

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-Third Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1947

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Thursday, April 3, 1947

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

Prayer by the Rev. Roy Burgess of Monmouth.

Journal of yesterday read and approved.

Papers from the Senate.

Senate Reports of Committees Ought to Pass—Amended Tabled

From the Senate: Report of the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act to Increase State Aid to Towns for the Support of Schools to Establish Minimum Salaries for Teachers" (S. P. 90) (L. D. 141) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 478) (L. D. 1336) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

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

(In the House, on motion by Mr. Mills of Farmington, tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report in concurrence)

Non-Concurrent Matter

From the Senate: Bill "An Act relating to Bank Accounts and Deposits of Town Treasurers" (H. P. 273) (L. D. 185) which was passed to be enacted in the House on March 5th, and passed to be engrossed on February 21st.

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

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

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that there be printed 1000 additional copies of the 1947 Senate and House Registers (S. P. 498)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

In the House, read and passed in concurrence.

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

Mr. MARSANS: Mr. Speaker, I present an order, and give notice of a proposed change in the House Rules.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Monmouth, Mr. Marsans, presents an order. The Clerk will read the order.

ORDERED, that beginning Tuesday, April 8, and continuing during the remainder of this regular session, under Orders of the Day, the Speaker shall lay before the House for consideration

1. The matter, if any, under consideration when the House adjourned on the preceding legislative day.

2. Matters that may have been specially assigned for the preceding legislative day and not then taken up for consideration.

3. Matters specially assigned for consideration.

4. Matters tabled prior to the preceding Monday and unassigned, in the order in which they were laid on the table.

BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that during Orders of the Day, no motion to lay on the table shall be in order unless a day is assigned not later than the sixth calendar day thereafter, provided however, that motions to reconsider may be made at any time when no other matter is under consideration and if laid on the table, the day assigned shall not be later than the sixth calendar day thereafter.

This Order shall suspend any rule of the House inconsistent therewith.

On further motion by Mr. Marsans, the order was tabled pending passage and tomorrow assigned.

House Reports of Committees Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Control of Rentals" (H. P. 1173) (L. D. 742)

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. Dunbar of Washington
Miss Clough of Penobscot
Messrs. Barnes of Arrostook

—of the Senate

Perkins of Boothbay Harbor
Williams of Auburn
McGlaflin of Portland
Haskell of Portland
Silsby of Aurora

—of the House

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. Mills of Farmington
Peirce of Augusta

—of the House.

(On motion by Mr. Allen of Portland, the two Reports, with accompanying papers, were tabled pending acceptance of either Report and specially assigned for Thursday, April 10th)

Leave to Withdraw

Mr. Johnston from the Committee on Agriculture on Bill "An Act Increasing the Potato Tax" (H. P. 1366) (L. D. 988) reported leave to withdraw.

Mr. Smith from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Appropriation for Seed Potato Board" (H. P. 1534) (L. D. 1165)

Mr. Hayward from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Fishing Tournaments or Derbies" (H. P. 1169) (L. D. 772)

Reports were read and accepted.

Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Byron from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Use of Motor-Boats in Merrymeeting Bay" (H. P. 1170) (L. D. 846)

Mr. Haskell from the Committee on Judiciary reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Teachers' Pension Benefits for Veterans" (H. P. 1541) (L. D. 1171)

Mr. McGlauffin from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Fire Escapes, Exits Thereto and Illumination Thereof" (H. P. 447) (L. D. 265)

Reports were read and accepted.

Tabled

Mr. Silsby from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Membership in the Jointly - Contributory Retirement System for Employees of the Sea and Shore Fisheries Department" (H. P. 1297) (L. D. 904)

(On motion by Mr. Sleeper of Rockland, tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report)

Tabled

Mr. Lombard from the Committee on Taxation reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Exemption of Veterans of World War II from Taxation" (H. P. 986) (L. D. 636)

(On motion by Mr. Atherton of Bangor, tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report)

Tabled

Mr. Morison from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Providing Exemptions for Veterans of World War II" (H. P. 1522) (L. D. 1143)

(On motion by Mr. Cousins of Fort Kent, tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report)

Ought to Pass in New Draft

Mr. Prout from the Committee on Agriculture on Bill "An Act relating to Seed Potato Board Appropriation" (H. P. 1533) (L. D. 1164) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1663) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Smart from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Resolve Providing for a Fish Screen at Outlet of Cobbosseecontee Lake, in the town of Manchester (H. P. 1062) (L. D. 694) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1664) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

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

Tabled

Mr. Ellis from the Committee on Pensions on Resolve Granting a Pension to Mary E. Dunbar, of Portland (H. P. 871) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1665) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

(On motion by Mr. McGlauffin of Portland, tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report and the new draft ordered printed under the Joint Rules)

Ought to Pass Printed Bills

Mr. Smith from the Committee on Agriculture reported "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to County and Local Agricultural Societies" (H. P. 411) (L. D. 243)

Mr. Tabb from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Giving Commissioner of Agriculture

Authority to Establish Quarantines" (H. P. 1365) (L. D. 987)

Mr. Byron from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reported same on Resolve Closing the Tributaries to Wassookeag Lake in Dexter in Penobscot County to All Fishing (H. P. 904) (L. D. 603)

Mr. Jordan from same Committee reported same on Resolve Regulating Dipping of Smelts in Lake Cobbosseecontee (H. P. 1594) (L. D. 1250)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Old Town Game Preserve" (H. P. 1161) (L. D. 841)

Mr. Smart from same Committee reported same on Resolve Opening Pleasant Lake, in Washington County, to Ice Fishing (H. P. 912) (L. D. 542)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Repealing Mount Bigelow Game Preserve in Franklin and Somerset Counties" (H. P. 899) (L. D. 598)

Mr. Silsby from the Committee on Judiciary reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Method of Payment of Alimony" (H. P. 917) (L. D. 614)

Reports were read and accepted, and the Bills and Resolves having already been printed, the Bills were read twice under suspension of the rules, the Resolves read once, and tomorrow assigned.

Ought to Pass With Committee Amendment

Mr. Smart from the Committee on Temperance on Bill "An Act relating to Publication of Applications for Liquor Licenses" (H. P. 1567) (L. D. 1196) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Bill, having already been printed, was read twice under suspension of the rules.

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

Committee Amendment "A" to H. P. 1567, L. D. 1196, Bill "An Act Relating to Publication of Applications for Liquor Licenses."

Amend said bill by inserting after the underlined word "issued" in the 6th line thereof the following underlined words "except licenses for malt liquor not to be consumed on the premises,"

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill was assigned

for third reading tomorrow morning.

