to get rid of her because the Federal government says unless a person has a college education we cannot give funds for it". The head of that academy said, "That is perfectly all right, we didn't want the money in the first place but the Federal government insisted we take it."

I will not carry on the rest of the argument but the result was the woman turned to the head man of the academy and said, "Will you please write to Washington and say I am doing a good job. This means my livelihood." That is one of the results of superimposing the Federal government upon our people. At the present time they haven't closed their fingers hard enough to tell us what it is going to do.

Many directives come from Washington to our Department of Education saying, "Here is your money for your education. Take the money and this is what you are to do." Now this little bill, of which we need have no fear, is simple. All you need to do is turn to Legislative Document No. 541 and start reading it. Section 28 says "elementary schools". We have been told they wouldn't go down lower than the sixth grade but it does not say so in that paper. Then it continues and takes secondary schools. The section on new buildings and renovations and so on; just read that. It tells about the school board members, there would never be more than nine nor less than five, no one town shall have more than three. Looking at the powers the nine members have, just read through and see what they can do. They can receive and expend funds, prorate maintenance and operation costs, including transportation to the participating towns. Read through a little more, read the last paragraph, read this bill and see where we are being taken, not led. At any rate that money doesn't mean much. That money simply means if your Department of Education wants to come in and say to the towns, "You consolidate—you form an area school"—you will

have an area school. It makes no difference that at the present time your community may not have very many people in it. They may be living in some of the industrial centers. Your committee will tell you, "We will have an area school here"—and don't forget that the area schools are already picked out, the sites are already established and the plans are already to go, when you finished with this simple little permissive bill. But what are your schools for? Your schools are to develop men and women, future citizens of this State and the United States.

If you have an area school and the children are transported, which they must be, your children will be forced to arise early in the morning in order to catch the bus which takes the children to such and such a town. Those children will stay there until a certain hour in the afternoon, then they will be brought home.

As an example of the lack of a well developed social behavior you might take into consideration our American boy who has recently been sentenced to death—the name is Colepaugh. He justified his steps against the United States because the children in the school didn't accept him. Your children in your smaller schools are receiving more individual care and attention than they ever will in a large school; they are learning to get along with a group of people and that is the most important thing in your education,—if you can learn to get along with other people.

We need a varied program for our children. We need more of a health program. I hope to see the time that we will have a health program for every boy and every girl in the State. I don't like to see these children put into larger schools with six girls playing on the basketball team and fifty-six girls sitting by and watching them; five boys playing basketball and the rest sitting on the side and watching them. I don't like to see these large football teams built up with a few playing and the rest sitting and watching them. In the smaller schools each boy and each girl has some part in that program and that is what we should strive for. What opportunity will your children have to engage in extra-curricular activities if they go in the morning and

are taken home right after school at night?

You have taken into consideration your healthy children; now take into consideration your physically handicapped child. That child can not participate in the physical education program; that child can participate in dramatics, one of the best things in the world for the youngster. You will deprive your children of their social activities. I have received several letters from various women's organizations opposing the area school. Your school in your small community is your social center. Tonight the second grade is putting on a performance and so and so, Susie and Johnny, have a part and the fathers and mothers turn out in the small school and watch their children. They see their children have the courage to get up and speak a piece or express their minds before people. Years back they didn't pay any attention to that. Now we are and we need to go even farther than they have. Your schools are somewhat like clubhouses in your small community. Your boys have their Cub program and the Scout program at the school; your girls have their Brownie program and Scout program and 4-H Club. Your women have Parent-Teacher Association meetings there at night. I know—I have been more or less brought up in the Parent-Teachers organization. We went to the school house and we were amused when we found we didn't fit in the chairs as well as we did a few years back. Your women are taking more of an interest in education all the time, especially in your rural districts. With the improvements in household benefits those women have more time to develop themselves, to get out and watch their children develop. Is it right for us to rob them of that opportunity? Surely you will not get as many people traveling, let us make it very conservative and say five or ten miles, whereas if it is just about a half a mile or a mile they can walk that distance. They can turn out and see what is going on. They meet with the teachers and find out the problems of the children. I think our children are the most important part of this whole program and surely when you put them all in a large building of 400, which is the number set for these area schools, you

will not have the individual training, you will not have the individual contact, you will not have your teacher knowing so and so's father and mother in such and such a town, because these teachers are not going to enjoy transporting themselves or riding on the bus, miles in the morning and miles at night. They couldn't very well if they are going to give any time at all to the people who live in that community and who have recreational activities after school.

Therefore, for the sake of our educational system and educational program and for the development of our boys and girls in this State, let us keep our small communities who are realizing their obligation to education and are doing all they can and are gradually improving their conditions. Let us keep them and let us not superimpose any such legislation as has been suggested by Legislative Document 541. I sincerely hope the motion of the gentleman from Woodstock (Mr. Judkins) will prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Westbrook, Mrs. Roberts.

Mrs. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Education, which committee considered this very carefully and finally sent out the report, "Ought to Pass," I just want to say a few words in regard to this bill, not the Commissioner.

The greatest assets we have in the State of Maine today are our boys and girls. They are to be the men and women of the post-war period. We are planning everything we can plan for the postwar period. Someone said we are not doing enough planning for the soldiers. I feel we are doing a great deal, and must do a great deal more. But the boys and girls are the men and women of tomorrow, and if we cannot plan for them today, just what will happen?

To me, this is an especially good bill, because it is progressive and it will elevate to a greater degree education in the State of Maine through more progressive schools. There are some schools which perhaps do not want that. It is absolutely permissive. There is not a thing in it which says, "Federal Government." It is just whether the town wants to, or not. I know three towns at the present time which are anxious to have an area

school, because they feel they will have better schools, better equipment, better and more courses, more adequate instruction, and turn out better equipped boys and girls to go out into the world, because they will not stay in the communities in which they were born. Many boys and girls, probably you know them as I do, say if they had only had an opportunity of being with a larger group, they would be better able to appear before people at the present time. There is almost an inferiority complex among the boys and girls who never have had the opportunity of being in a large group. That, to me, means a great deal.

Someone has said outside — I haven't heard it this morning—that they have spoken of postponing this; this is no time for it; the boys and girls across want to help decide it. Do you believe that the boys and girls want us to stand still until they get back? I have two boys, both in the service, 18 and 20, both across. Don't you believe those boys want me to develop myself? Some people say they want us to sit down at home and wait, and when they come back they will find everything the same as when they left. I don't believe it. I believe the boys and girls who are over there want to come back and find we have been working in the State of Maine for their good.

I believe a school should be something more than a social center. Social opportunity is marvelous, but we have got to have these various courses in order to help our children go out into the world. A person who has been in social life, and has a marvelous personality, that is wonderful, but all boys and girls don't have that personality; they do need these courses in order to bring them a little bit higher than they would otherwise be.

I can see nothing destructive in this bill. It is permissive, with the consent of the Governor and Council. It seems to me we should be able to get some assistance from the members of this committee. Our Councillors come from every section of the State. If our schools don't want it, they don't have to have it. This is the bill under which we are working, and no other. I do hope the motion of the gentleman from Woodstock, Mr. Judkins, does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Danforth, Mr. Springer.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in this bill. If it were not for that reason, I would have hardly dared to address the House, as I am a new member. I hope you people do not think by my introductory remarks that I am bragging, and I hope you will forgive me, too, if I give away my age.

I have had something to do with school work for some 40 years. I want you to know what I have for a foundation, at least, and why I think I have some reason to be very much interested in this bill. I have taught school in my home town for nine years, and I was superintendent of schools in my town for three years, before unions were installed, and I have served on the school board for over 30 years, and am still a member.

I think we have circumstances that are quite unique in the district in which I serve as one of the members. But it happens — has happened this year, although we all know there has been progress made because we wouldn't want to go back to the old system of having a local superintendent of schools. I will admit it is better as it is. Well, it comes to consolidation, more or less, doesn't it? That has resulted in the betterment of our schools. So last year here is what happened in this district which I represent as one of the members: In an adjacent town there was a school where the superintendent of schools found it almost impossible to find a teacher capable of going into that school and having any kind of a school at all. Finally, this adjoining town had a special town meeting, and voted, if arrangements could be made, to have the children from that school brought into our schools and distributed into the different grades. While they hated to give up the little old red school house, they saw it was necessary to do it. The very ones who objected to it the most are now happy that such a thing does exist, because of two or three reasons. First, the bus comes right by the door and picks up the children — there is no walking half a mile — and takes them on a warm bus and brings them to our school. That is consolidation for you, and it is pretty good. They found the town

saved about \$1,000, bringing their students to our school. We raised the teachers' pay because in our school they were taking on extra students, yet our town saved \$1,000. Everybody is better off. Now they are all talking in my district about whether or not this very bill which is presented for you to think about and vote on, if it cannot exist there. We have in our high school something like 100 students. We want to increase that, because of one thing: we want to increase the attendance, we want to increase the amount of money we can receive from other towns, so we can put in different subjects. At the present time we cannot do it on account of the money proposition.

I cannot see anything about this bill anybody need be scared of. It is not a case of "must," but a case of "you may if you wish." That is just what exists in my district. I hope you people will consider this a progressive bill and not support the motion of the gentleman from Woodstock, Mr. Judkins, that this bill be indefinitely postponed. Vote for this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Monmouth, Mr. Marsans.

Mr. MARSANS: Mr. Speaker, I feel I must say a few words for something I definitely believe in. Looking at the clock, I think this is a very opportune time. I am in hopes the pangs of hunger are gnawing more strongly than the pangs of fear at that which is supposed to lurk in this bill. If these whimsical dangers are there, all you have to do is to see to it that your town does not vote to join with another town; just as back in Roman days, you might not want to accept Christianity just then because you didn't want to be cast down in the pit to fight with the animals. Just wait a while until it is a little bit safer to do so, and then join the Christians who will inevitably win out anyway.

Mr. Boyker mentioned that this is not an opportune time because the boys are over across. They are over there fighting to a great extent because it was not an opportune time to fortify Guam when it was first suggested. Let us not let them come back and find that we didn't think it was an opportune time to keep up with educational advances. That democracy, that country, will rise or fall on the type of education they give to its children. So in



a State like Maine, it is not the industries and the factories which determine whether it stands high or low in the esteem of other states, but the educational advantages and opportunities we give the boys and girls in the State of Maine.

