

# 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-Fifth Legislature***

**OF THE**

**STATE OF MAINE**

**1951**

**DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL  
AUGUSTA, MAINE**

## HOUSE

Wednesday, April 18, 1951

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Emmet Rankin of Bridgton.

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

### Senate Reports of Committees Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment

Report of the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act relating to Schooling in Unorganized Territory" (S. P. 353) (L. D. 881) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith

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

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

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 353, L. D. 881, Bill "An Act Relating to Schooling in Unorganized Territory."

Amend said Bill by striking out, in the 4th line from the end, the underlined words "**appropriated by the legislature from the general funds of the state**" and inserting in place thereof the underlined words '**paid out of such sums as may be appropriated by the legislature**'

Further amend said Bill by striking out, in the next to last line, the underlined word "**expended**" and inserting in place thereof the underlined word '**unexpended**'

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

Report of the Committee on Towns and Counties on Bill "An Act relating to the Salaries of the Judge and the Recorder of the Millinocket Municipal Court" (S. P. 283) (L. D. 622) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee

Amendment "A" submitted therewith

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

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

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 283, L. D. 622, Bill "An Act Relating to the Salaries of the Judge and the Recorder of the Millinocket Municipal Court".

Amend said Bill by striking out in the 7th line thereof the underlined figures "\$2,100" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figures '\$2,000'

Further amend said Bill by striking out in the 8th line thereof the underlined figures "\$1,500" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figures '\$1,200'

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

### Non-Concurrent Matter

Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to the Enforcement of the Liquor Laws" (H. P. 1321) (L. D. 882) on which the Bill was substituted for the Report and referred to the Committee on Liquor Control in the House on April 16.

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

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

### Non-Concurrent Matter

Report of the Committee on Claims reporting "Ought not to pass" on Resolve in favor of the Town of Woolwich (H. P. 223) which was recommended to the Committee on Claims in the House on April 16.

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

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

#### Non-Concurrent Matter

Report of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Fishing Licenses for Boys' and Girls' Camps" (H. P. 1410) (L. D. 1018) which was re-committed to the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game in the House on April 16.

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

In the House:

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

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

The reason that I asked to have this bill re-committed was for the purpose of having an entirely new draft of the bill considered. The new draft has the approval of the Department of Inland Fisheries and Game and the Maine Development Commission, and I believe that the bill will contribute much to a business which adds to the recreational business in this State.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Harrison, Mr. Davis, moves that the House insist upon its former action and ask for a Committee of Conference on Bill "An Act relating to Fishing Licenses for Boys' and Girls' Camps." Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair, at this time, notes the presence in the balcony of the Hall of the House of the Turner Center Intermediate School, Fifth and Sixth Grades, in charge of Mrs. Mains, and also the Windham High School, Windham, Maine, Eighth Grade, in charge of Mrs. Simmons and Mrs. Hodgdon.

In behalf of the House the Chair, at this time, bids you all a cordial welcome. (Applause)

#### Messages and Documents

From the Senate: the following Communication:

April 16, 1951

Hon. Harvey R. Pease  
Clerk of the House of  
Representatives  
95 Maine State Legislature  
Sir:

The President of the Senate today appointed the following members to join a Committee of Conference on Bill, "An Act Relating to the Importation of Poisonous Snakes."

Senator Haskell of Penobscot  
Senator Savage of Somerset  
Senator Barnes of Aroostook.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Chester T. Winslow

Secretary of the Senate

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

#### Petitions Requiring Reference

Petition of James A. Sawyer of Morrill and 77 others in favor of Adequate Support by Taxation of the Departments of Education, Institutional Service and Health and Welfare (H. P. 1735) (Presented by Mr. Cole of Liberty)

Petition of Robert C. Whitehead of Windham and 59 others in favor of same (H. P. 1736) (Presented by Mr. Davis of Harrison)

Petition of Carrie W. Lord of Rumford and 76 others in favor of same (H. P. 1737) (Presented by Mr. Kelly of Rumford)

Petition of Rev. H. D. Megert of Kezar Falls and 16 others in favor of same (H. P. 1738) (Presented by Mr. Leavitt of Parsonsfield)

Petition of Wilbur I. Bull of Waterford and 69 others in favor of same (H. P. 1739) (Presented by Mr. Lord of Norway)

Petition of Ruby Small of Ash Point and 27 others in favor of same (H. P. 1740) (Presented by Mr. Low of Rockland)

Petition of Edna H. Bracy of Camden and 20 others in favor of same (H. P. 1741) (Presented by Mr. Ludwig of Hope)

Petition of H. O. Brown of Augusta and 87 others in favor of same (H. P. 1742) (Presented by Mr. Martin of Augusta)

Petition of Gordon W. H. Buzza of Winthrop and 72 others in favor of same (H. P. 1743) (Presented by Mr. Maxwell of Winthrop)

Petition of Reynold Nathan Pierce of Dexter and 70 others in favor of same (H. P. 1744) (Presented by Mr. Roberts of Dexter)

Petition of William R. Mayhew of Greenville and 31 others in favor of same (H. P. 1745) (Presented by Mr. Rollins of Greenville)

Petition of Joanna K. Sargent of Caratunk and 48 others in favor of same (H. P. 1746) (Presented by Mr. Roundy of Portland)

Petition of Leo Goodwin of Dayton and 29 others in favor of same (H. P. 1747) (Presented by Mr. Taylor of Lyman)

Petition of Walter B. Hamilton of Hallowell and 39 others in favor of same (H. P. 1748) (Presented by Mr. Vaughan of Hallowell)

Petition of David B. Howe of Fairfield and 49 others in favor of same (H. P. 1749) (Presented by Mr. Woodworth of Fairfield)

Remonstrance of Llewellyn F. Wortman of Greenville and 205 others Against the Sales Tax (H. P. 1750) (Presented by Mr. Rollins of Greenville)

Were read and ordered placed on file and sent up for concurrence.

### Orders

#### Tabled and Assigned

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

Mr. ROBBINS: Mr. Speaker, I present an order and move that it lie on the table and be specially assigned for tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Robbins, presents an order and moves that it lie on the table and be specially assigned for tomorrow. The Clerk will read the order.

Whereas there is now pending before the House of Representatives of the 95th Legislature of the State of Maine,

Bill "An Act to Facilitate Extension of the Maine Turnpike" (House Paper 686) (Legislative Document 416), a printed copy of which is hereto attached and made a part hereof; (Exhibit "A")

Whereby it is proposed to add a new sub-section VIII to Sec. 107 (Limitation on Use of General Highway Funds) of Chapt. 20 (State Highway Department) of the Revised Statutes of 1944, which pro-

posed new subsection VIII provides for the payment by the Treasurer of the State to the Maine Turnpike Authority created by Chapt. 69 of the Private & Special Laws of 1941, a portion of the state tax on gasoline for the purposes more fully stated therein, and

Whereby in the last sentence of the proposed new subsection VIII it is provided that "Upon the issuance of Turnpike revenue bonds or Turnpike revenue refunding bonds by the Authority under the provisions of Chapt. 69 of the Private & Special Laws of 1941, as amended and supplemented, the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed to constitute a material part of the contract between the authority and the holders of such bonds," and

Whereas an amendment is proposed to said Bill, a copy of which proposed amendment is hereto attached and made a part hereof; (Exhibit "B") and

Whereas, grave doubt has arisen as to the constitutionality of such Bill, with or without the proposed amendment, with relation to

1. The pledging of the credit of the State, directly or indirectly, and
2. The diversion of State Highway funds, and

Whereas, to the House of Representatives of the 95th Legislature it appears that the questions of law herein raised are important and that the occasion is a solemn one; NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDERED, That the Justices of the Supreme Judicial Court are hereby respectfully requested to give to the House of Representatives, according to the provisions of the Constitution in this behalf, their opinion on the following questions, to wit:

Question 1. Is the Maine Turnpike Authority a "State Department" within the meaning of Article LXII of the Constitution?