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

Passed to be Engrossed

Bill "An Act Changing the Definition of a Hotel for the Purpose of Liquor Licenses" (H. P. 1326) (L. D. 895)

Bill "An Act relating to Application of Penalty for Liquor Violation to Subsequently Issued Licenses" (H. P. 1569) (L. D. 1198)

Bill "An Act relating to Unclassified Service in Department of Agriculture" (H. P. 1584) (L. D. 1237)

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

Tabled

Bill "An Act Protecting the Right of Members and Non-members of Labor Organizations to the Opportunity to Work" (H. P. 1652) (L. D. 1346)

(Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, and on motion by Mr. Brown of Unity, tabled pending third reading)

Passed to be Enacted Emergency Measure Tabled

An Act to Create the Castle Hill-Chapman - Mapleton Community School District (H. P. 1465) (L. D. 1069)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed, and on motion by Mr. Ellis of Castle Hill, tabled pending passage to be enacted.

Passed to be Enacted

An Act relating to the Taking of Fur-bearing Animals from the Traps of Another (S. P. 474) (L. D. 1330)

An Act relating to Deputy Insurance Commissioners (H. P. 61) (L. D. 60)

An Act relating to Log Driving Dams (H. P. 1185) (L. D. 851)

An Act relating to Inspection of Motor Vehicles (H. P. 1193) (L. D. 781)

An Act Regulating Handling of Animals Seized by Humane Agents (H. P. 1257) (L. D. 929)

An Act relating to Persons Maintaining Children's Homes (H. P. 1311) (L. D. 890)

An Act relating to Statute of Frauds (H. P. 1394) (L. D. 1012)

An Act to Incorporate the Town of New Gloucester School District (H. P. 1448) (L. D. 1052)

An Act Excluding Circus Wagons from Definition of Trailers in Motor Vehicle Law (H. P. 1468) (L. D. 1072)

Resolve providing for purchase of Land for the Bangor State Hospital (S. P. 300) (L. D. 793)

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

Orders of the Day

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day, the Chair lays before the House the first matter of unfinished business, Committee Amendment "A" to Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Judge of the Lisbon Municipal Court." (H. P. 136) (L. D. 134) In the House the Bill was read twice and tabled on March 27th by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, pending adoption; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. PLUMMER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill has to do with the salary of the Judge of the Lisbon Municipal Court. It is with some reluctance that I bring this matter before the House, but the defeat of this bill threatens the existence of the municipal court in the town of Lisbon.

I realize these matters are usually taken care of by the various counties themselves, but this is a matter where they have to come to the Legislature to ask for help.

The present Judge states, and he stated to the committee, that he will resign unless the salary is raised to \$1200. I might say that we have a good court in Lisbon and it is appreciated by the people of Lisbon. We have letters from various industries in Lisbon, four large mills that pay approximately \$90,000 in taxes. They all endorsed this bill, in fact they recommended that the salary be \$1800, but we have put the bill in for \$1200.

At the time of our county budget meeting when we set up our county budget, this matter was brought up and was not opposed; and at our hearing before the Salaries & Fees

Committee it was not opposed. However, I understand that since then there has been opposition from our County Commissioners, which was perhaps to be expected. As far as I know, the only opposition was due to the fact that perhaps the income of the court was so small that it did not pay expenses or did not return anything perhaps to the county. Our court during the year 1946, I think took in \$1069 and something returned in fees. Of course that actually did not represent everything that we did by the municipal court.

I want to read here what the laws of the State of Maine say in regard to judges of municipal courts. The laws of the State of Maine prohibit municipal court judges from practicing criminal law in the State and also prohibit them from practicing civil law before another municipal court judge in his county. The municipal court has sole jurisdiction over forcible entry and detainer matters, therefore the Judge is not only tied to the job but he is prohibited from practicing criminal law and civil law in his county before other judges, and he is ruled out in all forcible entry and detainer cases in his town.

I think some of the members know that the minimum charge for appearing before the court is twenty-five dollars. That means that a lawyer would only have to have less than one case a week to get over \$1200 a year. I think in this matter we should make it impersonal and not figure we are raising a particular amount for any person: it is the job that we are paying for.

The court in Lisbon has been a great benefit to the town, not only to the town of Lisbon but to surrounding towns of Webster and Durham.

I will give you a few figures about the town of Lisbon. It is the largest town in Androscoggin County. We have a State valuation of \$3,456,000 and we pay a State tax of \$24,935 and pay a county tax of \$6,566. The population is approximately 4,500. As I say, with the two surrounding towns it means that the court has jurisdiction over in the vicinity of seven thousand people.

Under the present arrangement, the Judge furnishes his own chambers; he has no recorder; he furnishes his own clerk-hire, light, heat and so forth. It seems to me that

this is a just bill, and I do not think it is a bit out of line. I hope I may have your support, and I now move for indefinite postponement of Committee Amendment "A".

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rockland Mr. Sleeper.

Mr. SLEEPER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: All of the members who served on the Salaries and Fees Committee will have to sustain our action on this bill. We are not interested, and we know you are not interested in the salary of the Judge of the court at Lisbon. The Salaries & Fees Committee endeavors to act as a just and impartial body to listen to the reasons for and against the setting of salaries in these various courts and for county officials.

In the first place, I will explain to the members of the House that to grant the request of Mr. Plummer will not cost the State or us one penny, so we will leave that up to this House. I will, however, attempt to tell you why the committee passed the measure out the way they did.

We always, in matters of local color, the same as this bill is, talk to the County Commissioners. They are the men that draw up the county commitments; they know how much money they have to pay out and know what they want to pay.

It was also shown to the committee that this court is very much smaller than comparable courts. I think this judge has about one-quarter of the cases that some other court judges have who are paid the same amount he wanted. So we felt that the only thing we could do, in justice to the county and the County Commissioners, was to go along and follow out their report that the bill should not pass. They did not want us to advance his salary at all: they wanted it to stay at \$600. We did, however, feel that since he was supplying his own court chambers we would advance his salary from \$600 to \$900 in lieu of allowing him to hire those chambers.

That is the case in a nutshell and if this House chooses to override the Salaries and Fees Committee we are not going to be mad about it because I do not think our future will rise or fall on this bill. I do just want to explain that the duties of the Salaries & Fees Committee are obnoxious in some cases and

tiresome. In this case we felt we were justified in not granting the increase. We felt that if the people in the know, the County Commissioners, did not want the increase we would not grant it. That is the case in a nutshell, and the House can do as it wishes.

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

Mr. BICKFORD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I served eight years as County Commissioner of Androscoggin County and I know considerable about this particular matter.

In the first place, when this court was established in Lisbon there were members of the present board of County Commissioners of Androscoggin County in this House at that time, and they are now members of the present County Commissioners.

I feel there is a little mite of jealousy and untoward indifference on the part of the County Commissioners in regard to this matter. This is really a personal matter with the town of Lisbon. This court, since it has been established, has had a good record as far as the job is concerned, and cases have been well taken care of.

As the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, stated, the court is not permitted to participate in criminal matters in the county. Furthermore, the judge of any court has to be of some judicial judgment, so even though this court does not pay as big dividends as some other offices in the county, they might well consider that several other offices pertaining to the town of Lisbon, the income from those offices does not take care of what the salaries are. So that part of it, it seems to me, is immaterial. I think as this court was established by this Legislature and as it is what the town of Lisbon wants, that we should not deny the county that privilege. I am therefore against this amendment.