I certainly think that those of us who have been waving the flag of home rule—and I would never want to see it furled—let us not let Kittery tell Fort Kent what to do, or Calais tell Elliot; let each of these towns decide what it wants to do. Many of these towns want it, and I, for one, say "Let them have it." There is nothing of force in the bill; it is wholly permissive. And I want to go on record as being against the motion of the gentleman from Woodstock, Mr. Judkins, for indefinite postponement.

Mr. BOWKER of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Bowker, moves the previous question. In order for the Chair to entertain the motion for the previous question, it requires the consent of one-third of the members present. All those in favor of the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question will rise and stand in their places until counted, and the monitors have made and return the count.

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than one-third of the members present having arisen, the motion for the previous question is entertained. The question before the House is: Shall the main question be put now? All those in favor will say yes, those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the main question was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Woodstock, Mr. Judkins, that House Report "Ought to Pass" on Bill "An Act to Permit Establishment of Area Schools (H. P. 938) (L. D. 541) be indefinitely postponed, and the gentleman has asked for a division. All those in favor of the motion will rise and stand in their places until counted, and the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had,

Fifty-five having voted in the affirmative, and 52 in the negative, the motion prevailed, and the report was indefinitely postponed, and sent up for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Ward of Millinocket,

The House recessed until two o'clock this afternoon.

#### After Recess—2 P. M.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

On motion by Miss Deering of Bath, out of order, and under suspension of the rules, it was

ORDERED, that Mr. Ward of Millinocket, be excused from attendance this afternoon and tomorrow because of the death of his brother.

Mr. Downs of Rome was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. DOWNS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Recently I placed upon the table a committee report which I fear is delaying somewhat the action of this Legislature, and I do feel that if, at this time, I were allowed to take it off the table and let it share whatever fate may be its destiny, it would expedite matters quite considerably, so I would ask at this time, under suspension of the rules, to take from the table the first tabled and unassigned matter, House Report "Leave to Withdraw" of the Committee on Salaries and Fee on Bill "An Act Adjusting the Salaries of the Employees in the Classified Service of the State" (H. P. 1365) (L. D. 1018).

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs, asks unanimous consent of the House to take from the table, out of order and under suspension of the rules, the first tabled and unassigned matter. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Mr. DOWNS: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would move to substitute the bill for the report and I will say by way of explanation that if I am granted that permission, I shall present an amendment which I believe will entirely take care of the situation.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs, moves to substitute the bill for the report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think this bill of the Representative from Rome, Mr. Downs, has to do with increase of salaries for the em-

ployees of the State of Maine who earn under \$40 a week salary. I wish to state here, at the outset, that it was brought about perhaps by the thought that the committee voted unanimously not to pass this bill, due to the fact that the Budget Committee in deliberating on these various bills in their meetings of last fall, found that every one of the heads of the departments had a rising scale of salaries for their employees, and, going over it very carefully, we could not accept the entire recommendation of the heads of the departments for the employees in this bracket, but we did come to the conclusion that we would allow them enough money to take care of 64% of what they asked for.

The Budget Committee—also approved by the Appropriations Committee and the Governor sitting in, as this is his budget, not ours—felt in so doing we had dealt fairly with the employees of the State of Maine. If you accept any other suggestion, which you have a right to do, you are going to throw out of balance entirely this all-over budget report, and take out the 35 departments we have recommended for this raise. All this will have to be done if you pass the bill with the amendment proposed by Mr. Downs. I say this, that you may clearly understand the picture.

It is the belief of the Appropriations Committee, the Budget Committee, that we have dealt fairly with the employees of the State. We did not allow the full amount the heads of the departments asked for but we did allow and recommend 64% of what they asked for. And that, in my belief, is more than they would receive under this bill in some respects. I make this statement in order that you may be governed accordingly.

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

Mr. HASKELL: Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Salaries and Fees gave reasonable consideration. I think, to this bill. We did it by several conferences with the Employees' Association, by several conferences with the Appropriations Committee, and at least some of us in conferences with the Executive and Department heads, and in those conferences I think we learned these few fundamental facts, as far as the State payroll is concerned.

The employees within the classified services in the four years ending January 1 of this year have received wage increases of 25%. The next important fact we worked out is the fact that the present budget set-up—as worked out by the Department heads, the Budget Committee, and the Appropriations Committee—provides increases from \$7,830,000 to \$9,456,000. Already, through the Budget Committee, and the Appropriations Committee, allowances for wage and salary increases in the next two years of \$1,625,000 are made. Some of that money has been requested by department heads to take care of new employees that they hope to hire.

The Employees' Association, the Budget Committee, and the Appropriations Committee generally agree that about one-half the money will go for increases in the basic wage scale. If that is true, on top of the 25% they have had, this will provide in the normal budget for another 12%.

To be specific, take the case of the Department of Health and Welfare. They went before the Budget Committee and they said, "We want \$141,000 each year for increases in wages. We want to put \$66,000 of that in our present payroll. The remainder we want to use for new employees, if we are able to get additional help."

I bring that out to show you that in accepting this bill and the amendment which has been printed, you are saying, "Let us let the Legislature throw out the considered judgment of the department heads; throw out the considered judgment of the Budget Committee; throw out the considered judgment of the Appropriations Committee, and in its place, let us let the Legislature take over the administration of this \$5,000,000 payroll." I do not question your authority to do it, but I question the wisdom of saying this afternoon, "\$100 across the line; \$200 across the line," is better administration than the department heads, the Budget Committee, and the Personnel Board can work out for the employees of this State.

I happen to be Chairman of the Maine Development Commission, and I know what we worked out in our own budget for the type of increase we want to give. I know how much was approved, and I know exactly where we will ask the Personnel Board for approval. If my

own experience holds true, I have yet to be turned down by the Personnel Board for any reasonable request. I think these requests are reasonable, and I predict they will be approved. I certainly hope the report of the committee will be accepted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs.

Mr. DOWNS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It seems to me regrettable that the cause of the common people should have to be championed by a man whose hair is white as the snows of winter. Then it came to my mind that the Great Emancipator, Mr. Lincoln, said, one time, "The Lord must have loved the common people the most; he made so many of them."

The bill which I presented was a crude, cumbersome, unwieldy, unworkable bill; I realize that. As you have already been told, it was considered in committee and I was not so dense that I couldn't comprehend the impossibility of its passage; and I am frank to say to you, its passage would have been very unfair.

The thought occurred to me, after hearing the stories of many of the employees that something might be worked out which would be equitable, reasonable, and fair to all concerned, so we had this amendment prepared, which the members of the Appropriations Committee and one member of my own committee have told you was iniquitous, iniquitous because of the fact that the employes have been taken care of in the budget. If they did tell you, I failed to hear, what part was to be applied to new personnel and what part was to be applied to the present personnel.

This amendment you all have before you would give to the employes in the lower brackets, up to \$40, two dollars a week for a period of two years and get them by the emergency, and we submit to you that there is an emergency.

The same question which seems to be involved here is whether this is a matter for the Legislature to consider, and dispose of, or purely an administrative matter. I think the 90th and the 91st Legislatures answered that question, when the 90th Legislature said, "You shall give to your employees a 10% increase in salary, up to a certain bracket," and in the 91st Legisla-

ture, whereby a certain sum of money was allocated for exactly the same purpose.

Now, I want to bring just a thought or two to your attention. I don't believe it will be denied by anyone that the cost of living from 1940 or 1941 to the present day has increased somewhere from 35 to 40%. If I am in error, I am willing to stand corrected. I want to take for an illustration a person who is earning a gross salary of \$19 a week. After deductions she takes home \$16.50 now. Let us go a step further and take an employee earning a gross salary of \$26 a week, and his net take-home pay is \$21.80, whereas in 1941 he took home \$21.75. He hasn't got a great deal extra, as I see it, about five cents. Let us go down to the \$30 earnings, \$30 salary, gross salary, at the present time, with all the increases \$30; and he takes home \$29.50, as compared in 1940 with a take-home pay of \$30. In other words, he is 50c behind the eight-ball. That is exactly how it operates, right down through.

This is simply a plea for the lower brackets. It is up to you to determine. I admit the Appropriations Committee has told you, the whole thing would have to be gone over. I submit to you this figure is entirely within the figure at the present time. All we ask is that it be allocated to this bracket, for this one particular reason: then we know how much the present personnel is going to get. We are not particularly interested in future personnel, when and if you can get them. I think it is generally conceded that with the scarcity of help today that you are not going to get a very heavy increase in personnel inside two years at least, and I submit to you that it is just as fair to use this money to give some relief to the lower brackets in the next two years as to have that become built-up surplus.

Now, my esteemed colleague and associate on the committee has told you of a situation which did exist down in the Maine Development Commission, and I know it will be painful. Of course it will be painful. Let's see. As I see the list of salaries here in the so-called "scandal sheet," the lowest salary in that department is \$21; the next is \$23; beginning at the top at \$100 — and these are weekly salaries — the

next one is \$60; then \$21; \$72; \$76.85; \$25; \$28; \$23; \$76.85; and \$100. Now, I ask you, in fairness, is the passage of this poor, simple, weak amendment going to cause that department to suffer very much at the present time?

Now, this is a simple, honest, earnest effort on my part to give to the low salary brackets \$2 additional a week for two years only, so that they may be able to take home pay enough so that they may live honorably, honestly, and so we won't have any need for that small claims court to collect what bills they owe. I am leaving this to your consideration, and I am not at all afraid to leave the matter entirely in your hands.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bethel, Mr. Boyker.

Mr. BOYKER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: You all know how I stand in regard to raising the salaries of the employees of our State in the higher brackets. I have noticed that the members of the Budget Committee — some members — and also of the Appropriations Committee have stood up on the floor of this House and gone the limit, increasing the salaries of those in the higher brackets. Now, I am not a believer in partiality or favoritism. What is good for the goose is good for the gander, and I believe in paying to those who do the work a reasonable salary. I shall vote for this amendment if I have that privilege.

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

Mr. CARPENTER: A few weeks ago, as you recall, this House voted to raise three Commissioners \$28.84 a week. Now, I believe that it costs a fellow getting \$21 or \$30 a week just as much to buy a suit of clothes as it does the men we raised \$28.84. It costs him just as much for flour; it costs him just as much for bacon. If we can afford to give three men \$28.84 a week increase, who were already getting \$76.93, if we can afford to do that, the State of Maine still can afford to raise these people in the smaller brackets \$2 a week.