Question 2. Would Bill "An Act to Facilitate Extension of the Maine Turnpike" (House Paper 686) (Legislative Document 416) if enacted by the Legislature, in its pres-

ent form, pledge the credit of the State directly or indirectly, contrary to the Constitution?

Question 3. Would Bill "An Act to Facilitate Extension of the Maine Turnpike" (House Paper 686) (Legislative Document 416) if enacted by the Legislature, in its present form, divert State Highway Funds contrary to the Constitution?

Question 4. Would Bill "An Act to Facilitate Extension of the Maine Turnpike" (House Paper 686) (Legislative Document 416) if amended as proposed (Exhibit "B") and if enacted, pledge the credit of State directly or indirectly, contrary to the Constitution?

Question 5. Would Bill "An Act to Facilitate Extension of the Maine Turnpike" (House Paper 686) (Legislative Document 416) if amended as proposed (Exhibit "B") and if enacted, divert State Highway Funds contrary to the Constitution?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Robbins, now moves that the order be reproduced. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Thereupon, the House voted that the order lie on the table and be specially assigned for tomorrow morning.

On motion of Mr. Brown of Wayne, it was

ORDERED, that J. Warren Butman, Sergeant-at-Arms, be granted a leave of absence during his illness, and that the Clerk of the House be directed to express to him the regrets of the members that he is ill, together with their hopes for his very speedy recovery.

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

#### House Reports of Committees Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Labor reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Practitioner's Services Under the Workmen's Compensation Act" (H. P. 1586) (L. D. 1158)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. MARSHALL of York  
—of the Senate.  
WEST of Stockton Springs  
BROWN of Baileyville  
LETOURNEAU of Sanford  
CASWELL of New Sharon  
CASTONGUAY  
of Waterville  
—of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. REID of Kennebec  
COLLINS of Aroostook  
—of the Senate.  
LARRABEE of Westbrook  
WALLS of Millinocket  
—of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mrs. Moffatt of Bath, the Majority Report "Ought to pass" was accepted.

Thereupon, the Bill, having already been printed, was read twice under suspension of the rules and tomorrow assigned for third reading.

#### Divided Report

##### Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act to Provide Facilities for the Peaceful Settlement of Industrial Disputes Through Mediation (H. P. 1322) (L. D. 885) reporting same in new draft "B" (H. P. 1734) (L. D. 1293) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. MARSHALL of York  
REID of Kennebec  
—of the Senate.

LARRABEE of Westbrook  
 BROWN of Baileyville  
 WEST of Stockton Springs  
 LETOURNEAU of Sanford  
 WALLS of Millinocket  
 CASTONGUAY

—of Waterville  
 —of the House.

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting same in a new draft "A" (H. P. 1733) (L. D. 1292) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. COLLINS of Aroostook  
 —of the Senate.  
 CASWELL of New Sharon  
 —of the House.

Reports were read.

(On motion of Mr. Caswell of New Sharon, the two Reports, with accompanying papers, were tabled pending acceptance of either Report, and specially assigned for tomorrow morning)

Majority Report of the Committee on Public Health on Bill "An Act relating to Barbers, Hairdressing and Beauty Culture" (H. P. 1028) (L. D. 600) reporting same in new draft "A" (H. P. 1731) (L. D. 1290) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Mrs. KAVANAGH of  
 Androscoggin  
 Messrs. SAVAGE of Somerset  
 —of the Senate.  
 BATES of Orono  
 LUDWIG of Hope  
 Mrs. DAGGETT of Ashland  
 Messrs. SENTER of Brunswick  
 MARTIN of Frenchville  
 ST. PIERRE of Lewiston  
 —of the House.

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting same in a new draft "B" (H. P. 1732) (L. D. 1291) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. HASKELL of Penobscot  
 —of the Senate.  
 Mrs. MOFFATT of Bath  
 —of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Bates of Orono, the Majority Report "Ought to pass" was accepted, and the New Draft, having already been printed, was read twice under suspension of the rules, and assigned for third reading tomorrow morning.

#### Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Natural Resources reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Permits for Outdoor Advertising" (H. P. 1278) (L. D. 847)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. LARRABEE of Sagadahoc  
 WARD of Penobscot  
 —of the Senate.

BROWN of Wayne  
 PHILBROOK of Greene  
 WILLIAMS of Hodgdon  
 TAYLOR of Norridgewock  
 BRADEEN of Waterboro  
 —of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. CROSBY of Franklin  
 —of the Senate.  
 HANCOCK of Casco  
 MOULTON of Sweden  
 —of the House.

Reports were read.

(On motion of Mr. Chase of Cape Elizabeth, the two Reports, with accompanying papers, were tabled pending acceptance of either report, and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 24th)

#### Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Moulton from the Committee on Natural Resources reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Authorizing Forest Commissioner to Sell Lot 102, St. Agatha, 17, R. 4, Aroostook County (H. P. 1627) (L. D. 1186) as it is covered by other legislation.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Carter from the Committee on Taxation reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Proposing

an Additional Corporate Franchise Tax" (H. P. 1031) (L. D. 602)

Report was read.

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

Mr. Cole: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It was very evident, by the vote taken last week on the Sales Tax, that this House does not want a corporate tax. I am entirely in accord with the majority of the House that the tax that we have passed is one of the fairest that probably this House can pass.

At the time that I introduced this measure I was a little bit concerned about some parts of industry not paying their share of the costs of State government. In this bill that we have already passed I am confident that they are going to pay their part as well as every other industry, the farmers, in fact all of us. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move that we accept the committee's report, "Ought not to pass".

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Cole, moves that the House accept the committee report "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Proposing an Additional Corporate Franchise Tax". Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the "Ought not to pass" report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair, at this time, will appoint the gentleman from Saco, Mr. Hawkes, Speaker pro tem, and will direct the Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms to escort the gentleman to the rostrum.

Thereupon, Mr. Hawkes was conducted by the Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms to the rostrum, where he assumed the Chair amid the applause of the House, and Speaker Silsby retired.

Mr. Dow from the Committee on Taxation reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Creating a Committee to Study the Broadening of State Tax Base" (H. P. 1211) (L. D. 775)

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

### Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Rollins from the Committee on Taxation reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Tax on Telegraph Companies" (H. P. 1447) (L. D. 1065)

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Albert of Augusta, tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report, and specially assigned for Thursday, April 26th)

### Ought to Pass in New Draft

Mr. Cobb from the Committee on Agriculture on Bill "An Act relating to Fees and Duties of State Sealer of Weights and Measures" (H. P. 674) (L. D. 410) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1730) (L. D. 1289) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Brown from the Committee on Natural Resources on Bill "An Act relating to Kindling of Fires on Land" (H. P. 1279) (L. D. 818) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1751) (L. D. 1295) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Reports were read and accepted and the New Drafts, having already been printed, were read twice under suspension of the rules and assigned for third reading tomorrow morning.

### Ought to Pass

#### Printed Bill

### Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Rollins from the Committee on Taxation reported "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relative to Use Fuel Tax" (H. P. 332) (L. D. 191)

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Rollins of Greenville, tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report and specially assigned for tomorrow morning.)