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

Mr. DOUCETTE: Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, not personally being against this court in particular, but due to the fact that two years ago the matter was brought up before a committee and before the House here and permission was granted that a judge

should be named. As I understand it from the present County Commissioners, they are against this increase for the reason that they claim at that time a promise had been made that no increase in salary would be asked until they had established how much revenue they could derive from this court. That is one of the reasons I am against this bill and the County Commissioners are.

As far as I am concerned, it is not a personal matter with me. It is a matter that perhaps you should think of seriously because it concerns all of us, because it may at some time or other happen in your own district. I am therefore against this bill.

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

Mr. BICKFORD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In the county budget as it was made up — and we had a meeting of all of the county delegation here — this amount was set for this judgeship at \$1200. Now we all agreed at that time that was the amount that should be paid to this judge for the next two years.

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

Mr. MALENFANT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: They have increased the salaries of judges in other towns, and I believe the judge in Lisbon deserves an increase just as much as any other judge. The County Commissioners of Androscoggin County are against this increase, I believe, for personal reasons. I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Lisbon (Mr. Plummer) prevails.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer.

Mr. PLUMMER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I did not anticipate this measure would cause any debate, but since the discussion is entirely on the question of whether the court pays or not, I wish to say that it seems to me that is a wrong attitude to take when you are considering court matters. It might apply just as well to our schools or anything else. The question is not whether they pay or not but whether they are a benefit to the people. I do not think that court matters should be put on a monetary basis, how much they return to the peo-

ple, but rather whether they tend towards the enforcement and carrying on of law and order. Since there has been some little debate, I would ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, that the House indefinitely postpone Committee Amendment "A". All those in favor will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and Committee Amendment "A" was indefinitely postponed.

Thereupon the bill was tomorrow assigned for third reading.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the second item of unfinished business, House Report "A", "Ought to pass" and House Report "B", "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Assessing a Poll Tax on Females" (H. P. 1224) (L. D. 749) tabled on March 27th by the gentleman from Fort Kent, Mr. Cousins, pending acceptance of either report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. COUSINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I understand that this measure, "An Act Assessing a Poll Tax on Females" has been proposed to most of the Legislatures down through the years and that it has been laughed out of them. I do not think that it is a laughing matter. I have been accused of everything in proposing this bill. People have said to me: "Cousins, do you want to be a confirmed bachelor?" Ladies and Gentlemen, I assure you that isn't the case. (Laughter) I am serious. I am serious for several reasons. The first is money. At this time the communities and municipalities of the State are crying that they need new money. All right, here is a measure which would give to the cities and towns, and not the State from five hundred and six hundred thousand dollars a year. That is nothing to laugh at. I got the figure of five to six hundred thousand dollars a year from the State Tax Assessor. Personally, I think it would be more. This would lower the property tax rate in Maine towns from one mill to one mill and a half. That again is nothing to laugh at.

A poll tax is not the best tax by any means, but we have it, and,

since we have it, we might just as well have it on everybody. The poll tax is a very old tax; it is one of our oldest; it started in Colonial times, and it has been tied in with everything. At one time it was tied in with road taxes and men were allowed to work off their poll tax by working on the roads in front of their homes. Obviously, women could not do it. It has been tied in with voting; people were not allowed to vote unless they paid their poll tax. That also is not true in the State of Maine now. We call it a poll tax. It should not be called a poll tax; it should be called a capitation tax or a head tax.

You and I know that a lot of families in the State of Maine pay no taxes at all to the communities except one poll tax. Many of them are Federal employees; they rent homes and pay indirect taxes to their communities but they pay no direct tax except three dollars. This measure would get three dollars more from them, so they would be paying six dollars.

Many, many women today are working, have good jobs, and are earning good salaries, more than you or I, some of them. You see women in every walk of life. They were in the Armed Services, in industry, in the professions. We have women legislators, women administrators. They are as well able to pay a poll tax as you and I. Many, many wives are now working, adding money to the cash income of the family. The war accelerated this trend and it is continuing. Most insurance policies have women as beneficiaries. Over fifty percent of the securities of the United States, the stocks and bonds, are owned by women, which means they own over fifty percent of the business in the country.

All these reasons outweigh, in my mind, the only disadvantage of a poll tax on women, the fact that it takes six dollars from the family. A poll tax on women is no innovation. Many states have it. Thirty-six states in the United States have poll taxes and eighteen of these thirty-six states have poll taxes on women. All of our sister New England states, with the exception of Massachusetts, have a poll tax on women. New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut and Rhode Island all have them.

Members of the House, all of these reasons lead me to move the

acceptance of Committee Report "A" "Ought to pass" and when the vote is taken, I request a division.

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

Mr. McGLAUFLIN: I am sorry that I have to oppose the gentleman who has just spoken. I am opposed to the poll tax for women. To me this bill is an old chestnut. We have had that in this Legislature before, and we have thrown it out.

There are two good reasons why I am opposed to this bill. One is that in a great many instances, in case of married men, it simply means that the man, the husband, pays six dollars instead of three dollars, and the unmarried men, like the gentleman who has just spoken, still gets off by paying three dollars. My most serious objection, however, is that you cannot collect a tax from a married woman if she has no property; you cannot send a married woman to jail for debt. Now where does that leave us? You are going to have cases where the husband, if he volunteers, pays a six dollar tax, but you cannot compel him to pay his wife's tax because that isn't one of the necessities of life. You can make him pay for some things, but not that, and if she hasn't any property, how are you going to get the money?

Now most of you men in this Legislature realize what a difficult task it was formerly to collect a poll tax from men, and it was so difficult that this Legislature passed two utterly absurd and utterly illogical laws, to wit: That a man could not get a license to drive his automobile until he had paid his poll tax, and secondly, that he could not get a fishing license until he had paid his poll tax, and there isn't any common sense or any logic in either one of them, but I will admit that it is a matter of expediency and it has worked, absurd as it may be.

Now if you are going to have this bill passed, by all means let us pass some more so that you can collect the tax. Make it a law that a woman cannot get a divorce until she has paid a poll tax (Laughter) and that she cannot have a baby until she has paid her poll tax (Laughter) or some other absurd measure making it that she cannot go to a movie or a ball game; then

perhaps you can collect a tax, but as it is now you cannot collect these taxes against married women who don't want to pay.

Now the gentleman from Fort Kent (Mr. Cousins) who has just spoken, stated that the women owned fifty percent of the property. Let me tell you, Members, that the women have to pay taxes on the property that they own. The fact that they don't pay a poll tax doesn't exclude them from paying a property tax.

One other remark made by my colleague from Fort Kent, as I understand it, was that this tax would cut down real estate taxes one-half of one percent. Don't fool yourselves on that. No town in this State is going to cut down its real property tax on account of any poll tax. I am opposed to the bill.