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker, I do not want the members to be misguided by any statement that has been made on the floor of this House relative to how we stand on the Appropriations Committee or

the Budget Committee. We did recognize the need for increased wages for the employees of the State and to that end the Budget Committee, supported by the Appropriations Committee, did recognize the fact and recommended a raise for your approval. Do not misunderstand—we are not against all these raises. We have in mind the lower brackets, not the high ones as has been mentioned. We have tried to be fair—it is up to you to say if we have been fair or not. As I say, we did not grant all they asked for because sometimes it was \$3.00 and \$4.00 a week, but we did come to an average of at least \$2.00. That is my opinion and I feel that we have dealt fairly and squarely with the employees of the State of Maine.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Boothbay Harbor, Mr. Perkins.

Mr. PERKINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It has not been my purpose to enter into this discussion. Before the Committee on which I have the honor to serve, we have had several matters similar to this one, and I am very much in sympathy with increasing the salaries of those in the lower brackets to take care of the situation in which they find themselves. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs will prevail.

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

Mr. PEIRCE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We do not have to serve very long in the Legislature before we recognize the importance of the work done by the Budget Committee. We know it is highly important and it is exceedingly complicated work to work out a budget containing a two-year plan for the finances of the State.

We all agree, it seems, on the necessity of increasing the salaries of the employees in the lower brackets. I for one would be very glad to go along with the recommendation of the Budget Committee if I knew exactly, or even approximately, in terms of dollars and cents, what that 64% award of the department heads' request would mean to the State employees. If it would mean \$2.00 or \$2.50 I would be glad to support it; but under the Downs Bill, and the amendment which he has offered, we know just where we are going and we

have a pretty good idea how to recognize the place when we get there. We know our employees receiving less than \$40.00 a week are getting a raise of \$2.00. Therefore, I believe that it is the wiser, more conservative, policy if this House would vote favorably on the motion of the gentleman from Rome (Mr. Downs).

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Warren.

Mr. WARREN: Mr. Speaker: As a member of the Salaries and Fees Committee I think it is my duty to say a word or two. I am aware of the very careful and extended study that this committee gave to this matter. I am aware that the committee was not unsympathetic to Mr. Downs that the people in the lower brackets should have an adequate increase.

Now the question is—what is an adequate increase and how have they been figured so far? And that I submit is not a matter that this House can tell with intelligence. It is an administrative question; the duty of the Legislature is to furnish the money. Everyone agrees there is enough money in the budget to give all the employees under \$40.00 this \$2.00, if it seems wise to the administrative officers. Whether they will do that or not will depend upon whether they consider it the right thing to do. The money is there. You say we have established the precedent of legislating increases through percentage in the last few sessions. At that time I believe it was the request of the Administrative Department. Today they were surely in sympathy with that action. I do not think today they do like to see us take the matter out of their hands and it isn't the right way to handle that question.

We also looked very carefully into just what increases they have had and they certainly have not been neglected, and I do not think they are going to be neglected from now on. They have had advances right along and I have no doubt they are going to get some more. It is just a question of who decides what it shall be. I am very much opposed to this House saying that so much shall be given to so and so. I do not think it is the function of this House.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Dutton.

Mr. DUTTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This Legislature is here to transact the business of the Legislature. I believe it is our duty to stay here as long as is necessary to transact that business. If there is any committee that needs to revamp their estimates in order to carry into effect any matter that should be passed at this time, I believe it is our duty to stay here and attend to that job if it takes until the Fourth of July. I am just as anxious to get home as any member of this House but I don't want to go home one day before we have done our full duty.

To my mind the lower bracket employees of the State should receive consideration. I feel that Mr. Downs' requests are fair and just and equitable. I believe that if there must be some revamping done that there is ample opportunity to start in with the higher bracket employees and heads of the departments and give it to the lower bracket men and women who are working for a very low price. It costs them just as much for clothing, just as much for food as it does the higher paid salaried men.

I sincerely hope we will not go home until we have done fair justice to the employees of the State of Maine in the lower brackets.

The SPEAKER: The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs, to substitute the bill for the report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rockland, Mrs. Ellingwood.

Mrs. ELLINGWOOD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have been deeply concerned ever since I have been hearing about the salaries paid to those employees in the lower brackets and I do think something ought to be done about it. I know some among those employees who are not getting enough to live on. Some of the members who have plenty of money do not realize the hardship these people undergo who get such a small salary, and I hope that this House will consider this matter wisely and justly, and I hope the motion of the gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs, prevails.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Rollins.

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker: There seems to be no question of the availability of the money to

carry out this proposed legislation. It seems to boil down to a question of administration. I have been a member of the House before. We left the money in their hands, the way they would like it to be left this year. We did not find it distributed satisfactorily, the way we thought it was going to be. We all realize, as the previous speakers have said, that there people in the lower brackets are being paid, some of them, shamefully small salaries. We all have before us on our desks some nice, sweet, juicy salary raises, from \$1000 up to \$2000 apiece, for men who are getting enough to live on and as those bills come along we will endeavor to show you how much they are going to receive. That is one angle that perhaps the members of the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee and the Salaries and Fees Committee who have sanctioned these raises have overlooked.

I am as patriotic as any member of this House but I do not believe in making contributions to the Federal government to the detriment of our lower salaried group, and that is what we are doing when we make \$1000 and \$1500 and \$2000 increases on top of the large salaries.

I hope the motion of the gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs, prevails.

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

Mr. BREWER: Mr. Speaker and Members of this Legislature: As a member of the Appropriations Committee I have heard it said that they ask for salary increases in higher brackets. I plead guilty to that and I probably will be more guilty as time goes along in subscribing to this, but in the years I have sat on the Appropriations Committee I have always had in mind these workers in the lower brackets and I think that there has been, in the last two terms I have been here, provision made to take care of these people. We do not want either the employees or the members of the Legislature to feel that we are objecting to salary increases of these employees in the lower brackets.

As Mr. Haskell has told you, in the thirty-eight departments we have given them \$1,625,000 for increased salary and new personnel. It is my understanding and my sincere belief that new personnel is

not available, and, in that event the money that your Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee have given these heads of the departments has no strings tied to it and could be paid to their employees.

To my mind it is not a question of a raise, but it is a matter of how you, as members of this Legislature, care to give this raise. If you care to give it specifically, it will be done. In the past we have questioned whether it has been done by the department heads—that I cannot say, but I do know that there are, as time goes on, merit ratings and each group gradually receives a raise from the time they have worked there. I do want to call to your attention the fact that we are not objecting to these raises. We have, so far as we have been able, given the money to these departments. As Mr. Jacobs has told you today, the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee have come along up to a 64% of their demands.

Now as for revising our figures, I will say to you members that every member on that Appropriations Committee asked for that job, were given the job, and we are going to do the job; but it is going to be done the way you see fit because you gave us the job to do. Remember this, every bill involving appropriations, every time one of those goes through, every time one is knocked down, that changes our financial picture. We have so much money to do business with, and we have to cut our pattern to that cloth. That is one thing I want you to remember we have to do. We have so much money to work with; we have to fit it into the picture. We have to get the money somewhere—we don't pull it out of the air, but whether you see fit to let this increase go through or not, as I say, I asked for the job, I am going to do the best I can and so is every member on the Appropriations Committee, and if, in the opinion of this House, they don't see fit to do the job the way we suggested, that is still all right with me, but I do want the members of this House to know that we have, to the best of our ability, provided money for increases and it is up to you to decide just how those increases will be given out.

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

Mr. LEGARD: Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is within the province of this Legislature and is our serious duty to take into consideration the employees in the lower brackets and I should feel that I had neglected my duty to my constituents and to my office if I did not go on record at this time and I hope the motion of the gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs, prevails.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs, to substitute the bill for the "Leave to Withdraw" report of the committee. All those in favor of the motion will say yes; and those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being doubted,

A division of the House was had, Seventy-seven having voted in the affirmative and 22 in the negative, the motion prevailed, and the bill was substituted for the "Leave to Withdraw" report of the committee.

Mr. Downs then offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" read by the Clerk, as follows:

House Amendment "A" to H. P. 1365, L. D. 1018, Bill "An Act Adjusting the Salaries of the Employees in the Classified Service of the State."

Amend said Bill by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in place thereof the following:

**Sec. 1. Salary adjustment.** Beginning July 1, 1945, all state employees in the classified service shall be granted an increase in salary in accordance with the following schedule:

Employees earning up and not including \$40 per week, \$2 per week increase; providing, however, that no such employee shall receive more than \$40 per week because of such increase.

**Sec. 2. Appropriation.** There is hereby appropriated from the general fund of the state whatever moneys are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

**Sec. 3. Limitation.** The provisions of this act shall not affect or change any powers and duties granted to the personnel board under the provisions of chapter 59 of the revised statutes and shall remain in effect for a period of 2 years.

Thereupon House Amendment "A" was adopted, and the bill having already been printed was given its two several readings, under suspension of the rules; and on further motion by Mr. Downs, under suspension of the rules, the bill had its third reading and was passed to be engrossed as amended and sent up for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Downs of Rome, under suspension of the rules the House voted to take from the table House Amendment "A" to H. P. 1466, L. D. 1167, Bill "An Act Relating to Salary of Justices of Supreme Judicial and Superior Courts, which was tabled by that gentleman earlier in today's session, pending adoption.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Rollins.

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: At this time I would like to say that I find there is a constitutional amendment which prohibits the cutting of the salary of a Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court if it has once been raised, therefore I would ask unanimous consent of this House to withdraw the amendment which I offered.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman does not need unanimous consent. He may withdraw House Amendment "A".

Mr. ROLLINS: I wish to withdraw House Amendment "A", Mr. Speaker.

House Amendment "A" withdrawn.