### Ought to Pass

#### with Committee Amendment

Mr. Hayes from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to Investigations by County Attorneys and Sheriffs of Shooting of Humans While Hunting" (H. P. 1481) (L. D. 1088) 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" was read by the Clerk as follows:

**COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A"** to H. P. 1481, L. D. 1088, Bill "An Act Relating to Investigations by County Attorneys and Sheriffs of Shooting of Humans While Hunting."

Amend said bill by striking out in the fifth line thereof, the underlined words and punctuation "**after having knowledge,**"

Further amend said bill by inserting after the word "section" in the sixth line thereof the following underlined words and punctuation '**after having knowledge thereof,**'

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

Mr. Hancock from the Committee on Natural Resources on Bill "An Act to Provide Partial Cutting Adjacent to Roadsides" (H. P. 1642) (L. D. 1206) 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" was read by the Clerk as follows:

**COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A"** to H. P. 1642, L. D. 1206, Bill "An Act to Provide Partial Cutting Adjacent to Roadsides"

Amend said bill by inserting after the word "lines" in third sentence of second paragraph the underlined words '**or cutting deemed necessary by the State Highway Commission for highway purposes.**'

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

Mr. Sinclair from the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act relative to Excise Tax on Aircraft" (H. P. 553) (L. D. 324) 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" was read by the Clerk as follows:

**COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A"** to H. P. 553, L. D. 324, Bill "An Act Relative to Excise Tax on Aircraft."

Amend said Bill by adding at the end thereof a new section to read as follows:

**"Sec. 5. R. S., c. 21, § 12, amended.** The last sentence of the 1st paragraph of section 12 of chapter 21 of the revised statutes, as repealed and replaced by chapter 389 of the public laws of 1949, is hereby amended to read as follows:

'A state registration certificate of aircraft shall not be transferable[, unless the holder shall in writing report the transfer to the commission and shall properly execute the certificate as to transfer of title and surrender it to the transferee!']"

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

The SPEAKER pro tem: At this time the Chair notes in the balcony of the Hall of the House the Civics Group from Piscataquis Community High School of Guilford, Maine, with Mr. Merle P. Finley in charge.

In behalf of the House the Chair bids you a cordial welcome. (Applause).

Also at this time the Chair notes in the balcony of the Hall of the House pupils from the Eighth Grade of Levant Elementary School, with Mr. John Carlton in charge.

In behalf of the House the Chair bids you a very cordial welcome. (Applause).

Also in the balcony of the Hall of the House the Chair notes the presence of sixteen members of Problems of Democracy Class of Livermore Falls High School, with Principal Clyde L. Mann in charge, and the House, through the Chair, bids you an extremely cordial welcome. (Applause).

#### Passed to be Engrossed

Bill "An Act relating to the Salary of a Sheriff of Kennebec County" (S. P. 175) (L. D. 349)

Bill "An Act to Amend the Charter of the Kennebec Water District" (S. P. 276) (L. D. 615)

Bill "An Act to Increase the Salary of the Judge and Recorder of the Rumford Falls Municipal Court" (S. P. 282) (L. D. 621)

Bill "An Act to Authorize Cities and Towns to Accept Grants from Federal Government (S. P. 461) (L. D. 1075)

Bill "An Act relating to Complainant and Witness Fees and Costs of Police Officers and Constables" (S. P. 522) (L. D. 1250)

Bill "An Act relating to Acquisition of National Forests to Oxford County" (S. P. 537) (L. D. 1274)

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

#### Amended Bill

Bill "An Act Providing for Safety Equipment for Large Trucks" (H. P. 1373) (L. D. 963)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading.

Mr. Jamieson of Presque Isle offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1373, L. D. 963, Bill "An Act Providing for Safety Equipment for Large Trucks."

Amend said Bill by striking out the underlined figures "9,000" wherever they appear therein and inserting in place thereof the underlined figures '15,000'

House Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill was given its third reading, passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" and sent up for concurrence.

#### Passed to be Engrossed (Cont'd)

Bill "An Act relating to Liens on Electric Motors" (H. P. 1419) (L. D. 1027)

Bill "An Act relating to Merger, Consolidation and Conversion of National Banks and Trust Companies" (H. P. 1482) (L. D. 1089)

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

#### Amended Bills

Bill "An Act relating to the Salaries of the Judge and the Record-

er of the Old Town Municipal Court" (S. P. 284) (L. D. 623)

Bill "An Act relating to Salary of Register of Deeds of Kennebec County" (S. P. 385) (L. D. 911)

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

#### Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act to Provide Special Number Plates for Certain Officials" (S. P. 504) (L. D. 1215)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading.

(On motion of Mr. Finnegan of Bangor, tabled pending third reading and specially assigned for tomorrow morning)

Bill "An Act Designating Silicosis as an Occupational Disease" (H. P. 676) (L. D. 408)

Bill "An Act relating to the Hire of Qualified Appraisers by Cities and Towns" (H. P. 1214) (L. D. 771)

Bill "An Act relative to Revision and Publication of Municipal Ordinances" (H. P. 1543) (L. D. 1136)

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

Bill "An Act Regulating the Digging of Marine Worms in the Town of Stockton Springs, Waldo County" (H. P. 1187) (L. D. 741)

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

Bill "An Act Including Dust and Fumes as Occupational Diseases" (H. P. 1426) (L. D. 1033)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Keene.

Mr. KEENE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: L. D. 1033 entitled Bill "An Act Including Dust and Fumes as Occupational

Diseases" was reported unanimously "Ought not to pass" by the Labor Committee. It has since been revised by the process of amendment. The usual function of an amendment is to change the substance of a bill. Here it has merely clothed the same substance in technical language.

The original bill sought to add to our Occupational Disease law a provision covering, generally, the effects caused by the inhalation of dust, fibres and so forth. The amended bill substitutes for these general terms a technical word described as "Pneumoconiosis" which doctors tell us means, generally, "any pulmonary disease due to the inhalation of dust or fine particles". Here, then, we note in this amendment the same substance which the committee, after hearing all the evidence, rejected. Why should we try to substitute our judgment for that of the committee, who had the benefit of medical testimony at the hearing?

Mr. Speaker, I move for the indefinite postponement of L. D. 1033, as amended by House Amendment "A".

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Keene, moves that Bill, "An Act Including Dust and Fumes as Occupational Diseases" be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker, well, we talked this out yesterday, but I see the corporation is again taking control. Corporations have run this State for a long while. They have guided the legislation to their advantage; they are doing everything within their power to place the burden of taxation upon the laboring man, the low-income group. It is their bill. There is no question about it, and it has their support 100 per cent.

This, I say, is just trying to keep that laboring man at work, so that he can pay that sales tax. If we don't protect him, where are we going to get the money to run this giant business?

I explained yesterday what the bill called for, and I will read it again. I will read it into the record: "Diseases of the Chest", which is the official publication of the American College of Chest Physicians. "Dust Inhalation in Relation

to Pulmonary Disease" by John E. Silson, M. D., New York, New York. "Everyone is inhaling some dust with almost every breath taken but the results of this dust upon the lungs is considered part of the natural process of aging when it occurs outside of his occupation. The relationship of dust inhalation to pulmonary disease is therefore usually considered only from the point of view of industrial exposure. Observations on the effect of dust in industry have consequently been limited largely to those pathological processes which can be clearly differentiated from pulmonary diseases of non-occupational origin. To these characteristic changes in the lungs produced by dust, the term pneumoconiosis has been applied."

For the information of this House and its members, as a member of the Taxation Committee I want to say that we have labored three long months on taxation bills, I should say on taxation bill, the sales tax bill. There has never been any talk about any other bill. There are bills that are coming out tomorrow morning; some divided; some came out this morning "Ought not to pass". There is a divided report on an income tax bill. I doubt if ten minutes have been spent on the bill.