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

Mr. ROBBINS: Mr. Speaker, if the marital status of the sponsor of this legislation is of any concern to this body, I would like to reply to the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin. Speaking as a roommate of the gentleman from Fort Kent, Mr. Cousins, I will say that the gentleman from Fort Kent is doing his best to remedy that situation and will soon be in a position to pay the six dollars proposed in this bill. (Laughter)

Seriously, the gentleman from Portland points out that this bill has been several times rejected in the past. I simply wish to suggest the need of municipalities for revenue has never been as urgent as it was in the past. The gentleman from Portland (Mr. McGlauffin) also makes the point that this tax would be difficult to administer. I can only inquire: How do four other New England states manage to collect it?

Finally, I wish to say that I attended the hearing on this bill, and the only opponent was the Secretary of the Communist Party in the state, and he made the point that women in Maine do not achieve equality with men. The Portland Press Herald printed a list from the Business and Professional Women's Clubs which showed that thirty-six per cent of the public offices in the State of Maine in 1946 were held by women—in other words 3077

women were listed as public office-holders. That was day before yesterday, and it is now 3078. Women have not yet achieved equality with men, Mr. Speaker, but they are on their way.

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

Mr. JORDAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a member of the Taxation Committee, I signed the "Ought to pass" report on this bill. I would like to give my reason for so doing.

But first of all let me state that my reason had nothing whatever to do with the additional money to be so raised. I am not interested in the rate of the poll tax, or for that matter whether we have a poll tax or not. I am simply interested in correcting a very discriminatory law, and make it applicable to all who have the privilege of voting and holding office in this State.

If we men had begged and pleaded with the women of the state to take the franchise and help us run the state, it might be well argued that we could very well say that for doing as we asked, we would grant them freedom from the poll tax. But it is my distinct recollection that it was the ladies themselves who not only asked but demanded to be enfranchised, and who declared, and still declare, that they are men's equals if not superior, and they finally convinced us of this fact, and have received all the privileges which heretofore belonged to men alone.

Now I have found that for every privilege there is a corresponding duty, and for those who desire the rights of citizenship, of voting, etc., it would seem to be self evident that they should accept the duties and burdens which make those privileges possible. I do not merely say that women should pay the poll tax, I ask, "Why shouldn't they?"

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier.

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The days when women must direct the affairs of the State from their boudoir have changed. I think that in assuming the privileges of the franchise that it is true that we should also accept its responsibilities. If this bill read that a poll tax should be assessed on unmarried women, I

would be one of its champions. However, I feel that if we assess all women that it will place a burden upon a great many families in this State who should not and could not afford that burden. Consequently, I do not favor this bill.

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

Mr. MUSKIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am rising to defend the women. I am opposed to this bill. It occurs to me that the gentleman who introduced this bill also introduced a bill to exempt veterans from poll taxes. Considering the number of men who are veterans in this State, if both of these bills are passed it is conceivable that the situation would be reversed and the women would be paying poll taxes and the men would not. Also, if both of these bills were passed, the effect would be that the women of this State would be paying the veterans probably the only bonus they will receive from this Legislature, and, as a veteran, I oppose that kind of a measure. Therefore I hope that this measure fails of passage.

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

Mr. DOUCETTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in opposition to this bill because of the fact I am a married man, I have a daughter who is married, and if I should vote for this bill I might as well resign my room in the Augusta House and go back home.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Milo, Mr. Burton.

Mr. BURTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have heard about the poll tax as being the only tax that a lot of men pay. Now I cannot subscribe to that thought. Take those of us who, before we came to your beautiful State of Maine, lived in apartments in the larger cities: while we paid only a poll tax, as renters it was in the rent bill evidently, and it had to be there in order to make any profit for the owners of those apartments. Therefore I do not think we have to dwell too much on that. If a person is single and boards, they probably put it in his board, I don't know.

Another thing, there is a bill pending in this Legislature at this time for a number of exemptions

from poll taxes, not enough, of course, if the bill passes, to equalize what the poll tax would be, but it might be quite a considerable amount. As I was one of the signers of the "Ought not to pass" report, I hope that this bill will not pass.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As Judge McGlauffin stated, I hate to rise in opposition to my colleague, the gentleman from Fort Kent, Mr. Cousins. On hearing the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Houlton (Mr. Robbins) giving the gentleman from Fort Kent a piece of advice, and being acquainted with the home life of the gentleman from Houlton, I am sure that you are in good hands.

I presented, as you remember, a bill at the special session to go along and attempt to pay a Soldiers' Bonus with what was called a miscellaneous or luxury tax. I went home last evening and I happened to have a calendar, and I was told when my wife read the calendar, "If you remember correctly, I haven't let up on you since you tried to tack on an additional five per cent on cosmetics." I will hate to go home if this bill passes.

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

Mr. McCLURE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: If what Miss Cormier says is correct, I feel sure if the women today were conducting the affairs of state that every one of us would be willing to pay that extra poll tax. In spite of that, I will agree and go along with my colleague, Mr. Cousins.

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

Mr. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I am against taxing the women a poll tax, but every one who holds a social security ticket should be taxed a poll tax.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Chelsea, Mr. Harris.

Mr. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to say I am in favor of this tax. Probably I should not be, because my family has four children, they are all girls, and they all will have to pay a poll tax. But it seems to me that where we are trying here to

find some way to get taxes, to broaden our tax base, that it is no more than fair that the women should pay some tax.

I can readily see where the members of the House from the cities are not very much interested in this. What tax would be paid in the cities in comparison with all the tax would be very small. But in the small towns like the one I come from it would mean something. We have had and are going to have more and more exempt poll taxes by the men, and I believe there should be. Any veteran who is receiving any compensation now does not pay any poll tax. I think the time has come when the women of the State of Maine, or their husbands, should pay a three-dollar tax.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess.

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want, at the start, to assure you that I dislike very much to be in disagreement with my good friend, Mr. Cousins, who is also a fellow member of the Aroostook delegation, but I do not feel I would be performing my duty to the people at home if I did not oppose this measure.

Much has been said by the proponents and others in favor of the bill. I honestly did not know that the side of the case could be so ably presented as Mr. Cousins has done. I also realize I am under a great handicap in trying to match his ability in expressing my opposition on the other side of the case.

My opposition to the poll tax is from an entirely different angle than I believe has been expressed. It would mean, if it were enacted, that every married woman in the State as well as the single ones would be assessed a poll tax, and that means six dollars instead of three for the married man.

I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen of the House, that the poll tax, even on men, is the poorest piece of tax legislation that we have in this State and the most difficult one to collect, and it does not represent, in any individual community that you wish to pick out, any sizable amount of money. I do not believe that this Legislature—and this is only my opinion, Ladies and Gentlemen—should pass a lot of

tax bills—and we are faced with tax bills which are of real importance that we must discuss and pass or turn down, bills which are of great importance not only to the State but to every community in the State. I cannot go along with any proposition that would create or pass out of here more tax bills than are absolutely necessary. I do not believe that this bill will solve any problems and I believe it would be just another difficult tax to collect in each of our communities.