Thereupon Bill, "An Act Relating to Salary of Justices of the Supreme Judicial and Superior Courts, L. D. 1167, was passed to be engrossed, and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the second tabled and assigned matter, Majority Report "Ought not to Pass" and Minority Report "Ought to pass in New Draft" (H. P. 1462) (L. D. 1163) of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Amending the Law relating to State Employees' Retirement System to Include Public School Teachers (H. P. 819) (L. D. 507), tabled on April 9th by Mr. Peirce of Augusta, pending acceptance of either report, and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. PEIRCE: Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks, I shall propose that the House adopt the minority report, "Ought to Pass in New Draft." Discussing in detail a matter exceedingly complicated and one which no single individual claims to have all knowledge about, is a task which I personally do not relish, but I shall try to describe to you the purpose and the operation of this bill which would merge the present teachers' retirement system with the state employees' retirement system.

In line with most other states, Maine adopted a few years ago a state employees' retirement system, set up on a modern actuarial basis. There are a great many different actuarial systems which we could have adopted. The present teachers' retirement system is on a different actuarial basis than the State employees' retirement system. The State employees' retirement system requires the employee to contribute a certain percentage of his earnings to the retirement fund. These individual contributions are matched by the State, by the State's donation to the fund, and on retirement at the age of 65, after a minimum of 25 years' service to the State, the individual employee may retire on an allowance fixed by the number of years he has served the State and by the size of his contribution to the state.

We believe that the teachers would benefit by increased retirement allowances if their retirement system were merged with the employees' system. Under the proposed bill, individual teachers would make contributions along these lines: a teacher starting out at the age of 20—and some do—would contribute 3.7% of her annual salary to the retirement fund. As she continues her service in that profession, the contribution increases very gradually. At the age of 30, she would be contributing 4.11%; at 50, she would be contributing 5.58%; and at 60, the age of retirement under this bill, she would contribute 6.67%.

On the other hand, it might be interesting to have some idea of the retirement allowances the teachers would be granted. A teacher whose average retirement salary was \$1,000—and that is very low, and it is not anticipated that there would actually be any in that class—would

receive at the age of 60, on retirement, after 30 years of service, a retirement allowance of \$423. The retirement allowance increases with the increase in the average retirement age. A teacher whose average retirement salary was \$1,800 a year would receive at the age of 60, after 30 years of service to the State, approximately \$625. That is an annual retirement allowance. Teachers who put in longer service, who have larger average annual salaries at retirement, will of course receive a larger retirement allowance. So much for the bill itself.

I would like to point out that one difference between this bill and the State employees' system is that the teachers would be permitted to continue to retire at the age of 60, rather than at the age of 65, which is the retirement age for State employees.

The opposition to this bill will say that the main objection to it is on an actuarial angle. The Maine Teachers' Association had as a part of its program—and still has—first, raising the minimum salaries of the teachers, which has been done by the MacKinnon Bill; and the second item on its program was improving the retirement system. In accordance with that plan, they submitted to the actuary who set up the State employees' system their plan in some detail and asked him for estimates on the cost. The original plan called for retirement of the teachers at the age of 65. The actuary submitted figures based on that retirement age. Subsequently the Maine Teachers' Association found it desirable to reduce the retirement age to 60, and they asked, again, for estimates from the actuary. At that time the actuary answered that the change-over would increase the cost to the State by between twenty-three and twenty-four thousand dollars under the retirement system.

I notice that the report sent out from the Appropriations Committee places the estimated increased cost to the State at \$100,000. I am not prepared to say on what basis the Appropriations Committee made its estimate. Neither am I trained to discuss in detail the basis of the actuarial figures.

Subsequent to the report from the actuary in which he estimated the increased cost would be twenty-



three or twenty-four thousand dollars, the Department of Education wrote to the actuary and asked him certain questions in regard to proposed changes.

At this time, it should be brought to your attention, the Legislative Research Committee presented a bill which would change the actuarial basis of the State employees' system. This bill, L. D. 960, was taken up in the Committee on Judiciary. That part of the bill which changed the basis of the State employees' system was rejected by the Committee; certain minor changes which the Legislative Research Committee requested were granted in the new draft which the Committee on Judiciary reported out.

At the time the Department of Education's request was submitted to the actuary, the actuary did not know the status of L. D. 960. He said, in his reply, that he felt that the State employees' retirement system for the year was in a state of flux; that was the gist of his answer; and that he couldn't for that reason answer the questions which the Department had presented.

That has created no end of confusion, I would say, among the proponents of the bill. Mr. Kennan of the Maine Teachers' Association has been in conference with the actuary in New York City. Mr. Wood of the Maine Teachers' Association wrote a letter on the 9th of April to the actuary in which he reviewed the situation, and pointed out to him that the Legislative Research Committee's recommendation, changing the actuarial basis of the bill would not be passed, and then asked if the actuary would confirm his estimate of \$23,000 increased cost. On April 11 Mr. Wood received a telegram from the actuary in which he did confirm his estimate of additional cost to the State of twenty-three to twenty-four thousand dollars.

The letter is long; the telegram is longer. I will read them, if you would like to hear them.

We feel, and the Maine Teachers Association feels, that the time is now. Something must be done by this Legislature to stop the migration of our trained Maine teachers from this State to states offering higher salaries and better retirement security. We feel the merger of these retirement systems would

accomplish this. The time is now. Action should be taken by this Legislature, which has already taken steps in setting up a study committee. But the study committee alone we feel is not enough. The study committee can obtain much better results if it has this plan in actual operation and can study and bring back to the next session of the Legislature changes for improvements and amendments. A study has been made by the Maine Teachers' Association. They feel nothing further can be gained by study. It is now time to set the machinery in operation and then make the mechanical repairs.

In this morning's Kennebec Journal, the Superintendent of Schools of Augusta was quoted as saying that the personnel turn-over in the Augusta school system has been 46% in the last two years. Other localities are having the same experience. Now is the time to take constructive action to stop this migration of our own Maine teachers to other states.

We do not see teachers from Massachusetts or New Hampshire coming into Maine to teach. The Employees' Retirement Act was passed, I know, with some trepidation by the Legislature which enacted it. They knew they would not have all the answers to it. Since that time it has been found that amendments were desirable. Those amendments have been enacted, and the State has suffered no serious financial loss through situations which were subsequently corrected by amendment. We feel that the bugs in this bill can be ironed out in a similar fashion. We know the bill is not perfect. We feel it must be put in operation before we will know how to amend and improve it further. A lot of you have received letters—I have—from teachers all over the State in support of the bill.

I would like to read an excerpt from one of them on the dangers that may arise should we do nothing to stop this movement of Maine teachers to other states. The letter is from the Principal of Brewer High School written to the Representative of the City of Brewer and, in part, reads as follows:

"We are not finding it any easier to find teachers each year and when other states give definite advantages in tenure, pay and retirement—unless something along this line is

done it seems to me that Maine is going to be in a critical position. It is only natural for the good teachers to move into the higher pay and better job leaving behind poorer ones to carry on. This certainly is not conducive to progressive education. I think that at the present time the general public is sympathetic to the teaching needs and simply by putting this thing off for two years and wasting their money necessary for such a bill that has already been studied by several concerned with the matter, it seems to me it is a simple case of buck passing. Most of your other groups now come under Social Security either through the state or government.

"Yesterday a boy was in talking with me from the Navy and stated that if he stayed in he could retire and live comfortably at the age of 39. The teachers do not ask for anything like this but do think that at the age of 60 they should have some security for the remainder of their years." This is signed by Albert E. Pillsbury, Principal.

At the time, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House accept the Minority Report "Ought to pass in new draft."

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Peirce, moves acceptance of the Minority Report "Ought to pass in new draft."

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker and Members of this House: I am going to speak in favor of the passage of this bill, and in doing so I feel that I am not only speaking for the Brunswick, Topsham and Bowdoinham teachers but also for a lot more from Bath to South Portland. Why I say that is because of the letters and telephone calls and personal interviews that I have had from and with our teachers.

There is no question or any doubt as to what our teachers want of this Legislature. They want the passage of L. D. 901, the MacKinnan Bill; L. D. 504, the Deering Bill, and L. D. 507, the Peirce Bill. Those three bills are what they have asked for and what they want. Any other bills so far as I can ascertain do not interest them enough to bring forth any comment. We do not have to tell them what they want — they know.

When the public hearing took place the teachers turned out in

full force and teachers, educators and laymen spoke in favor of the bill. Not one single voice was raised in opposition. If there were objectors present they should have made the fact known. Even if there were objectors among the committee there is no law or regulation that prevents them from expressing their minds at a hearing. It would have been far better to speak right out and show wherein the bill was faulty. Much more so than to listen to the proponents and not show or attempt to show them that their thinking was in error.

I doubt very much if it could be shown by anybody present at the hearing that this Peirce bill was not a good bill.

I have been in this Legislature since 1941. I have seen the teachers come here and ask for legislation that was due them. At first they got nothing but stiff opposition. Then at the next session in 1943 they got practically no opposition but did get a lot of promises. However, the teachers had friends here in the Legislature who never ceased working for them — and do not forget either, that they worked for themselves. Now in 1945 they came again and, from the Governor down, we welcomed them with open arms and they went away in high spirits, with renewed faith and hope. They really felt that the Maine Legislature was going to do the right thing. And I really believe that the great majority of us thought the same. Why the change of heart?

The other day we sent the Roberts bill on its way rejoicing. That can be no valid reason for killing this bill, or even holding it up. Put this Peirce bill through so we will have a law, not perfect perhaps, but far better than no law at all, and then it will give the Roberts committee a specific opportunity to do some studying and investigating. Instead of looking for something to investigate, they will have a job already waiting for them and if they cannot improve the Peirce bill, no harm is done. If they can better it, well and good.

The Roberts recess committee and the Peirce bill should make a fine combination. It has been said that the Peirce bill is premature. Apparently it has been working pretty fair for the State employees up to now. Why should the addition of the teachers cause so much hub-bub?

The teachers of Maine deserve all that we give them and all they can get. Let's acknowledge the truth. We have treated them badly—we have underpaid them—we have baited them—we have worried them. They have taken a lot from this State and have not shown resentment. I wonder how much longer they will submit.

Listen to me. You all know what put the laboring man on his feet and gave him a voice that is not only heard but heeded. It is the labor union.

What I now say is my own personal thoughts. If the teachers are not cared for properly in this State, there will come a time in the future when they will come to us, not as a group of scattered individuals, but as a well organized union, perhaps affiliated with one of the great unions in this country, and they will not ask us—they will tell us what we are to do, and we will do it or our schools will not operate. None of us like bitter medicine, so let's not ask for it.