I am on some of the minority reports, but during the process of getting this grotesque, unfair tax bill before the Legislature of Maine, every corporation lobbyist, practically every one, has been consulted and called into private session. Have the people been consulted and called in? No! Never! Nor any representative of the people. Trying to sweeten the thing so the corporations would go along, so that it wouldn't pinch their toes!

This is another motive here. The corporation does not want to protect their workmen. I say that it is time that the members of this House, as I look them over—they are all ordinary, the most of them—there are a few exceptions—but ordinarily they are the rank and file of the citizens of Maine, and I believe they have a job here to work for all the citizens of Maine, and I hope that they will see their way clear to protect the interests of those they represent, the people.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Clinton (Mr. Keene) does not prevail, and when the vote is taken I would ask for a division.

At this point Speaker Silsby returned to the rostrum.

The SPEAKER: Mr. Hawkes, in order that you may have some token to remind you of this occasion, may I present you with this little gavel.

Mr. HAWKES: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Thereupon, Mr. Hawkes was conducted to his seat on the Floor, amid the applause of the House, and the Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It seems to me that in discussing this bill that one of the difficult things is to make it concrete enough so that we really understand what is meant by some of the terminology. I would like to try to give you a couple of illustrations.

In the first place, we had a situation in some induction centers during the last war, where men who had been engaged in coal mining were called up for induction, and of course were given their routine x-ray of their lungs, a chest x-ray. Now in the case of some of those men the x-ray showed a condition which at first was believed to approach tuberculosis, and certainly would fall within the definition of the word "pneumoconiosis." However, upon further examination by experts, and further tests, it was discovered that there wasn't any diseased condition there after all, and these men were inducted into the Armed Forces along with the others.

We have another situation that goes even further than that. I hope this was presented before the committee but it may not have been. That is the situation where a person who has lived for a long period of time in a community where there is a lot of coal dust or such matter in the air anyway, and it is reliably reported, I am sure,

that it is not uncommon in communities like that for an ordinary person, on a chest x-ray, to disclose a condition which to a person who is not an expert resembles some condition in the lungs approaching tuberculosis or within this term.

I would like to get this clear. Now the point is that I am in sympathy with protecting the workers and I am in sympathy with eliminating the condition that the gentleman from Greenville (Mr. Rollins) described yesterday, but I think to do it we need a piece of legislation that is more certain to be workable than this one that we are discussing here because we can get into—and will, of course, if it is passed—the same condition that we got into on the induction of these soldiers, and on the examination of people who live in certain areas. In other words, it will be impossible to tell, anything short of the most thorough and far-reaching investigation, whether the condition is a result of industrial exposure or whether it is something else.

So while I am in sympathy with the purposes of the gentleman from Greenville (Mr. Rollins) I am not in sympathy with this particular act.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Bearce.

Mr. BEARCE: Mr. Speaker and Members of this House: What I have in mind is possibly more in the way of a question, but I wonder what would be the effects in regard to a man who had been spraying potatoes or dusting apples and potatoes, or one who was working in a fertilizer factory or a factory where they mixed chemicals for purposes such as spraying and poisoning of the different parasites which we may have.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. KEENE: Mr. Speaker and Members: There were several bills before the Labor Committee at this session pertaining to certain types of diseases pertaining to the lungs. Now today, under the Third Readers, under Item 13, we have

already passed the bill "designating silicosis as an occupational disease". That bill was reported out of the Labor Committee as "Ought to pass" because that particular type of a disease could be definitely determined as a certain type.

Now this Item 17 that we are discussing, L. D. 1033, and the amendment that the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Rollins, introduced, is so broad that it cannot be tied down particularly to any particular type of fumes or dust.

I have talked with some of the medical profession, and they have informed me, and I think you all know, that there is prevalent in the air at all times certain types of dust, and that each and every one of us are inhaling a certain amount of that dust. If our physical condition is not just right, the inhaling of that dust could cause us to contract a certain type of lung disease. Now if we should happen to be working in an industry where dust and fumes were prevalent, or we should happen later on, not knowing a lot of the people are walking around with a lung disturbance and have no knowledge whatsoever of it, if we should happen to secure employment in one of those industries and later on a lung condition developed, that employer would be subject to the Industrial Accident Commission benefits under this act. It is a bill that I am pretty sure that if you members of this House will give a good and definite consideration to, and remember that this was heard before the Committee on Labor, and at that hearing the medical profession was present, the lobbyists, the insurance companies and so forth; it was debated pro and con, and the committee, in their executive session, came out unanimously with an "Ought not to pass" report, I feel confident that this House will vote to indefinitely postpone L. D. 1033 and House Amendment "A".

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There is a bill just passed, a third reader,

that covers silicosis. That takes care of the problem of the slate quarry, of the stone cutter, but it doesn't take care of the man in the wood-working plant. As I explained yesterday, the present process of making high-grade veneer, with sanding machines—I have a picture here on my desk where you cannot even see the men in the plant. Now all industry has the privilege, and I think that most of them exercise it, of examination, physical examination before employment. That being the case, if the man has picked up something from coal dust, which is not very prevalent, in the State of Maine anyway, or some other dust which is flying in the air, if he has any disease started, the physician would note it, and there are many men who sign a waiver on certain diseases and are still employed.

I believe that this bill, although broad, can be defined as an occupational disease coverage for inhaling of dust from a man's occupation. I hope the motion does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Keene, that Bill "An Act Including Dust and Fumes as Occupational Diseases" be indefinitely postponed. The gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Rollins, has requested a division.

All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Keene, will rise and stand in their places and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Seventy-six having voted in the affirmative and ten in the negative, the motion prevailed and the bill was indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair, at this time, notes the presence in the balcony of the Hall of the House of the Hermon Junior High School, in charge of Mrs. Herrick and Mrs. Ruth Hillman.

In behalf of the House the Chair, at this time, bids you all a cordial welcome. (Applause)

**Passed to be Engrossed (Cont'd)  
Amended Bill**

Bill "An Act relating to Automobile Travel by State Employees" (H. P. 791) (L. D. 471)

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

**Passed to be Enacted  
Emergency Measure**

An Act relating to Interstate Transportation of Clams (S. P. 259) (L. D. 558)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a division was had. 120 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

**Emergency Measure**

An Act to Create Town of Owl's Head School District (H. P. 1652) (L. D. 1222)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a division was had. 125 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

**Emergency Measure  
Finally Passed**

Resolve Authorizing the Maine Public Utilities Commission to Set Out and Maintain Buoys on Sebago Lake (H. P. 1590) (L. D. 1162)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a division was had. 127 voted in favor of same, and none against, and accordingly the Resolve was finally passed, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

**Passed to be Enacted**

An Act relating to Vacations for Members of the Fire Department of the City of Lewiston (S. P. 123) (L. D. 212)

An Act relating to Sea and Shore Fisheries Laws (S. P. 174) (L. D. 346)

An Act relating to Membership of the Blueberry Industry Advisory Committee (S. P. 387) (L. D. 935)

An Act relating to Boats for Hire on Inland Waters (S. P. 392) (L. D. 1010)

An Act relating to the Municipal Regulation of Motor Vehicles (S. P. 397) (L. D. 944)

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

**Tabled and Assigned**

An Act relating to Vital Statistics (S. P. 401) (L. D. 949)

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

(On motion of Mr. Center of Standish, tabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for tomorrow morning)

An Act relating to Place of Taxation of Personal Property (S. P. 409) (L. D. 969)

An Act relating to Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act (S. P. 437) (L. D. 1000)

An Act Creating the Maine Frozen Dairy Products Law (H. P. 254) (L. D. 190)

An Act relating to the Digging of Shellfish and Marine Worms in the Town of Freeport (H. P. 652) (L. D. 371)

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

**Tabled Temporarily**

An Act relating to Joint Operation of Schools (H. P. 883) (L. D. 525)

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

(On motion of Mrs. Moffatt of Bath, tabled until later in today's session, pending passage to be enacted.)