I want to ask just this one question and refer briefly to those towns which during the past few years had to be taken over by the State and operated. I ask you Ladies and Gentlemen if assessing another tax, even though it be three dollars, on the same people in those communities would have helped them any? Would that have kept them off the State? No, it would not. You cannot improve these communities by adding another tax bill to the same people. I believe we should adopt a tax policy from the State level to care for the needs of these towns. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the motion of my good friend from Fort Kent, Mr. Cousins, does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Corinth, Mr. Elliott.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a member of the Taxation Committee who signed the "Ought not to pass" report, I wish to state that my reason for so doing was that I hated to see any man, either married or single, trying to hide under the dress skirts of a woman.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is upon the motion of the gentleman from Fort Kent, Mr. Cousins, that the House accept Report "A", "Ought to pass" of the committee. The same gentleman has requested a division. All those in favor of the motion will please rise and remain standing until counted and the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER: Thirty-nine having voted in the affirmative and eighty-eight in the negative, the motion fails. Is it now the pleasure of the House to accept the "Ought not to pass" report of the Committee, Report "B"?

The motion prevailed, and Report "B" "Ought not to pass" was accepted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the third matter of unfinished business, Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Treasurer of State." (S. P. 36) (L. D. 155), which in Senate was passed to be engrossed. In the House, tabled on March 31st by the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Peirce, pending first reading; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

On motion by Mr. Peirce, the bill was given its two several readings and tomorrow assigned for third reading.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the fourth matter of unfinished business, House Report "Leave to Withdraw" of the Committee on Towns on Bill "An Act Authorizing Towns to Expend Money on Cottage Roads." (H. P. 1526) (L. D. 1119) tabled on April 1, by the gentleman from Madison, Mr. DeSanctis, pending acceptance of report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

On motion by Mr. DeSanctis, the matter was tabled pending acceptance of the committee report and specially assigned for Wednesday, April 9th.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the fifth item of unfinished business, Bill "An Act Relating to Penalties for Operating Motor Vehicles While Under the Influence of Intoxicating Liquor or Drugs." (H. P. 1602) (L. D. 1270) In the House the bill was read twice and tabled on April 1st by the gentleman from New Sweden, Mr. Anderson, pending third reading.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Rankin.

Mr. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to tell you a short and simple story. I introduced this bill by request, and I am privileged to name the gentleman who asked me to introduce it. It was the gentleman from New Sweden, Mr. Anderson.

I am not going into all this bill, but only the part that amends the bill. You are all familiar, if not by actual experience, with the laws that regulate driving under the influence of intoxicating liquors, that is to say the law governing the is-

suage or taking away of drivers' licenses.

After the first part of the bill, I read as follows: "No subsequent license or permit shall be granted to such person; except that a person who has had 3 convictions under the provisions of the foregoing section may petition the secretary of state for a special license, who, after being satisfied beyond all reasonable doubt that the said petitioner has refrained from all use of intoxicating liquor for a period of ten years next preceding the day of hearing on the said petition, may issue a special permit or license conditioned upon continued non-use of intoxicating liquor."

Now the committee makes a change, it changes the figure "ten years" to "six years." Now I have not been authorized by the author of this bill to make any change, and I am not disposed to make any change. I think the bill as it stands without amendment is a good bill, in fact a very fine bill, but I do not think it is so good under the amendment. In other words, I am advocating that we do not amend this in the way that has been suggested.

We had a rather short but interesting hearing upon this matter. The Secretary of State was in favor of the ten-year figure, and, as far as I know, he has not changed his mind about that. The Deputy Secretary of State appeared and spoke for the measure.

There is a curious idea that there is something wet about this measure, and a good many drys in fact spoke against it. I suppose no one is as dry as I am. As I said in the hearing, I am as dry as the Desert of Sahara, in practice and in theory. I believe this is a moral bill and I believe that every man should have the chance that is offered in this bill.

At the present time, if you have erred in this matter three times you can never get another license as long as you live, even if you abstain absolutely from the use of intoxicating liquor. I think that is unjust and I have found general agreement on that. Of course the Judiciary Committee believes it is an unjust provision and wants to change it more radically than I do.

Now you are going to hear the other side of this matter in a little while. I was told this morning in good nature that my hide would

be taken right off. You will hear from the other side and they will tell you ten years is too long a period. It may be. Who knows absolutely? I do not think they know whether six years or ten years is the best figure. There being a doubt, I would resolve the doubt in favor of the longer period. I am sure every one of you would do that if you had any doubt about it.

There are some who go to the extreme and say if a man is convicted of one drunken driving that he should never have an opportunity to drive again as long as he lives. I think that is going too far. A few of us would take that position, but those who do take such an extreme position as that would vote for the ten-year figure rather than for the six-year figure.

It has been said that if a man abstains from all intoxicating liquor for six years he is a good risk. Well, I think he is a pretty good risk, but I think he is a better risk if the period is made longer, if it is extended to the ten-year figure. In other words, I think we should allow a margin of safety, and I think we should allow a very generous margin of safety.

The gentleman who was the author of the bill you know was for a time Deputy Secretary of State until he went into the Navy. Now the people in the State Department speak from past experience. The gentleman from New Sweden gave this figure of ten years, and the Secretary of State, a week or two ago, gave the very same figure. I think their views upon this matter are good.

Of course, we must exercise our judgment on this. If we believe six years is enough, very well; but I am making a plea for the longer figure, I think it ought to be ten years. I think we ought to stay by the present law under present conditions.

You will note that this is a very stringent thing here. Not only must one refrain from driving while intoxicated but they must refrain from all intoxicating liquors during this period of ten years or six years. Not only that, but at the end of the ten-year period, if he is given a license to drive again, if after that he is found guilty of taking a single drink his license is taken away from him as long as he lives. That is very stringent, that is very drastic, but I think it is not too drastic.

I have said in essence this is a moral law. I think we have no right to assume a man shall never be allowed to drive again after three offences of intoxication. He should be given another chance. That is a moral law. We all believe, I am sure, every man under those circumstances should have another chance, but we should not make the chance too good. I contend the ten-year figure is better than the six-year figure.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman from Bridgton (Mr. Rankin) wish to make a motion?

Mr. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker, I move indefinite postponement of Committee Amendment "A".

The SPEAKER: The amendment at this time is not in order for indefinite postponement. The amendment was adopted on March 31st. Does the gentleman wish to request that the rules be suspended so that he may move reconsideration?

Mr. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker, I move that we reconsider our action whereby we accepted this bill as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the rules be suspended so that the gentleman may move for reconsideration of Committee Amendment "A"?

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER: Ninety-one having voted in the affirmative and five in the negative, the motion prevails.

On further motion by Mr. Rankin, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby it adopted Committee Amendment "A" on March 31st.

Mr. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker, I move that we indefinitely postpone Committee Amendment "A" to H. P. 1602, L. D. 1270, Bill "An Act Relating to Penalties for Operating Motor Vehicles While Under the Influence of Intoxicating Liquor or Drugs."

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read Committee Amendment "A".

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

Committee Amendment "A" to H. P. 1602, L. D. 1270, Bill "An Act Relating to Penalties for Operating Motor Vehicles While Under the Influence of Intoxicating Liquor or Drugs."