The Peirce bill is a good bill. With the assistance of the Roberts recess committee, it may become a better bill. The teachers want it and they have told us so. Do not let the 92nd Legislature adjourn branded as double crossers. Let's vote today on this bill just the same way we would if this hall was filled with teachers. I ask for a roll call vote as I want it on record that I did not sell our teachers down the river. Vote to accept the Minority "Ought to pass" report.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a member of the committee that considered this bill and a signer of the "Ought not to pass" report, I want to call your attention to a few of the problems that have troubled me.

We have had before our committee last session and again this session numerous amendments and problems in connection with the retirement system for State employees. Here we combine the two systems, our State non-contributory system with our present retirement act.

Now what does this bill propose to do? The teachers have a non-contributory system. Since 1924, those teachers have had a privilege

of coming under a contributory system. Some are under the non-contributory system and some are under the contributory system, and now we are proposing to combine those systems with our State retirement system, the Employees' Retirement Act, so that we have to reconcile three or four propositions instead of two.

We have had a lot of difficulty in working out the problems in connection with the other system. I would like to call your attention to the fact that there are now 1420 teachers who are teaching and who are eligible to retire after a given number of years under the non-contributory system. Those teachers have taught for over twenty years during the period when they had the privilege of transferring, but they have not seen fit to do so. Under this act, we give them now after twenty years of not contributing, when they had permission to do so, the right to come under the State Retirement Act and share in all the benefits under that Act.

I might say that I am in favor of combining our various retirement systems under one administrative board as rapidly as possible, but I do feel we should know something about what that may cost. As an illustration, I would like to mention some cases. I know there are several teachers who have taught between forty and fifty years and who could have come under the contributory system twenty years ago. When they retire under the non-contributory system, they would receive the maximum under that plan, which under the most feasible bill we now have, aside from this one, would be \$600. Under this bill before us, those teachers, some of them, I know some that are in the bracket from three to four thousand dollars. Let us take for example a teacher earning \$3400 who, under the present plan, would be entitled to \$600 retirement allowance. If we combine those systems, he would get \$1700 a year. A teacher retiring around sixty-five would receive twelve to fifteen thousand dollars more than they would be entitled to under the old non-contributory system. I submit to you if one or two teachers—I know of two where the cost would probably be in excess of thirty thousand dollars to make the transfer for those two.

The estimates presented are for one year. This would be over a lifetime if they lived the normal life span. The figures submitted to the Committee by the proponents of the measure admitted in the statement given to us are based on the assumption that none of these 1420 teachers under the non-contributory system will transfer if they have less than ten years more to teach. I submit to you these teachers earning more than fifteen hundred dollars per year are not likely to stay under a system where they would receive six hundred dollars when by transferring they would receive \$750 to \$2000 a year depending on the present compensation.

No one knows what the cost would be or what the effect would be on the individual teacher. The teachers who have contributed have contributed 4% of their salary but they have not been allowed to contribute more than one hundred dollars per year, so that teachers in a high bracket have not contributed as much as they should. Some teachers in the low bracket who started at an early age may possibly have contributed more. That will create an inequality. A teacher who has a high salary and who has not contributed enough, and the State having matched those funds, will have an insufficient reserve to make a sound fund on an actuarial basis and we will have to raise more by taxation to bring it up to the figure required.

This is what we will ultimately have to do if we combine these systems. We have had estimates ranging from \$3600 to \$100,000 per year. Some proponents of the measure frankly admit they do not know anything about what it would cost so far as those teachers under the non-contributory system are concerned.

I have tried to find out how old these teachers are, what their present salaries are and how long they have been employed. I find no one in the Department of Education or no one connected with the Teachers Association who has those figures available. That being true, if we pass this bill, we are passing something we have no idea as to what the cost of it will be for this year and next year. It may well throw our budget out of balance in an amount of two or three hundred thousand dollars for the biennium.

We also have this to consider. I think no one knows whether all the teachers would benefit by the change or not. There are some teachers who probably would not benefit. In view of the fact that we do not know and no one has any idea just what it would cost and what the benefits would be, I believe we should wait until a committee that would be appointed under the Roberts bill, so-called, has had an opportunity to assemble the facts in connection with these teachers under the non-contributory system so that they can come back to the Legislature, either at a special session or at the next regular session, and give the figures on what it would cost to combine the systems, so that when we do combine them we may make provision to finance it properly. Therefore, I hope the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Peirce, does not prevail. I believe the majority report should prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mapleton, Mr. Webber.

Mr. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, may I make a slight correction in the figures that we have. I think at the present time in the State Teachers Retirement System 5% of the salary is contributed, not less than twenty dollars and not more than one hundred dollars. The State retirement system is considered sound. Both systems are sound. I cannot see if they are put together that it will cause any great loss. Whatever the cost, after we study it two years, what are we going to do about it? Are we going to turn the teachers down? I believe after a teacher has faithfully worked in serving the State of Maine and the children she is entitled to the best pension system which may be worked out. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Peirce, will prevail.

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

Mr. PEIRCE: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Williams, I would like to state that there is already prepared an amendment which would exclude from the benefits of this measure the two individuals he mentioned who would benefit under it. That amendment was not incorporated into the new draft. AF-

ter the new draft was drawn it did not seem advisable to go to the extra expense of printing another new draft, but on the acceptance of the report I will submit an amendment excluding those two individuals.

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

Mr. HASKELL: Mr. Speaker, as a signer of the committee report on this measure "Ought not to pass" I do not consider myself to be any less sympathetic with the viewpoints of the teaching profession of this State to the end of wishing to raise the standards of our pension system. However, retirement pensions are an extremely complex situation. In an effort to untangle some of the complexities there was made available to the committee, prior to rendering their report, a letter from Mr. George B. Buck, Consulting Actuary of New York City, who was the gentleman recently employed to set up the State Employees Retirement System and who was also consulted by the Maine Teachers Association.

With your permission, I would like to read just two paragraphs from that letter. This bears date of March 22, 1945. "With the information I now have, I am inclined to favor the passage of Legislative Document No. 263 because it seems to me that pension legislation covers fiscal operations extending over such a long period in the future that the time to be sure you are on the right course is before you start. My office could not at this late date assume responsibility that the proposed amendments are proper. Unless you have someone who is familiar with the technical operation of retirement systems to assume the responsibility, you may end up with legislation that is less desirable either from the standpoint of the teachers or the public or both.

"When I was last in a conference with you in Augusta, I think I indicated that it seemed to me that the teachers were not sufficiently in accord to expect that legislation could be agreed upon in time for adoption at this session. Later, Dr. Kennan seemed to indicate that the teachers were agreed, but it still seemed to me that, if so, they had agreed among themselves at a rather late date. So far as I know, we have never prepared figures for any plan that has been accepted, nor has the proper legislation looking

toward a merger ever been reviewed by our office. It would seem to me that a further study of the whole situation would appear desirable."

Prior to the release of the committee report, no information was made available to us indicating any change of mind on the part of this Actuary. With this view in mind, it therefore would not seem to me individually that it was proper or just to send a report onto the floor of the House recommending this measure be passed. I therefore hope the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Peirce, does not prevail.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct one impression that might have been conveyed from the statement of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Peirce. It happens he mentioned that there were two teachers who would be affected in that manner. I would like to say this: They do not live in my county. I feel we could not accept any amendment or pass any amendment that would exclude one, two or three teachers. We are dealing with a group of teachers.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Clifton, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker, may I face the House?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman has permission to face the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, while serving in the 90th Legislature we were told by an actuarial study that a pension system that had been enacted by the Legislature was such that if it was continued for many years it would bankrupt the State. At that time I made a resolution if I ever saw anything like that coming before a Legislature I would try to know something about it before it was enacted into law. Today I believe the same case is presented to us here. I will admit I have failed to find what this is all about. Apparently everybody in the House has; those sponsoring the bill and those opposing it. Even the Actuary which the Teachers Association has employed has failed to find out the real facts regarding this bill. I believe we have no duty as members of this House as high and honorable as looking out for some minority group in the State. I am as interested as any of you in the em-

ployees of the State and in the teachers of the State, but I do not wish to do anything which within two years the next Legislature will have to repeal or which the teachers themselves will hate as soon as it is enacted. I remember the ill will that was caused among the employees of the State when we had to repeal the old employees system plan. I believe if we enact something today and know nothing about it and in two years or more, if this study shows this system is all wrong and of no benefit to the State or to the teachers or anyone else, we are doing an injustice not only to the State of Maine but to the teachers themselves.

As far as all this talk about not doing anything for the teachers, I have no fear to face any of them as friends, or relation, or even if I were asking for a vote, which seems to be the difficulty with some members of this House. When we have accepted the recommendation to do what I believe was a good thing for the teachers, and I know you all do, that is, an increase in their minimum pay to one thousand dollars, small as it was, I think we have performed our duty. Unless someone can tell us as to how much this bill will cost—it is not a case of pulling it out of thin air—what it will cost this year and next year and what it will cost ten years or twenty years from now, I believe we are going haywire if we enact it as legislation today. I believe this committee which we have set up here can find out those facts and in two years from now can present them to us, and then we can act as an intelligent group. When we know we cannot vote as intelligent beings on a bill, I say there is only one way to vote and that is to vote against it. I am asking you to oppose the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Peirce, to accept the Minority "Ought to pass" report.

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

Mr. CARPENTER: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the letter read by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Haskell, when that letter was written it was thought that Bill 960 was going to pass, which would have changed the whole structure. As I understand it, the Maine Teachers Association has made a study of this bill for the last two years aided by an actuary. They feel that they

know all about this bill without seeing it in actual operation. I want to go on record as knowing that the teachers of Augusta are one hundred per cent behind this bill.

The SPEAKER: The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Peirce, to accept the Minority "Ought to pass in New Draft" report of the committee. The gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Brown, has asked for a roll call vote. Under the Constitution, in order for the yeas and nays to be called requires the consent of one-fifth of the members present. All those in favor of the yeas and nays being called will rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had. The SPEAKER: Eighteen obviously being less than one-fifth of the members present, the roll call is not ordered.