An Act relating to Number of Voting Districts (H. P. 1036) (L. D. 564)

An Act Enlarging the Powers of Wiscasset Academy (H. P. 1324) (L. D. 887)

An Act Granting Additional Powers to Portland University (H. P. 1340) (L. D. 915)

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

#### Tabled and Assigned

An Act relating to Transportation of Poultry (H. P. 1399) (L. D. 1012)

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

(On motion of Mr. Edwards of Raymond, tabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for tomorrow morning.)

An Act relating to payment to Androscoggin County Law Library (H. P. 1417) (L. D. 1025)

An Act relating to Crop Dusting by Aeroplanes (H. P. 1466) (L. D. 1082)

An Act relating to Showing of Cattle at Fairs (H. P. 1507) (L. D. 1102)

An Act relating to Supervision and Control of Certain State Lands (H. P. 1551) (L. D. 1111)

An Act relating to a Ferry Between Beals and Jonesport (H. P. 1658) (L. D. 1230)

An Act relating to Taking of and Dealing in Clams, Quahogs and Marine Worms in the Town of Brunswick (H. P. 1685) (L. D. 1260)

An Act relating to Domestic Mutual Insurance Companies (H. P. 1687) (L. D. 1262)

An Act relating to Boards of Registration in Towns Under Three Thousand Five Hundred Inhabitants (H. P. 1688) (L. D. 1263)

#### Finally Passed

Resolve relating to the Protection of Clams Within the Town of Freeport (H. P. 655) (L. D. 373)

Resolve Authorizing the Forest Commissioner to Convey Certain Interest of the State in the Island in Cumberland County to H. Norman Cole, of Gray (H. P. 1589) (L. D. 1161)

Resolve Authorizing the State Forest Commissioner to Convey Certain Interest of the State in Property Formerly Owned by Anne Gray (H. P. 1644) (L. D. 1207)

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

#### Orders of the Day

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day, the Chair lays before the House the first tabled and today assigned matter, Report A reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A", and Report B reporting "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Boilers, Air Tanks and Unfired Pressure Vessels", H. P. 389, L. D. 225, tabled on April 10 by the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis, pending acceptance of either report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. TRAVIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I will be as brief as possible in explanation of this bill as I realize we have a very heavy docket ahead of us, not only today but the balance of the session, and I am very anxious that we conclude what our constituents will think is good work and resume our regular occupations in a few weeks.

If Report A is accepted, I will then move the adoption of Committee Amendment "A" and House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A". This is an act relating to boilers and air tanks. Two years ago, a document was put in relating to boilers, air tanks and unfired pressure vessels. Unfortunately, the same title was carried over in this act.

Now, in air tanks—here is an unfired pressure vessel but there are thousands of unfired pressure vessels in industry in the State which do not qualify as air tanks and this bill makes absolutely no attempt to cover them. It would be impossible for industry to operate seven days a week, as it is attempting to operate today, if this bill attempted to cover all unfired pressure vessels. And I will here state

that if I should be fortunate enough to return two years hence, perhaps I should say unfortunate, if such an attempt should be made, I would lead the opposition to that attempt.

I have spent a lot of time on this bill, checking it very carefully with both boiler experts, insurance experts, mechanical engineers and others and I am convinced that it is an important safety measure. We have had on the statute books for some time an act relating to boilers, which covers high pressure boilers. A good many people are under the delusion that a low pressure boiler, which is herein described as carrying not more than fifteen pounds per square inch, a low pressure boiler is a perfectly safe boiler. It is, as long as it remains a low pressure boiler. However, if there is not regular inspection of that boiler to see that the safety devices on that boiler are in operation then, if the safety devices are not in working order it is very easy for this low pressure boiler to become a high pressure boiler and explode.

There have been many explosions throughout the country; there have not been too many in Maine but there have been some. It is for the safety of our public schools, our public meeting places, that low pressure boilers, in my opinion, should be included in this bill.

All that it will cost the owner of the low pressure boiler is his certificate for \$1.00 which is good for fourteen months. \$1.00 is a pretty low price to pay to be sure that your boiler is safe. The price on air tanks is \$1.00 for twenty-six months, which means that each air tank any industrial concern may own, they are paying less than fifty cents per year for that air tank.

Now your large industries have insurance on their air tanks and they feel that this bill is not necessary. However, it is necessary for the little fellow who is not insured and, therefore, not being insured, there is no inspection on his air tank and these regulations which are imposed from time to time — we don't like to make additional regulations but we often find ourselves in a position where we have got to make regulations for the benefit of the few who would not

otherwise comply with the safety of us all.

I think that if this bill would save the life of one person, it would be worthwhile. I am a firm believer in the sanctity of human life and I believe that we can take measures which protect not only ourselves but our neighbors and our children and I am very much in favor of this bill as a safety measure. I feel that anyone, for the most part those who objected to this bill, would probably do so either from ignorance of the provisions of the bill, exactly what it means, or from the selfish interest of objecting to the fifty cents or a dollar which they would pay for the inspection certificate.

Now, in the event they are covered by insurance, the State inspector does not come near them; their own inspector is certified by the State, and they simply pay for the certificate. One person said to me: "What are you trying to do, force everyone to take out insurance?" No, that is not the point. Your insurance companies are very much in favor of the bill not because it would increase their own insurance but because it would cut down their damage, their property damage, if not accidents, personal fatalities or serious injuries which might result. So, anyone who is not insured, if this bill becomes a law, is not forced to take out insurance. He can have the State inspector come and inspect that boiler and he should be perfectly willing to do so for his own protection.

I have checked into this very carefully and I feel it is a very good bill. I am happy to sponsor it and since I decided to sponsor it, I have checked it very carefully and very thoroughly and I am still of the opinion that this is a good bill and I recommend it for your earnest consideration.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair correctly understand that the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis, moves the acceptance of the "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" report?

Mr. TRAVIS: I do, Mr. Speaker. I move for the acceptance of Report "A".

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis, moves that the House accept Report A



"Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Boilers, Air Tanks and Unfired Pressure Vessels," H. P. 389, L. D. 225.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Bearce.

Mr. BEARCE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis. I believe that this bill is not needed or required in that I attended the hearing on this bill and, if I remember correctly, there was no proof that there was any accident caused by an air compressor in this State. As far as evidence at the hearing was concerned, ever — probably there has been at some time — but with regards to the insurance, I want to answer that I am not speaking selfishly at all as it happens that I carry insurance myself but there are others who don't; there are others who can't afford to. This bill would be a wonderful bill for the insurance companies, I have no doubt. Also, the inspection. It is a cost of inspection. It is a cost to the State. It would set up I don't know how many inspectors but certainly if it is covered it would take a lot of them. Also, this bill would include the small stores, the repair shop, any place, as I understand it, other than agriculture or residence. Other than that, it is covered as I understand it, I may be wrong, in this bill. Also, in regard to boilers, it would naturally cover the boiler in the small store or large one, also the small shop, and I would like to know this: That supposing an inspector goes into your store or garage or whatever place it might be, and inspected your boiler and ordered you to tear it down. And after tearing it down and inspection, it was found that this boiler was all right. Who would pay? The State or the man being inspected? I would like to have that answered; also I would like to know as to who is going to pay the bills on all this cost; added to our taxes, I assume. I cannot see any need or reason for this bill. We had practically the same thing two years ago which was rejected. I agree that industry is more or less — big industry is more or less exempt from the risk

but the small fellow is not able to come here and protect himself at the hearing because he is not here. So I do not think he was represented. So, I hope the motion of the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis, does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Orono, Mr. Bates.