Amend said bill by striking out in the 9th line from the end thereof, the underlined word "all" and inserting in place thereof the underlined word "a".

Further amend said bill by striking out in the 7th line from the end thereof, the underlined figure "10" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure '6'.

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

Mr. McGLAULIN: Mr. Speaker, I consider this motion a challenge to my judgment and I accept that challenge. Under the law as it stands today, if a man drives an automobile under the influence of liquor he may be fined from \$100 to \$1000, usually \$100; he may be sent to jail up to thirty days, and he loses his license to drive for a period of three years, but at the end of two years he may apply to the Secretary of State, and, after a hearing, if it is found that it is safe for him to drive he can get his license. If he is guilty the second time, the penalty so far as his license is concerned is that he forfeits his license for five years but at the end of three years he may apply to the Secretary of State, and if he can show that he is a safe driver he may then get his license. If, however, he comes to the third time, then he loses his license forever.

Do you think that the man who drove the car under the influence of liquor on the third occasion was any more of a menace than he was on the first occasion? Oh no, they are just the same. And bear in mind that the State of Maine sold this man the liquor on which he got drunk, encouraged him to get the rum that it knew would make him intoxicated if he drank very much of it, so that the State could get paid for so doing.

Now the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Rankin, introduced a bill that provided, as I understand the bill, that if this man could show that for a period of ten years he had not used any intoxicating liquor whatsoever then he might be reinstated once more. That bill came before the Judiciary Committee. I said at once, "That is a good bill and, perhaps to make it better," I said, "if a man has the guts and stamina to leave off intoxicating liquors for a period of five years he has a right to another chance." We discussed that matter. One of the members of the committee thought it should be seven years. I suggested five years. We finally compromised on six.

Now why do we say that six is enough? It is for this reason: The law as it stands today applies to men who are continuing to use intoxicating liquor. Now you have brought a new element into the picture; you have a man who is ready to reform; and when any man, I do not care how many times he has got drunk, when he is ready to reform, if he reforms he is no longer a menace in any highway. And the reason that I favor this six years is because if the man has the sand and the stamina to refrain from drinking for a period of six years he has proved to me that he has reformed.

I am interested in this subject. Some years ago, in 1919, I think it was, I was one of the trustees for the Reformatory for Women, and at that time they had a rule that no woman could apply for a parole until she had been in that institution for six months. I immediately stepped upon that rule and we changed it. My argument was that if I could be convinced that a woman was ready to reform in twenty-four hours I would let her out of that reformatory.

I want to tell you of another experience. Some years ago a man by the name of Irving came to my office in Portland and he said, "I have been a liquor seller the most of my life, I have two suspended sentences hanging over me now. If I could get a license to run a taxi I would go out of the liquor business, but I have applied for a license and the city clerk has denied it on account of my record. I came to you to see if I could get you to take that matter up with the Portland City Council and see if I cannot get a license." I said to him, "Do you really mean that you will give up the liquor business?" He said, "Absolutely." I said, "I will take the case." I went before the City Council of Portland and I told the facts as I have told them to you, and I said, "Here is a man that I believe is ready to reform. I say if that is the case it is your duty to give him a chance." And those men had the good sense to agree with me, and that man got his license, and, to the time of his death he never went back into that business.

Now if a man can show that he has reformed by abstaining from liquor for six years, why should you continue to hold him for ten years when perhaps he has become so old

that he cannot drive a car anyway? God Almighty himself forgives a man who reforms and repents. If any man in this State can refrain from using intoxicating liquor when the State itself offers it for sale and tempts him all the time, if he can overcome that temptation for six years he is entitled to another chance and nobody but a Prohibitionist would say he should not have it.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is upon the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Rankin, that the House indefinitely postpone Committee Amendment "A." Is the House ready for the question? All those in favor will say aye; those opposed no.

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

Thereupon the House voted to adopt Committee Amendment "A," and the bill was given its third reading, passed to be engrossed as amended and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the sixth item of unfinished business, House Amendment "A" to Bill "An Act Permitting Closing of Banks on Saturday." (H. P. 970) (L. D. 628) In the House the bill read twice, tabled on April 1st for reproduction under House Rule 36.

The Clerk will read House Amendment "A."

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

House Amendment "A" to H. P. 970, L. D. 628, Bill "An Act Permitting Closing of Banks on Saturday."

Amend said bill by striking out of the bill all of the emergency preamble and all of the emergency clause.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the first tabled and today assigned matter, House Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Creating a State Board of Examiners of Electricians and Defining its Powers and Duties." (H. P. 610) (L. D. 375) tabled on March 27th by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Allen, pending acceptance of report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do not

know whether it is this cold that makes me feel so poorly this morning or whether it is the fact that as usual I am on the poor end of a committee report.

I would like to defend the bill which I introduced at this session of the Legislature, a bill which is purely and simply a safety measure and which we feel is really for the benefit of the people of Maine. It was with that thought and that intention that this bill was introduced by those who are connected with the electrical trade. The contractors, the workers, and everyone agree that we should have some kind of an examining board to make sure that the electrical work done in this State is done with a degree of skill which would prevent the great number of fires which have occurred all over the State.

This morning I received from the Insurance Department two or three statistics which I think are well worth reading to you this morning.

In 1944 there were 187 fires caused by faulty wiring; in 1945, 199; in 1946, 262. As was described in this House not more than two or three days ago on an entirely different matter, you will recall that the Sacred Heart Convent in Jackman, Maine, was destroyed by fire which caused a loss of approximately \$250,000. Mr. Flynn, of the Arson Division of the Insurance Department, informs me that fire was started definitely by faulty wiring above the bakery at the convent. Two weeks ago there was a fire in Aroostook County which was definitely caused by faulty wiring.

Members, there is much to be desired in the electrical work which is done in this State. This bill is not intended to hinder anyone; it is merely to make sure that amateur electricians are not going around the State putting in wires which will cause the loss of property and lives.

I am authorized to say that Mr. Flynn, who is nationally recognized and who was called to the State of Georgia a month ago to help them put in an electrical code to help the people of Georgia, is heartily in sympathy with this bill and with any measure which will help Maine to increase its standards of electrical work.

If we did not have any other boards in the State perhaps it might not be wise to set up a Board of

Examiners for Electricians, but you know we have boards for everything ranging from the hairdressers down, and it seems to me a matter of such vital importance should be included in that list.

I do not intend to talk for twenty, twenty-five, thirty or thirty-five minutes. I think anyone can say what they want to in five minutes and bring out the pertinent facts on any measure.

Members, this bill is offered to the people of Maine and is offered to the Legislature as a sincere desire on the part of those persons in the electrical business who wish to improve the standards of their own trade, who wish to help the people by preventing this large loss of property and of lives which occurs even in the State of Maine, as these statistics which I have presented show. I therefore move to substitute the bill for the report of the committee.

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

MR. ATHERTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do not believe that this bill warrants any lengthy debate. However, I should like to explain briefly why your Committee on Legal Affairs reported "Ought not to pass."