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

Mr. PEIRCE: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Peirce, asks for a division. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Peirce, to accept the Minority "Ought to pass in New Draft" report of the committee. All those in favor of the motion will rise and stand in their places until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had. Forty-eight having voted in the affirmative and 64 in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question is now on the acceptance of the majority report "Ought not to pass". All those in favor will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the majority report "Ought not to pass" was accepted, and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the third tabled and today assigned matter, House Report "Ought to pass in New Draft" (H. P. 1465) (L. D. 1166) of the Committee on Salaries and Fees on Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Attorney General" (H. P. 1214) (L. D. 765), tabled on April 10th by Mr. Payson

of Portland, pending acceptance of report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. PAYSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The original bill L. D. 765 was my child, and I thought a great deal of it. Carelessly I trusted it to the tender mercy of the powerful Committee on Salaries and Fees and they mutilated it so I did not recognize it when it came out. I do not know that I should ask you to share my grief in such a wanton act, but on the other hand I am not in favor of this bill they brought out.

Now you know me well enough to know that there are no personalities in the proposition. I put in two bills, one to have the Attorney General appointed for a seven year term on nomination of the Chief Justice by the Governor, confirmed by the Council. In connection therewith I put in the salary increase for \$6,500 to be effective only if that Constitutional Amendment went through. It is the only way I am in favor of this salary increase.

Under the present system the Legislature elects an Attorney General for a two year term and political custom allows him to hold office for four years. So long as we indulge in that luxury, I think five thousand dollars is enough to pay for the job. Effective in 1943, the salary was increased from four to five thousand dollars, a twenty-five per cent increase. I believe the new draft increased the salary from five to six thousand dollars.

I move that the new draft be very indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Rollins.

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I hate to oppose my colleague from Portland (Mr. Payson) and I hate to even think that personalities would enter into this situation, but I do see in the report which I think was given to the 91st Legislature by the Legislative Research Committee, of which Mr. Payson was the worthy House Chairman, on page 8, the following: "No reason is perceived why either the Attorney General or the State Auditor should receive less compensation than a member of the Public Utilities Commission and in the light of the practice in the latter office it may be questioned whether all the members of that Commission should receive the same salary."

As I understand it, the members of the Public Utilities Commission get \$6,000. This bill which was passed out unanimously by the Committee on Salaries and Fees sets the Attorney General's salary at the same rate as the Public Utilities Commission, which evidently at the time my colleague, Mr. Payson, signed this report, he was in full agreement with. Possibly he did not get his man in as Attorney General, but he must remember that the Attorney General is elected by this body and we are in a Democracy and he represents today the State of Maine. Personalities do not enter into it, as the gentleman from Portland (Mr. Payson) says. Therefore I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Payson, does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs.

Mr. DOWNS: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish or would not wish if it was in my power through eloquence to wreath any garland of roses around the Committee on Salaries and Fees. It was their honest attempt to consider what matters were brought before them disinterestedly and fairly. This bill which was presented by my esteemed friend and associate, the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Payson, is so brief that I know you will permit me to read it. The bill states: An Act Relating to the Salary of the Attorney General. The 6th sentence of the 1st paragraph of section 1 of chapter 17 of the revised statutes is hereby amended to read as follows: "The attorney-general shall have an office in the state capitol and shall receive an annual salary of \$6,000 in full for all services and in lieu of all fees." That bill was presented to us by the gentleman from Portland, who has just moved its indefinite postponement.

I hold no brief for the present Attorney General who happens to come from Kennebec County, which is my own county to be true, but I know that my friend, the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Payson, is not opposing it on this ground and I know that the members of this House will not believe that he is. It is true he had a bill in the Legislature before the Committee on Judiciary, as I remember it, which would change the entire set-up for the election of the Attorney Gen-

eral. It was in connection with that bill, I am assuming, and I want to be perfectly fair, I believe it was on the premise that that bill might receive passage that he presented this bill to the Committee on Salaries and Fees. The Committee on Salaries and Fees took the matter under consideration and, as with two other salary increases which were considered by the Committee that afternoon, reported unanimously "Ought to pass".

Now I understand there has been an amendment prepared, perhaps offered, I am not sure, which would reduce the amount of this salary by five hundred dollars.

Now we must be fair or attempt to be fair in this matter of increases in salaries and I want to read to you, to substantiate my statement, the words of the gentleman from Portland, because these are his records; it is his signed report.

"Economic conditions which have prevailed during the past three or four years involving manpower shortage and inflationary increases in living costs have resulted in manifold appeals from state officials for increases in salary. As the law now exists the salaries of certain of these officials are fixed by the Legislature while others are at the discretion of the Governor and Council. Whether wisely or unwisely the present Legislature declined to authorize the great majority of increases in salaries which were sought at its hands and the Governor and Council have not improperly felt that the policy adopted by the Legislature should in general be their guide in acting upon appeals made to them.

"Regrettable as it may appear it is undoubtedly true that by comparison with compensation now being paid by private employers for services involving corresponding ability, salaries paid by the State are exceedingly low."

That being true, we must approach this matter of salary adjustment carefully. The words of my esteemed brother are absolutely true, as the members of this Legislature know. Certain salaries are fixed by the Governor and Council. Certain salaries are fixed by the Legislature and it is only through action of the Legislature that the heads of certain departments can get any increase in salary, no mat-

ter how meritorious. We must approach this carefully and I am not entirely speaking of this particular salary. We must use judgment, but be fair. We have gone on record this afternoon as recognizing some matters. We must go on record as favoring other requests which are equally as meritorious.

Now to apply myself to this particular bill. This change was granted four years ago and it became effective three years ago. The increase as I remember was one thousand dollars with certain requirements along with it. You will agree with me, I believe, that some of that increase at least has been absorbed in the high cost of living. It was felt, and very properly felt, that some changes will very probably be made in the office of the Attorney General which will add heavily to the duties of that office. I am not at liberty to elaborate on that statement but I trust the members of this House know me well enough to know that I am not telling them something which is not so. With that thought in mind, and in keeping with the total salary increases, we felt it was no more than fair that we should grant to the Attorney General an increase in salary. This bill which we had before us would enable us to do it. It was not the intention of the committee in any way to finagle my friend, Mr. Payson, or make light of his bill. We did feel in comparison with the other increases which we had made that this was neither unjust or unfair. In the light of perhaps some adjustments which I believe the members of this Legislature will make in other salaries, I believe the amended bill would be absolutely in keeping. I trust the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Payson, does not prevail.

**THE SPEAKER:** The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Payson, to indefinitely postpone the report. All those in favor of the motion will say yes; those opposed no.

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

Thereupon, the "Ought to pass in new draft" report of the committee was accepted, and the bill, having already been printed, was read twice under suspension of the rules.

Mr. Rollins of Greenville offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.



House Amendment "A" read by the Clerk as follows:

House Amendment "A" to H. P. 1465, L. D. 1166, Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Attorney-General."

Amend said Bill by adding before the headnote in the 1st paragraph the following: 'Sec. 1.'

Further amend said Bill by striking out, in the 2nd paragraph thereof, the underlined figures "\$6,000" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figures "\$5,500'.

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

**Sec. 2. Limitation of act.** This act shall remain in force for a period of 2 years only. It is the intent of the legislature to change the present statute for a period of 2 years only, after which period the present statute shall return to full force and effect.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt House Amendment "A"? All those in favor will say yes; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being doubted,

A division of the House was had.

Eighty-eight having voted in the affirmative and none in the negative, the motion prevailed, and House Amendment "A" was adopted, and the bill was assigned for third reading tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the fourth tabled and today assigned matter, House Report "Ought not to pass as covered by other legislation" of the Committee on Salaries and Fees on Bill "An Act Relating to Expenses of Members of the Liquor Commission" (H. P. 547) (L. D. 261), tabled on April 10th, by Mr. Rollins of Greenville, pending acceptance of report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

On motion by that gentleman, the "Ought not to pass" report of the Committee was accepted, and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Monmouth, Mr. Marsans.

Mr. MARSANS: Mr. Speaker, I wish at this point to ask that the House reconsider its former action. I would like to give my reason for it. Early this morning the House accepted the "Ought not to pass" reports on several measures regard-

ing academy resolves. There is a slight error in procedure. These came through before our blanket award came along and I wish to rectify the matter and would therefore ask that the House reconsider its action whereby it accepted the Committee reports on Items 1 to 11, H. P. 807, 806, 632, 505, 504, 726, 418, 1178, 1064, 633, and 1124.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Monmouth, Mr. Marsans, moves that the House reconsider its former action whereby it accepted the "Ought not to pass" reports of the Committee on Education on the resolves just enumerated:

Resolve in favor of Coburn Classical Institute (H. P. 807)

Resolve in favor of Patten Academy (H. P. 806)

Resolve in favor of Litchfield Academy (H. P. 632)

Resolve in favor of Parsonsfield Seminary (H. P. 505)

Resolve in favor of Limington Academy (H. P. 504)

Resolve in favor of Greeley Institute (H. P. 726)

Resolve in favor of Corinna Union Academy (H. P. 418)

Resolve in favor of Lincoln Academy (H. P. 1178)

Resolve in favor of Leavitt Institute (H. P. 1064)

Resolve in favor of Monmouth Academy (H. P. 633)

Resolve in favor of East Corinth Academy (H. P. 1124)

Is it the pleasure of the House to reconsider its former action on the items read by the gentleman from Monmouth, Mr. Marsans?

The motion prevailed and on further motion by the same gentleman these resolves were recommitted to the Committee on Education and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the fifth tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act Extending the Workmen's Compensation Act to Cover Occupational Diseases." (H. P. 1443) (L. D. 1137), tabled on April 10th by Mr. Poulin of Rumford, pending first reading; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. POULIN: Mr. Speaker, the bill as originally introduced by me had a fixed schedule of twenty-eight items. After considerable time and effort by the Judiciary Committee, the bill was reported out unanimously "Ought to pass" under a new draft with thirteen

cheduled items. Since the redraft there were some objections to certain sections. These changes are in the amendments offered under L. D. 1180, which I hope will meet with your approval as it is the purpose of this bill to provide a workable occupational disease bill that will be fair to labor as well as industry. It is very difficult to present a new bill to cover occupational diseases that is perfect, but at least this is a start in the right direction.

The quarry and granite industry of Maine, because of the excessive cost of insurance coverage, is not covered in this schedule for that reason and is purposely left out.