Mr. BATES: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I arise to support the motion of the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis, that L. D. 225 receive passage.

Two years ago I sponsored a similar bill particularly in the interest of public health and safety. The objections to a great degree, at least, to that bill of two years ago have, in my estimation, been eliminated in the bill presented by Mr. Travis. On the angle of public safety in the State of Maine, I feel that this law is needed. Many accidents directly traceable to low pressure boilers and air tanks have been discovered and Maine has been extremely fortunate in not having more accidents. It does not seem logical to me that this good luck can continue. When an explosion occurs, the newspapers with headlines are usually quick to give facts about the damage caused and the injuries suffered and what the fire and police departments did but seldom are there any facts brought out about the real cause of the accident. Now some of these causes that could have been determined by adequate inspection service are improper operation, faulty construction, defective safety valves, inadequate relief valves, no relief valves and defective fuel control valves.

The protection of human life is surely involved in this bill and I hope you will join me in supporting it.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis.

Mr. TRAVIS: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for rising the second time but the gentleman from Caribou, my good friend, Mr. Bearce, has asked a couple of direct questions which I am afraid no one else in the House but myself can answer.

He stated it would take a number of inspectors to do the job. Such is not the case. It was figured that one additional inspector will do the job because approximately ninety per cent of these boilers and air tanks are now covered by insurance and the fees from these boiler certificates will more than pay the cost or the salary of one inspector and two stenographers, if two stenographers are necessary. Therefore, there is going to be no additional expense on this bill.

He asked the question: Who will pay for the fee in case the boiler has to be opened up? That is clearly stated on page 6. "For the inspection of a miniature boiler, the fee shall be \$3. For a hydrostatic test of any boiler except miniature boilers, a fee of \$5 shall be charged in addition to the inspection fees hereinbefore provided for, provided that not more than \$20 shall be collected for such inspection of any one boiler made for any one year . . ." That answers that question as to who pays; the individual pays.

Now, the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Bearce, admits that he doesn't feel that this bill is necessary because he carries insurance. By his own admission he admits the justification for this bill. Would he deny the protection — he carries insurance so the insurance inspectors inspect his boilers and air tanks — would he deny that same privilege to those who, as he says, cannot afford insurance? Could they not afford this \$1.00 for the insurance certificate which protects them and protects you and protects us?

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in opposition to the motion made by my good friend, the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis, believing as I do that this particular document is wholly unwarranted. I cannot convince myself that the small fees which he has stated will be the ultimate cost to the owner of a low pressure boiler or to any owner of a boiler. I am thoroughly convinced that with respect to

boilers, the State is running along very nicely. If I read correctly on page 6, under section 66, it sets up a schedule of fees to be charged the owner, which range from \$3 to a maximum of \$20.

I hope that every member of this House will try to recall to his mind any serious accidents or damage that has occurred and, if, in his convictions and knowledge of accidents, deaths, or what not caused from poor installation and poor operation of these low pressure boilers and otherwise, then he would feel warranted in voting for the bill. If he believes that the thing is being operated correctly and with reasonable safety by the present owners, I believe he should vote against the adoption of Report A — I believe it is — and vote against the motion of the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis.

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

Mr. BURKETT: Mr. Speaker and Members: This bill was heard by the Legal Affairs Committee, as I remember, and while I cannot recall how the committee split, I am sure that a majority of the members of the committee were for the bill and signed the "Ought to pass" report. I regret that I am unable to discuss the technical aspects of this bill, perhaps sometimes it is my reason for not talking, but I am sure the committee was impressed with the sincerity of the proponent and the case that he made out showing the necessity for this legislation. I want to support his motion.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Bearce.

Mr. BEARCE: Mr. Speaker, I forgot to mention also, if I understand this bill correctly, that the water system is to be under this as well in your small places.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Woodworth.

Mr. WOODWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Westbrook,

Mr. Travis. This bill has been described as a safety measure but according to section 64-a, it does not apply to boilers located on farms and used solely for agricultural purposes, or the boilers located in private residences or apartment houses of less than six families. I don't know that a man living in an apartment house with only six families in it would enjoy being blown up any more than anybody else. It looks to me as if the bill, which was killed in the House and sent up two years ago, has been redrafted simply to soften up opposition from as many quarters as possible.

Either it is a safety measure or it is not. If it is a safety measure, it should protect all people; if it is not a safety measure, it does not protect all the people and that is what this bill does not do. It does not protect all people. I should say that this is just another departmental expansion bill with additional expense and increasing cost over a period of years and I hope the motion will not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move the indefinite postponement of this bill as amended.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Jamieson, that the Bill and Reports of the committee on Bill "An Act relating to Boilers, Air Tanks and Unfired Pressure Vessels," H. P. 389, L. D. 225, be indefinitely postponed.

All those in favor of the motion will say aye; those opposed, no.

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

Seventy-one having voted in the affirmative and twenty-five having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed and the Reports and Bill were indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the second tabled and today assigned matter, House Report "Ought not to pass"

of the Committee on Claims on Resolve to Reimburse the City of Hallowell for Support of Andrew W. Tuttle, H. P. 1571, tabled on April 11 by the gentleman from Hallowell, Mr. Vaughan, pending acceptance of the report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Thereupon, on motion of the gentleman from Hallowell, Mr. Vaughan, the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the third tabled and today assigned matter, An Act Relating to the Excise Tax on Certain Types of Oleomargarine, H. P. 657, L. D. 366, tabled on April 12 by the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Low, pending passage to be enacted; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Thereupon, on motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Low, the bill, having already had its third reading, was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the fourth tabled and today assigned matter, Majority Report "Ought to pass" and the Minority Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act to Revise the State Civil Defense Law," H. P. 152, L. D. 84, tabled on April 13 by the gentleman from Lyman, Mr. Taylor, pending acceptance of either report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Thereupon, on motion of the gentleman from Lyman, Mr. Taylor, the majority report "Ought to pass" was accepted; under suspension of the rules, the bill was then given its two several readings and assigned for third reading tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the fifth tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act relating to Licenses to Hunt or Fish for Members of the Armed Services of the United States", H. P. 1696, L. D. 1276, tabled on April 13 by the gentleman from Moose River Plantation, Mr. Watson, pending third reading; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. WATSON: Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Jamieson.

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

Mr. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I was asked to present this bill by the Aroostook County Town Managers Association. They have also asked me to present an amendment and I present House Amendment "B" to House Paper 1696, Legislative Document 1276, and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Jamieson, presents House Amendment "B" to Bill "An Act relating to Licenses to Hunt or Fish for Members of the Armed Services of the United States" and moves its adoption. The Clerk will read the amendment.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "B" to H. P. 1696, L. D. 1276, Bill "An Act Relating to Licenses to Hunt and Fish for Members of the Armed Forces of the United States."