At the hearing on this bill way back on February 12th, as nearly as I can recall nearly all the proponents were large electrical contractors, and I believe they were mostly from the City of Portland. Appearing in opposition were small electrical contractors from every part of the State and also representatives of industry and large industrial concerns in Maine who felt this was merely another regulation with which they would be burdened, and they felt they were perfectly capable of hiring competent helpers without their having an examination and a license by the State.

Beyond that, I would like to point out a few things in the bill and how it affects certain people. First of all, regarding the farmers, any farmer under this bill, if it were passed, would be prohibited from touching anything in the electrical system in his barn or outlying buildings except in his own house, and if his house happened to be a two-family dwelling he could not touch anything in connection with his electrical system in that house. Also referring

to that property owner who is authorized under this bill only to do electrical work on his home if it is a single family dwelling, if it should be a two-family dwelling he could touch nothing. If he should own a single house and desire to rent to anyone else, no matter how minor the repair might be in his electrical system, he would be prevented by this bill from touching it and would be required, as is the farmer, to hire a licensed electrician.

The proponents of this bill stated they did not object to the installation of appliances, and they put a clause in the bill: "Nothing in this chapter shall be so construed as to forbid the insertion in electrical circuits, by unlicensed persons, of devices or appliances. * * *" which means you could plug in your toaster or coffee-maker.

Another objection is that there is included the current edition of the so-called National Electrical Code. That would mean that whatever the National Electrical Code might contain would be a part of the statutes of the State of Maine.

Therefore, we in the committee felt this was merely another regulation with which to burden business and that it was definitely inexpedient at this time. We therefore hope the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Allen, does not prevail.

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

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am in favor of the passing of Representative Allen's bill, and when we vote upon it I would like to have a division of the House.

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

MR. BICKFORD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: If as many of the fires in the State of Maine were caused by poor wiring as some people would have you believe, I am going to say that half of the houses would be burned up inside of twenty-four hours.

Now many fires that are caused by unknown reasons, it is easy for the fire chief to say "Poor wiring." They have to make up some kind of a report. I had the experience myself, and the fire chief called the cause of this loss poor wiring. I did not believe it. I went and em-

ployed a good electrician, and I said, "I do not care how much this costs, I want you to find out about this wiring." I found it was the old-fashioned wiring. I am going to admit it was not as good wiring as there is today, because the old fashioned wiring was up and down wiring in porcelain fixtures about sixteen inches apart on the studding. We found in the very spot where this fire started that the wires were still right there intact, and it could not possibly have been any short circuit. We did make up our minds the fire was caused by rats because we found many indications to that effect.

Now I am sure that this bill, as the last speaker said, would cause a lot of hardship in preventing a lot of people from doing a little wiring in their homes. Under this bill they could not do it.

Now we have also in the building trades like the plumbing trades other stringent laws of pretty near the same import. They can hardly tighten up a nut in their bathrooms or anywhere else unless they have a licensed plumber, and yet the contractor says a man who is not licensed can do the same job. The contractor can get away with it. I hope that this bill will not pass.

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

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: May I merely make two points? First of all, there is nothing in this bill which prevents a person in his own home or on his own property doing a little electrical wiring; secondly, I call the attention of the House to the fact that approximately two weeks ago you refused to pass a bill which outlawed the Board of Plumbers in the State. I think to be consistent, if we believe in keeping the Plumbers Board, that we should believe in passing a bill which would create a Board of Electricians. I believe that the regulation of electricians in the State is certainly as important as the regulation of plumbers.

I hope this House will substitute the bill for the report of the committee.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Allen, that the House substitute the bill for the "Ought not

to pass" report of the committee, and a division has been requested. All those in favor of substituting the bill for the report will please rise and remain standing until counted and the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had. The SPEAKER: Twenty-three having voted in the affirmative, and seventy-nine in the negative the motion fails of passage.

Is it now the pleasure of the House to accept the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee?

The motion prevailed.

On motion by Mr. Jennings of Strong, the House voted to take from the table the thirtieth tabled and unassigned matter, An Act to Incorporate the Town of Strong School District (H. P. 1279) (L. D. 947) tabled on March 26th by that gentleman, pending passage to be enacted.

On further motion by Mr. Jennings under suspension of the rules, the House voted to reconsider its action of March 12, whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed.

Mr. Jennings then offered House Amendment "B" and moved its adoption.

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

House Amendment "B" to H. P. 1279, L. D. 947, Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Town of Strong School District."

Amend said bill by striking out in the 5th line of Sec. 8, the words "then 4 months after the approval of this act" and inserting in place thereof the words "then April 1, 1948".

House Amendment "B" was thereupon adopted, and on further motion by Mr. Jennings, the Bill was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Sleeper of Rockland, the House voted to take from the table the twenty-seventh tabled and unassigned matter, An Act Relating to Taxation of Domestic Fowl (H. P. 1096) (L. D. 708) tabled on March 26th by that gentleman, pending passage to be enacted.

On motion by Mr. Rich of Detroit, under suspension of the rules, the House voted to reconsider its action of March 14th whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed.

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

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

House Amendment "A" to H. P. 1096, L. D. 708, Bill "An Act Relating to Taxation of Domestic Fowl."

Amend said Bill by inserting at the beginning of the 1st line thereof, the following: 'Sec. 1.'

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

"Sec. 2. R. S., c. 81, § 6, sub-§ VI, amended. Subsection VI of section 6 of chapter 81 of the revised statutes, as amended by section 1 of chapter 258 of the public laws of 1945, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

'VI. All mules and horses less than 6 months old, and all colts of draught type under 3 years old, and neat cattle 18 months old and under, and all sheep to the number of 35, and swine to the number of 10, and domestic fowl to the number of 50 and all chickens 2 months old or younger.'

The SPEAKER: Is it now the pleasure of the House to adopt House Amendment "A"?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Chelsea, Mr. Harris.

Mr. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, there is some confusion as to what this amendment means. I would like to ask: Does it mean that the animals referred to in this amendment will stay exempt as they have been or will they be taxed?

Mr. RICH: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question that has been asked, the only thing this amendment will do is to change exemption of all domestic fowl. At the present time domestic fowl or chickens two months old or younger are exempt from taxation, also flocks of hens up to fifty. This amendment proposes that all chickens, regardless of age, be subject to taxation. I am offering this amendment for this reason: The primary purpose of the bill in its original form is to tax the chickens to the man in the town that has them in his possession. I believe, in order to correct some of the errors of chicken taxation, that a second step is needed to tax chickens, regardless of ages.

Those of us who have been Tax Assessors in the towns realize the number of chickens that can be seven weeks old on the first day of

April, but which are not taxable. We also know that these chickens are primarily owned by the men in the broiler business, so-called; they are seven-week-old chickens on the first of April, and they cannot be taxed. By the next September or October those fowl have been sold as broilers in a period of five or six months, therefore they are never taxed. I proposed this amendment to do away with that grievance.