In 1937, a Recess Committee on Compensation for Occupational Diseases was created and in January of 1939 the report was given and with a majority report of seven to three they recommended, after many hearings and many reports from many states and from witnesses before the committee from labor and industry, that the State should provide compensation for occupational diseases. I would like to read what this committee said in conclusion.

"We are confident that the experience of other states indicates that with a tradition of competency in Maine's Industrial Accident Commission, such as we have been building up, industry will have nothing to fear from an occupational disease statute, and Maine employees will obtain something to which they are logically and humanly entitled.

"We therefore recommend the adoption of an occupational disease law for the State of Maine, along the lines of the law which we have drafted and append hereto as a suggestion for the legislature." This was signed by Clement F. Robinson, Donald W. Philbrick, Sanger M. Cook, Frank E. Maliar, George D. Varney and Clarence R. Burgess.

The operation of this addition to the Workmen's Compensation Act would be up to the Industrial Accident Commission and the Commissioner of Labor.

There are about thirty-four states with occupational disease compensation. Conditions have changed very fast in the last twenty years. Many occupations, due to use of chemicals, war implements, and new inventions, have caused injuries

and occupational diseases that were never suffered before.

At our State Convention in Bangor in 1944, the Republican Party inserted in its platform that a law on occupational disease should be supported by the party.

The Governor in his inaugural address to the joint Legislative bodies at this session recommended that the State pass legislation on compensation for occupational diseases.

For these many reasons outlined, I offer an amendment and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Poulin, offers an amendment and moves its adoption. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Poulin.

Mr. POULIN: Mr. Speaker, this amendment has not been reproduced, and I therefore move that the matter be tabled until tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Poulin, moves to retable this matter pending its first reading, and assign it for tomorrow morning. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the bill was retabled and tomorrow assigned.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the sixth tabled and today assigned matter, Majority Report, Be referred to the 93rd Legislature, Minority Report "Ought to pass in New Draft" (H. P. 1470) (L. D. 1179), of the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act Relating to Hours of Labor for State Employees" (H. P. 1259) (L. D. 883), tabled on April 11th by Mr. Bell of Thomaston, pending motion of Mr. Poulin of Rumford that the Minority Report be accepted; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Thomaston, Mr. Bell.

On motion by Mr. Bell, the matter was retabled pending same motion and tomorrow assigned.

#### Passed to be Engrossed

The following Bill and Resolves were taken up by special assignment:

Bill "An Act relating to Pollution in Cobbosseecontee and Annabessacook Lakes" (H. P. 1471) (L. D. 1173)

Resolve Authorizing the Forest Commissioner to Grant Permits for Setting and Maintaining Poles and Wires on a Public School Lot in Webster Plantation (H. P. 1455) (L. D. 1177)

Resolve in relation to Status of Certain Persons in re Teachers' Retirement Association (H. P. 1472) (L. D. 1175)

Resolve relating to Appointment of Special Committee to Study Proposals to Establish Technical and Vocational Institutes (H. P. 1473) (L. D. 1176)

Resolve Authorizing the Forest Commissioner to Convey Certain Interest of the State in Land in Piscataquis County to Harry Greenleaf, of Norway (H. P. 1474) (L. D. 1178)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the seventh tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Adjutant General" (H. P. 1463) (L. D. 1169), tabled April 11th by Mr. Hawes of Vassalboro, pending second reading; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

On motion by Mr. Hawes the bill was given its second reading and assigned for third reading tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the eighth tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Forest Commissioner" (H. P. 1464) (L. D. 1168), tabled on April 11th by Mr. Legard of Bath, pending second reading; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. LEGARD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move indefinite postponement of this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Jefferson, Mr. Gross.

Mr. GROSS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have had quite a lot of talk about salaries. This deals with a salary. I am going to take a few moments of your time to point out a few facts for your consideration. First of all, I wish to state that my remarks are going to deal with two

things, figures, and only figures and jobs, and not personalities.

I have made up here a list, so far as I can get them from the records of the legislative documents printed at this time, of the salaries, or better, salary requests, and changes and subsequent alterations which have been laid before you.

If you will bear with me a moment, I will read this chart and explain it as I go. I have divided it into the following headings: The department, the number of the original bill, the amount in the original law, the amount increased to, the number of a new draft, if any, the amount in the new draft, if any, and any subsequent amendments which may have been placed on your desks regarding them.

Adjutant General, the one you just acted on, No. 269—\$4500. Asked for an increase to \$5500. Under New Draft 1169 there was no change. It was left at \$5500. There was no increase or decrease. There is an amendment to decrease it.

Commissioner of Agriculture, No. 596, from \$4500 to \$6000, an increase of \$1500. No new draft; no change.

Attorney General, No. 765, originally asked for an increase from \$5,000 to \$6500. Under new draft reduced to \$6000 and by an amendment and your recent action reduced to \$5500.

Banking Commissioner, No. 593, from \$5000 to \$6000. No change.

Forest Commissioner, No. 590, from \$5000 to \$6000. New draft \$5500; no amendment.

Governor, No. 367, increased from \$5000 to \$10,000. No change.

Commissioner of Inland Fish and Game, No. 551, increased from \$4000 to \$6000. No new draft out. To date, no amendment.

Labor Commissioner, No. 793, from \$3000 to \$4000, plus \$1000 from some other department. New Draft \$3500. No change. No decrease. There is an amendment which puts a two year limit on it.

Members of the Liquor Commission, increased from \$4000 to \$6000 for the Chairman and from \$3000 to \$4000 for the members. New Draft 1170. Two year limitation by proposed amendment.

Secretary of State, No. 20, increased from \$4000 to \$5000. There is an amendment to bring it down \$500 and put a two year limit on it.

Justices of the Supreme Judicial Court and Justices of the Superior Court. You just took care of it.

Unemployment Compensation Commission, No. 949, increase of \$1000 for each member. No new draft and no amendment. There may be an amendment pending on the table to come off tomorrow.

The point I would like to bring out is this: Why the discrepancy in these department heads? Why isn't the services of one as good as the other? Why isn't the services of the Forestry Commissioner as good as the Fish and Game Commissioner or the Unemployment Compensation Commissioners or any other? There has been no change in the amount of work. One of the principal reasons for changing these salaries is the higher cost of living. It has been pointed out to you ladies and gentlemen that it costs as much for A as it does for A, B, C or D. I cannot see why the original bill was not left alone.

Now I believe in fair play. We have heard quite a lot about fair play this afternoon. I think we should stay in line with that thought. I think we have three alternatives: Either to pass these as introduced, change them in equal proportion or do away with them entirely. In this particular instance I would move to substitute the bill for the new draft.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Bath, Miss Deering.

Miss DEERING: Mr. Speaker, noting the absence of the gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs, I move this matter be retabled.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Bath, Miss Deering, noting the absence of the gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs, moves that this matter be tabled, pending the motion of the gentleman from Jefferson, Mr. Gross, that the bill be substituted for the new draft. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The House will be in order. The Chair notes that the gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs, just came in. The gentlewoman from Bath, Miss Deering, moves to take from the table the matter tabled a few moments ago. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would state that this is a bill relating to the Salary of the Forest Commissioner. There is a motion before the House to indefinitely postpone, made by the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Legard. There is another motion pending by the gentleman from Jefferson, Mr. Gross, that the bill be substituted for the new draft. That motion at this time is out of order. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs.

Mr. DOWNS: Mr. Speaker, this matter was considered by the Committee on Salaries and Fees and a recommendation was made. The committee I can say acted upon this the same as other matters which it had before it. I was of the impression that there was an amendment to be offered which would somewhat modify the findings of the committee. Do I understand, Mr. Speaker, there is a motion for indefinite postponement of the committee report?

The SPEAKER: The motion was for indefinite postponement of the bill.

Mr. DOWNS: Mr. Speaker, I would say to the members of the House that the committee considered the matter, as I have said, the same as they did the others which were presented to them. That is my recollection. Mr. Speaker, to be a little more specific and sure of my premise, I would move that the matter lie on the table and be especially assigned for tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs, moves that the bill be tabled and specially assigned for tomorrow morning. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the bill was so tabled and so assigned.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the ninth tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act Relating to Salaries and Expenses of Members of the State Liquor Commission" (H. P. 1467) (L. D. 1170), tabled April 11th, by Mr. Weston of Farmingdale, pending second reading, and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. Weston of Farmingdale offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" read by the Clerk as follows:

House Amendment "A" to H. P. 1467, L. D. 1170, Bill "An Act Relating to Salaries and Expenses of

Members of the State Liquor Commission."

Amend said Bill by inserting before the headnote in the 1st paragraph thereof the following: 'Sec. 1.'

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

**Sec. 2. Limitation of act.** This act shall remain in force for a period of 2 years only. It is the intent of the legislature to change the present statute for 2 years only, after which period the present statute shall return to full force and effect.'

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt House Amendment "A"? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Jefferson, Mr. GROSS.

Mr. GROSS: Mr. Speaker, I move that this matter lie on the table and be specially assigned for tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Jefferson, Mr. Gross, moves that the amendment lie on the table pending its adoption and be specially assigned for tomorrow morning. Is this the pleasure of the House? All those in favor will say yes; those opposed no.

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

Thereupon House Amendment "A" was adopted, the bill was given its second reading, and tomorrow assigned for third reading.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the tenth tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Commissioner of Labor and Industry" (H. P. 1468) (L. D. 1171), tabled on April 11th by Mr. Springer of Danforth, pending second reading; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

On motion by Mr. Springer, the bill was given its second reading, and tomorrow assigned for third reading.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the eleventh tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act to Promote Public Safety with Snow Removal or Sanding Equipment" (H. P. 1452) (L. D. 1141), tabled on April 11th by Mr. Williams of Clifton, pending second reading; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do not know but I kind of hate to talk against this particular bill. It is a safety measure and I have always prided myself for being for safety, but on the other hand I think we should be a little careful what we legislate here today that we do not build up some laws which nobody can live up to.

In this bill it only asks at the present time to place three more lights on motor vehicles that are sanding or plowing roads. That seems unfair. They now have their headlights and tail lights and now we ask for three more, one to the front and one to the rear, with blinkers, and one pointing down to the wing.

Now I have never offered a humorous amendment to any bill in this House, but I was tempted to put in an amendment asking to put a revolving light on here of one thousand candle-power. Now of course there is a possibility of one driving into a snow plow and it is a serious situation. There is also danger of one driving into the rear of some car ahead of you or into some tree or some other obstacle, but I am not going to introduce a bill asking to put lights on every tree side of the road or every obstacle you might run into in driving along the road.