Amend said Bill by inserting before the enacting clause the following emergency preamble:

**Emergency preamble.** Whereas, there are members of the armed forces of the United States of America stationed at military and naval posts and bases within the state; and

Whereas, there are no provisions of law permitting such members to purchase licenses to hunt and fish at the resident license fee; and

Whereas, in order to permit such members to fish this spring it is vitally necessary that the following legislation become effective as soon as possible; and

Whereas, in the judgment of the legislature, these facts create an emergency within the meaning of the constitution of Maine and require the following legislation as immediately necessary for the preservation of the public peace, health and safety; now, therefore,

Further amend said Bill by striking out the 1st underlined sentence of that part designated "XI" and inserting in place thereof the following underlined sentence:

**'A license to hunt or fish shall be issued, at the resident license fee,**

**to any member of the armed forces of the United States of America who is a citizen of the United States and stationed at some military or naval post, station or base within the state.'**

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

**'Emergency clause.** In view of the emergency cited in the preamble, this act shall take effect when approved.'

Thereupon, House Amendment "B" was adopted and the bill as amended was given its third reading, passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the sixth tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act Relating to Transportation of Fish, Game or Fur-Bearing Animals by Aircraft", H. P. 1728, L. D. 1283, tabled on April 17 by the gentleman from Chelsea, Mr. Perry, pending passage to be engrossed; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. PERRY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to thank the House for allowing me to table this particular bill yesterday. I have had a chance since to discuss it with the Fish and Game Department and, at this particular time, I would like to move that it pass to be engrossed.

Thereupon, the bill, having already had its third reading, was passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the seventh tabled and today assigned matter, House Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act Relating to Closed Time on Deer in Southern Counties of Maine", H. P. 1575, L. D. 1147, tabled on April 17 by the gentleman from Eustis, Mr. Carville, pending the motion of the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Brown, to accept the report; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eustis, Mr. Carville.

Mr. CARVILLE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I misunderstood the motion of the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Brown, yesterday, and I would like to concur with Mr.

Brown in his motion that we accept the "Ought not to pass" report.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Brown, that the House accept the "Ought not to pass" report of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act Relating to Closed Time on Deer in Southern Counties of Maine", H. P. 1575, L. D. 1147. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the "Ought not to pass" report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

On motion of the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, the House recessed until 2:30 p. m.

#### Afternoon Session 2:30 P. M.

Called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the eighth tabled and today assigned matter, Majority Report "Ought to pass" and Minority Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act relating to Exemptions from Taxation", H. P. 336, L. D. 194, tabled on April 17 by the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Jones, pending the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, that the Reports and Bill be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. PERRY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to add a few words to the remarks that I made yesterday with regard to this bill and with regard to my vital interest against the indefinite postponement of this particular bill.

In the first place, it appears to me that there is logical reason against the non-postponement of this bill, the indefinite postponement of it, by reason of the mere fact that this bill was introduced, had a public hearing before our Taxation Committee, and from the Taxation Committee of ten members we got an "Ought to pass" majority report. I would remind the members of the House there were two veterans of World War I on that committee who signed the

"Ought to pass" report. If this were anywhere near as vicious as the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, would have us believe, I doubt very much if those particular gentleman, especially the veterans, would have signed the "Ought to pass" report.

The gentleman from Portland (Mr. McGlauffin) also stated yesterday it was the intention in the original adoption of this bill that it had nothing to do with the amount of money or the ability to pay. And he put that in, that particular remark which I will read: He said: "Now I want to point out to you that this was in the nature of a bonus. It did not have anything to do with whether the soldier was rich or poor, black or white, it was in appreciation of what the soldier had done by giving his service to the country."

If the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, had gone through this particular law back along, as he stated he had, I fail to see how he could have overlooked the fact that the bill in 1919, which was after the last war, had the clause stating that any particular veteran owning in excess of \$5,000 worth of property got no exemption at all whatsoever. Now, if that wasn't put in there for a need clause in stating that a person well off would get no exemption, I fail to understand. I might go on further to state that in 1921 a member of the Legislature by the name of Mr. Norman D. Garcelon, whom probably some of you members might know was Commander of the American Legion, put in an amendment that took off the \$5,000 exemption, which was originally on the law, understand, and left it wide open so everybody, regardless of need or ability to pay, came under this particular law.

I can agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman from Falmouth, Mr. Dow, as long as the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, insists that this is a bonus and if it is a bonus, I can see no reason why we here in the State Legislature should state that the small towns and municipalities are going to go ahead and pay a bonus at the local level. If we want the veterans to have a bonus, I state that we should handle it here our-

selves and have the intestinal fortitude to go on and do it.

I cannot go along with the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, in stating that it is the American way to hand out a bonus in any way, shape or manner or to hand out a tax exemption to give to a veteran who is financially well-off a bonus and let the poor veteran who is not able to own a home go ahead and help pay his buddy's bonus, so-called. To me that is not the American way and if he wants to put it to me, that is not what any veteran fought for, to give it to the particular person who doesn't need an exemption and make the particular person who might need it desperately help pay it through higher cost in rent.

Another item that I would like to bring out is the mere fact that one of the gentlemen who is Administrator of the Veterans Affairs right here in the State House has put out this booklet which has been put on all our desks, "Third Annual Report of the Division on Veterans Affairs" and, as he states in here, it says: "Once more," — because we recommended this particular thing two years ago and it still wasn't done — Mr. Rowell states: "Once more it is recommended that Veterans' organizations sponsor legislation which will give a more equitable basis for granting tax exemptions to veterans reaching the age of sixty-two years."

Now, if the Administrator of the Veterans Affairs here comes forth and says that he recommended for two years that we do something about this, at the particular time now we have the vehicle before us to do it, if there should be some amendments needed — I am not hard to get along with and if amendments are based on a fair and equitable basis, I will be glad to introduce the amendments myself. But the mere fact that by indefinitely postponing the particular bill and killing it here when it merits attention — and believe me it does merit attention — the amount of money involved and the economic structure of all our small towns which are going to shoulder this burden, it could not stand to be indefinitely postponed. We can

work on this bill and get something out of it that should be had. Thank you.

**TH SPEAKER:** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin.

**MR. MCGLAUFLIN:** Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Kipling realized how easy it is to forget what the soldier did after time passes, I want to read a few lines of his poem on "Tommy."

"I went into a public-house to get a pint o'beer,

The publican 'e up an' sez, 'We serve no redcoats here.'

The girls be'ind the bar they laughed an' giggled fit to die, I outs into the street again, an' to myself sez I:

O it's Tommy this, an' Tommy that, an' "Tommy go away";

But it's 'Thank you, Mister Atkins,' when the band begins to play,

\* \* \*

I went into a theater as sober as could be,

They give a drunk civillian room, but 'adn't none for me;

They sent me to the gallery or round the music-'alls,

But when it comes to fightin', Lord, they'll shove me in the stalls.

For it's Tommy this, an' Tommy that, an' "Tommy wait outside";

But it's 'Special train for Atkins,' when the trooper's on the tide,

The troopship's on the tide, my boys.

\* \* \*

For it's Tommy this, an' Tommy that, an' 'Chuck him out, the brute!'

But it's 'Saviour of 'is country' when the guns begin to shoot; . . ."

It was demonstrated to me yesterday how true that poem is. But when the people of the State of Maine felt after one of the greatest wars that the soldiers did deserve some consideration and they felt that they couldn't afford to give them a bonus which we all would like to have done, they made the provision applying to a special class: that when a man became a soldier and became sixty-two years of age,

he could have exemption from taxation thereafter, and they also provided for the totally disabled.