Thereupon a viva voce vote being taken, House Amendment "A" was adopted, and the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Mills of Farmington, the House voted to take from the table the twenty-second tabled and unassigned matter, An Act Increasing the Salary of the Judge of the Calais Municipal Court (S. P. 162) (L. D. 401) tabled by that gentleman on March 26th pending passage to be enacted.

On further motion by the same gentleman, under suspension of the rules, the House voted to reconsider its action of March 12th whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed.

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

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

House Amendment "A" to S. P. 162, L. D. 401, Bill "An Act Increasing the Salary of the Judge of the Calais Municipal Court."

Amend said Bill by drawing a line through the words "commencing July 1, 1919" in the 6th and 7th lines thereof.

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

On motion by Mr. Woodbury of New Gloucester, the House voted to take from the table the forty-fourth tabled and unassigned matter, An Act to Incorporate the Town of Gray School District (H. P. 1290) (L. D. 949), tabled by that gentleman on April 1st pending passage to be enacted.

On further motion by the same gentleman, under suspension of the rules, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed on March 20th.

Mr. Woodbury then offered House Amendment "B" and moved its adoption.

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

House Amendment "B" to H. P. 1290, L. D. 949, Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Town of Gray School District."

Amend said bill by striking out from the 6th and 7th lines of Sec. 9, of the bill as amended, the words "then 3 months after the approval of this act" and inserting in place thereof the words 'then April 1, 1948'

House Amendment "B" was then adopted and the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Stetson of Dixfield, the House voted to take from the table the forty-sixth tabled and unassigned matter, An Act to Incorporate the Town of Dixfield School District (H. P. 1446) (L. D. 1051) (Emergency) tabled on April 2nd by that gentleman pending passage to be enacted.

On further motion by the same gentleman, under suspension of the rules, the House voted to reconsider its action of March 26th whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed.

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

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

House Amendment "A" to H. P. 1446, L. D. 1051, Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Town of Dixfield School District."

Amend said Bill by striking out all of section 9 thereof and inserting in place thereof the following:

'Sec. 9. Emergency clause; effective date; referendum. In view of the emergency recited in the preamble hereof, this act shall take effect when approved, only for the purpose of permitting its submission to the legal voters of the territory embraced within the limits of said district at a special meeting thereof called and held for that purpose not later than 4 months after the approval of this act. Such special meeting shall be called, advertised and conducted according to law relating to municipal elections; provided, however, that the selectmen in the town of Dixfield shall not be required to prepare for posting or

the town clerk to post a new list of voters, and for the purposes of registration of voters, said selectmen shall be in session the 3 secular days next preceding such meeting. The town clerk shall reduce the subject matter of this act to the following question: "Shall the act to incorporate the Town of Dixfield School District be accepted?" and the voters shall indicate by a cross placed over the words "Yes" or "No" their opinion of the same. This act shall take effect for all the purposes thereof immediately upon its acceptance by a majority of the legal voters voting at said meeting.

The result in said district shall be declared by the municipal officers of the town of Dixfield and due certificate thereof shall be filed by the clerk of said town with the secretary of state.'

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

On motion by Mr. Mills of Farmington, the House voted to take from the table the twenty-ninth tabled and unassigned matter, An Act Relating to Removal of Superintendents of State Institutions (H. P. 1176) (L. D. 849) tabled on March 26th by the gentleman pending passage to be enacted.

On further motion by the same gentleman, under suspension of the rules, the House voted to reconsider its action of March 12th whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed.

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

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

House Amendment "A" to H. P. 1176, L. D. 849, Bill "An Act Relating to Removal of Superintendents of State Institutions."

Amend said Bill by striking out in the 4th line thereof the underlined words "the superintendent of state institutions" and inserting in place thereof the underlined words 'the superintendent of a state institution'

House Amendment "A" was then adopted, and the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Jordan of

South Portland, the House voted to take from the table the seventh tabled and unassigned matter, Bill "An Act Authorizing Cities and Towns to Provide for the Collection and Disposal of Garbage, Rubbish and Refuse, and to Assess a Charge Therefor" (H. P. 1076) (L. D. 732) (Committee Amendment "A" pending) tabled by Mr. Jordan on March 7th pending first reading.

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

Mr. JORDAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill does not do anything more than add an additional tax upon the property owners of any given town which wishes to use this law if passed. We already have the right to invoke a city ordinance whereby we tax ourselves out of the general fund. I see no reason why we should add a separate tax, which would not reduce, in my opinion, the property owners' tax. You could not collect it from anyone other than a person owning property, because it would have to be assessed on your tax bill. Therefore, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move the indefinite postponement of this bill and accompanying papers.

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

Mr. Weeks: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This is definitely not a tax bill. To make you aware of it, I will say that it provides: "Authorizing and empowering, by ordinance or by-law, to provide for the collection and disposal of garbage, rubbish and refuse, and to assess from time to time upon any person or persons owning, occupying or using the premises upon which any garbage, rubbish, or refuse shall have been produced or accumulated, a charge for the collection and disposal of said garbage," and so forth.

Every one knows that in every city or town there are those who get the advantage of any garbage disposal contract made and those who do not, therefore those who have the benefit of the collection system do not pay in proportion to those who do not have it. The cost right now is included in your general tax bill. Some have it and some do not have it. But you are going to pay for it just the same,

whether you have the benefit of the service or not. That is the primary purpose, to saddle the obligation where it belongs.

This matter is not, local, as far as I am concerned; it is not Portland or South Portland; it is sanctioned by the Maine Municipal Association and is in accord with the general trend throughout the country of segregating these matters and have those pay for them who have the benefit. Other things remaining equal, the general tax bill will be down. If you take an item of general expense out of your appropriation, you are going to have to raise less money and your tax rate will probably be reduced. That is something desirable for many cities and towns.

This matter has been considered by your Judiciary Committee and received its "Ought to pass" report, therefore I hope that the motion of the gentleman from South Portland (Mr. Jordan) will not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Jordan, that Bill "An Act Authorizing Cities and Towns to Provide for the Collection and Disposal of Garbage, Rubbish and Refuse, and to Assess a Charge Therefor" (H. P. 1076) (L. D. 732), be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor will say aye; those opposed no.

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

Thereupon, the bill had its two several readings.

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

Committee Amendment "A" to H. P. 1076, L. D. 732, Bill "An Act Authorizing Cities and Towns to Provide for the Collection and Disposal of Garbage, Rubbish and Refuse, and to Assess a Charge Therefor."

Amend said bill by striking out in lines 5 and 6 (line 4 as printed) after the underlined numeral "XXI" the underlined words, "**Authorizing and empowering, by ordinance or by-law, to provide**", and inserting in place thereof the following new underlined word, '**Providing**.'

Further amend said bill by striking out in line 7 (line 6 as printed) the underlined words "**to assess**" and inserting in place thereof the following underlined new words, '**for the assessment**'

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

The SPEAKER: If there is no further business to come before the

House, the Clerk will read the notices.

On motion by Mr. DeSanctis of Madison,

Adjourned until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.