Now I think this bill would be all right if they added that this was for State owned equipment, equipment that does nothing else but looks out for the plowing and sanding of the roads. The sad part of it is that our own State equipment is not completely equipped in this fashion. They do not know where they can get the lights. We are asking the many men who use trucks who take snow contracts to put on these lights on their trucks. It does not seem hardly fair where the folks that wrote this bill admit they do not know if this equipment can be secured after January 1, 1946. In that case they are going to let them go along without them. I think this law will work a hardship on many people who are plowing in the winter. I doubt if the fellows who wrote this bill have ever ridden on a snow plow. I have never operated a snow plow but I have ridden on them and I have hired people to plow roads. I do not think it is fair to ask them to add fifty dollars' worth of equipment. We do not want to ask him

to put the wires on and hook it up so the lights will percolate, especially in these times.

I think until the day comes when people are interested in these jobs of working on the road that we had better be careful what we legislate and not make criminals out of a lot of people who are working for the public good. With these remarks, I will move indefinite postponement of this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Coombs.

Mr. COOMBS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill is designed to prevent accidents involving cars smashing into the rear of snowplowing equipment and sanding equipment upon our roads. The increasing number of these accidents, according to the State Police, has made it necessary that such legislation should be introduced. At the present time just the regular tail-lights on the back of the truck are all that is required. As you know, it is a small red tail-light that is not visible at any great distance in a snowstorm. Because of this trouble we have had accidents—we have had accidents in my own county because of it.

This bill also provides for a light mounted on the vehicle to show the left wing of the plow whenever the left wing is used, so that cars which are passing the snowplows would be able to see that the wing was extended out into the road and would not run into it. This does not mean this light is required for plowing with the ordinary plow mounted on the right side of the truck and plowing the right hand side of the road. That light is only required on trucks which have a left wing and that extends out into the middle of the road so that there will be a hazard to those cars passing the snowplow.

I have talked with Lieutenant Shaw, the Safety Director of the Maine State Police, and he informs me that similar regulations are in force in other states and that there is a definite need for this legislation for the safety of drivers in the State of Maine.

I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Clifton, Mr. Williams, does not prevail.

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

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Motor Vehicles who passed out a unanimous report "Ought to pass", and as one of the two members of that committee who were assigned the task of writing a new draft after investigation of this bill presented by the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Coombs, I would like to comment very briefly on its merits.

I am sure that the gentleman from Clifton, my friend Mr. Williams, would not attempt to put any joking amendment on this bill, because I know he is aware, as are the rest of the members of this House, of the seriousness of highway conditions, not only now but under conditions which will be present the minute cars are back on the road in greater numbers. This bill, as it says here, is a public safety measure. We offer no apology for trying to safeguard the lives of the people of this State. I do not think that the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Coombs, would have introduced this bill if there had not been accidents and a great many of them. It is true I have not operated a snowplow, but I have been on one and I have driven a truck. He says he has talked with Lieutenant Shaw. So did we. Lieutenant Shaw informed me that there were more accidents on the sanding trucks than with snowplows. These vehicles are a hazard and there are not perfect drivers in the State of Maine any more than in the rest of the country. We wish there were.

I would like to read to you just one or two figures here and a paragraph from a magazine article in the State Police Biennial Report. Lieutenant Shaw, Director, says:

"The total figures for the year 1942 reveal 1,828 accidents reported to this Division. As a result of these accidents, 150 people were killed and 1,043 persons injured."

Now there have been deaths due to cars running into these plows at night. I believe there were two last year in this Kennebec area. A member of the House told me of a person up-state who got killed. Anything that we can do to cut down the accident toll is a step in the right direction.

Let me read you from an article entitled "Death Rides Every Highway". It says: "If the present highway accident rate continues, without getting worse because of

increased congestion, by 1960 we shall be killing 80,000 people annually, and seriously injuring more than a million a year. Even in 1943, we killed more Americans on our roads than died through enemy action. Moreover, nearly all of these accidental deaths were easily preventable.

"Every day we kill or injure 1,000 workers. With 24,500,000 automobiles in operation, five million less than at the time of Pearl Harbor, traffic deaths were cut from about 40,000 annually to a low point of 23,300 in 1943. But in the last few months of 1943, the death rate suddenly turned sharply upward by 15 per cent. It is still going up!"

We have tried in the redraft of this bill to take into consideration the fact that this equipment is not known to be absolutely available at this time. That is true, as the gentleman from Clifton, Mr. Williams, says. Therefore we wrote in this bill on or after January 1, 1946.

In other words, shall we pass this legislation now or wait two years and ninety days. I do not know about you, but I would certainly hate to go home and pick up the paper next winter and read about even one accident where somebody was injured or killed and realize that here in this Legislature we might have prevented that accident. This is one link and we have got to have even greater restrictions when this war is over, unless we are going to wipe out our population on the highway. I certainly hope, in the interest of public safety, that the motion of the gentleman from Clifton, Mr. Williams, does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I am one of the unfortunate ones who has a contract for plowing snow, not through any wish of my own but because it was wished on me. There is no question but what it is a good safety measure. From my point of view I do not see how it can be accomplished under present conditions. We cannot get batteries and the generators are not large enough to handle them even if we got the batteries. If this law passes there will be very little snow plowed in my town. I would be glad to do it if possible, but under present conditions I cannot see it.

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

Mr. WESTON: Mr. Speaker, I plowed snow for several years and plowed this winter. This bill is attempting to get on snow plows a uniform set of lights so when you see the blinker you will know it is a snow plow. The State has tried it out and finds it is the most satisfactory system of lighting they have yet discovered. This blinker, six inches in diameter, gives the motorist warning so that he will slow down in time and will not crash into it. Speaking of generators, most of the equipment now is equipped with generators which, as you increase the load, increase the charging rate. I do not see any reason why they cannot discard a lot of useless lights and put on some that will do a good job.

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

Mr. WIGHT: Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Motor Vehicle Committee, I can say we gave very careful consideration to this bill because of the very hazardous conditions under which the snowplows and sanders work. Regarding the lights, I understand that there is one light at the top of the vehicle and one at the rear and one pointing to the ground so that that vehicle is easily discernable at a long distance and it also can be recognized as one of these trucks or plows. This is practical legislation and the mechanical difficulties of the truck owners would be very slight. Those lights are available as I understand it at \$23.00. They cost \$17.95 for the lights at the top of the truck and about five dollars for the light which shines on the wing. The committee was unanimous in its decision, feeling this would prevent accidents and possibly save lives. I trust the motion of the gentleman from Clifton, Mr. Williams, does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Clifton, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker, I feel quite successful on this bill because my seat mate has been up. I have been trying to get him up all this session and this is the first time he has made a speech. This is also the first time that the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Wight, has been up. I have been wishing

to hear some remarks from those two gentlemen.

I am not going to make a long speech. The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Allen, has explained that we should do away with accidents, if possible, and I am one hundred per cent in agreement with him on that. But until it is possible to do this, let's not make criminals out of a lot of good citizens who are trying to keep our roads in good condition in these difficult times.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Clifton, Mr. Williams, moves that this bill be indefinitely postponed. Is this the pleasure of the House? All those in favor of the gentleman's motion for indefinite postponement will say yes; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken,

The motion did not prevail.

Thereupon the bill was given its second reading and tomorrow assigned for third reading.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Bath, Miss Deering.

Miss DEERING: Mr. Speaker, I move we adjourn until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Miss Deering, moves that the House adjourn until ten o'clock tomorrow morning. All those in favor of the motion will say yes; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken;

The motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the twelfth tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act Relating to Fees of Town Clerks for Fishing and Hunting Licenses" (H. P. 988) (L. D. 588), in the House the bill substituted for the report, read twice, and House Amendment "A" adopted, tabled on April 11th by Mr. Ward of Millinocket, pending assignment for third reading.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rangeley, Mr. True.

Mr. TRUE: Mr. Speaker, the only reason I asked Mr. Ward to table this bill was to offer an amendment. In the original bill it only mentioned town clerks. There are many other people selling licenses and I wanted to make it uniform. I now offer this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The amendment not having been reproduced, the

gentleman from Rangeley, Mr. True, moves that the amendment lie on the table pending adoption. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the thirteenth tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act Relating to Keeping Certain Animals Confined" (H. P. 1426) (L. D. 1106), tabled April 11th by Mr. Ward of Millinocket, pending motion of Mr. Williams of Auburn to indefinitely postpone; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rangeley, Mr. True.

Mr. TRUE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer an amendment. This amendment I hope meets with the approval of all the members of the House. I wish you would give it careful consideration.

The SPEAKER: The amendment not having been reproduced, the gentleman from Rangeley, Mr. True, moves that the amendment lie on the table pending adoption. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the fourteenth tabled and today assigned matter, "Resolve Authorizing Preparation of a Digest of the Opinions of the Law Court" (S. P. 346) (L. D. 894), which was in the Senate passed to be engrossed, and in the House tabled on April 11th by Mr. Williams of Clifton, pending second reading; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

On motion of Mr. Williams, the Resolve was tabled pending second reading and specially assigned for tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the fifteenth tabled and today assigned matter, House Amendment "A" to Resolve, Authorizing the Forest Commissioner to Advertise and Sell Certain Stumpage in the Town of Ashland, tabled April 11th by Mr. Rollins of Greenville, pending adoption; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

On motion by Mr. Rollins, House Amendment "A" was adopted, and the Resolve as amended was passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.



The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "B" to S. P. 103, L. D. 178, Bill "An Act to Regulate the Practice of Architecture and to Create a Board to Provide for the Examination and Registration of Architects", tabled earlier in today's session by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Allen, pending adoption.

On motion of Mr. Allen, House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "B" was adopted, and the bill was assigned for third reading tomorrow morning.

Thereupon, on motion by the gentlewoman from Bath, Miss Deering, the House voted to reconsider its action just taken whereby it voted to assign this bill for third reading tomorrow morning.

Senate Amendment "B", as amended by House Amendment "A" was then adopted, and the bill as amended was assigned for third reading tomorrow morning.

On motion by Miss Deering of Bath,

Adjourned until tomorrow morning at 9:30 o'clock.