I want to point out once more that there is a decided difference between a pension and a bonus and a dole. A pension is given for something that has been done, services rendered. Many soldiers get pensions because the country feels that they have earned that pension. But a bonus is something that the people are not obliged to give. They give it voluntarily in appreciation of the services rendered. They didn't ask in this case that they offer their services for the country. Whether they went to Bangor or Paris or anywhere else, it didn't make any difference. They offered their lives and in compensation of that they said: "When they get to be sixty-two years old, we will give them and their widows \$5,000 exemption." Now, a dole is charity. A dole is not a bonus; it is not a pension; it is charity.

Now, having that in mind, I told you how I, myself, worked to get this bill back from the destruction that the people in Chelsea had rendered to it once before. They put their foot in the appiecart and upset the appiecart just as they are trying to this time. I appreciated the position that the gentleman from Chelsea, Mr. Perry, was in. He very kindly came to me and talked to me about this bill and I told him that in the first place I did not like the way he had changed "estate" to "residence." He told me that there were some people in Togus, who had been in Togus, who didn't live in Chelsea and they get exemption in two places, which should not be, and I stated that I was going to have it confined to one residence and surrounding buildings, a shop, a barn or whatever it might be, or—he has another bill in to compensate Chelsea for the loss they had by reason of these tax exemptions—and I told him I would gladly support that measure but I felt that this bill would be most unfair to the soldiers who were not totally disabled.

I went further. I stated the way to correct some of the feeling that the soldiers should not have so large an exemption and I can ap-

preciate that fact and I offered to go along with the reduction from \$3500 to \$2500 but, no! They wanted their pound of flesh. Fairness wasn't going to enter into this thing. They were going to have whole hog or nothing. That is why I am standing for indefinite postponement of this bill and I want to go on record over this State where we stand, where you stand, on this measure.

I have stated and I still believe that this is one of the best Legislatures that I have ever served in, and I do not believe there are any members here who intentionally want to be unfair. I did say to the gentleman from Chelsea, Mr. Perry, that this wasn't a question of whether you deserve it or whether you don't. It was given to a class and that class was the soldiers who had reached the age of sixty-two years and they should all be treated alike and it does not matter whether he is rich or poor, the question of whether he can afford to pay it or whether he can't doesn't enter into this at all. But I find that some of you members who ordinarily possess very sound judgment, like Representative Dow here, and I respect him very much, but I can't imagine his letting this prejudice run away with him. Just your prejudice, voting for something so grossly unfair as this measure is! Let me again point out to you that there are soldiers in this State who have reached the age of sixty-two years, who are entitled to this exemption. I know of a number of them who haven't claimed it. They want to do their part, but the time comes with many of them when that exemption means an awful lot to them.

I was in Portland the other day, when a woman came to me and she said she was the wife of a soldier. She said: "Don't let them take away our taxation exemption," and I said to her: "I can promise you here and now that they won't take it away with my consent." I talked with a soldier, who said the same thing to me. He said: "Don't take away our exemption; it means a lot to me." And I said to him: "We have got in Augusta one of the finest Legislatures I ever knew. I can't imagine that that Legislature

will vote to pass the bill that takes away from every soldier and every widow the exemptions they have been getting unless they are totally disabled. I can't imagine this Legislature, just because we don't want to and you feel that somebody ought to pay, being so unfair as to let somebody suffer who is depending on this.

I was talking this noon with a friend of mine, whom I played cards with pretty often, and I mentioned this matter and he said: "I can't go along with you on this." He said: "There is a man in our town who hasn't yet reached sixty-two but he will in a couple of years, and I feel that he doesn't need this exemption and I am against you." Now, I want to point out to you that that is pure prejudice. Don't let your prejudice overcome your judgment! I have pointed out that if you think they are getting too big an exemption, let's cut down the exemption but don't let us throw out those men who are now receiving that exemption, who expect to get that exemption. If you cut it down, well and good.

I want to say to you, now, that I would much rather see the entire law erased from the books than to pass this objectionable measure which is so unjust to some of the veterans. I still insist on the indefinite postponement of this bill and then let another Legislature act on it. If you want to consider some measure to reduce it so the burden will not be so great I am willing to go along with an amendment. I was willing to do anything I could to cooperate but now I have to insist upon the total rejection of the bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dixmont, Mr. Jacoby.

Mr. JACOBY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I believe since I have been in this House that I have had a great deal of respect for the clear thinking of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin. His reference to this bill as a bonus, I believe, has a great deal of merit but I do not believe that this distinguished gentleman wishes the towns and cities and villages in the State of Maine to pay this bonus. In justice to the

cities and towns and villages and the veterans, themselves, and I am a veteran, I do not believe that this bill should be indefinitely postponed.

I would rather that the sponsors of this bill, as they are willing to do, offer their amendments so that it is passed and, if necessary, put the bill on a State level and not the local level.

I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland (Mr. McGlauffin) will not carry.

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

Mr. BERRY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It had not been my intention to take any part in this debate on this bill. This is exactly the same bill as we had here four years ago. Now, I am, perhaps, the oldest veteran in this House, and I belong to a veterans organization that is the only organization in the State today because our Grand Army of the Republic has passed on.

Now, when that bill was passed several years ago, it was \$5,000, then it was brought down to \$3500. Now, for myself, it doesn't matter; I haven't got too many more years to go, but the idea is this: For fifty-three years I have been hooked up in four wars and my name wasn't drawn out of a fishbowl any of those four times. I volunteered my services to my country. Now, the story is: Our widows, and this applies to all of them, are receiving the \$48 a month today; some of them have a small house and they are exempt under \$3500. I would like to ask some of the proponents of this bill if they could live on \$48 a month. I have known some of them to go out and spend that in one evening. I don't think that is right; under that bill we were exempt several years ago and I believe we should keep it. Now there are a number of veterans in the House today, Spanish War veterans—there is a Spanish War veteran in the House and there is a Spanish War veteran in the Senate. I wonder if these younger veterans realize how many Spanish War veterans there were in World War I. I can tell you how many there were, there were 68,000 in World War I and they all volunteered their serv-



ices as they did in 1898. We had 8,000 in World War II. Those men didn't have to go; they volunteered again for positions in which they could be used and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, prevails and that this be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. March.

Mr. MARCH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I haven't any poetry to read but I would like to read from a few notes that I made after yesterday's debate. I would like to state my position on this bill. I suppose anyone who takes the position that the veteran isn't entitled to everything is risking his popularity. I am not seeking popularity; I am just taking a stand for what I think is right. My son-in-law lost his life in the last war; one of my nephews lost a leg in Normandy. I believe in rehabilitation. The government helped my nephew finish his education, gave him an automobile and a pension. He now has a good job and if he is as well fixed as I expect him to be when he is sixty-two, I don't think someone should pay his taxes and I don't think he would want them to do so.

The gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, has stated that there should be no distinction made whether the veteran is black or white, rich or poor. I agree that there should be no distinction as to color or creed, but I don't think the taxpayers of the State should take over for those veterans who are able to pay and who are healthy at sixty-two or any other age. Give the veterans aid when they are disabled or needy, bonuses aren't justified; help when and where needed is justified. I hope the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I stand here as a veteran and also as a signer of the minority "Ought not to pass" report of the committee. I agree with the gentleman from Chelsea, Mr. Perry, that this is important legislation. It is very im-

portant legislation at this time, when many of your sons and grandsons may be called to serve their country. I was not called, like the gentleman from South Portland. I volunteered my services. I was in France a year before they ever called a man in World War I. But let that be as it may. The soldier that is called does his duty just as well as the volunteer, but I might leave this fact with you: The World War I veteran received very little. The World War II veteran, who seems to want to take away from the World War I man, receives plenty as the doctor just said, they have been given an education, they have given thousands of them educations; they gave none of us educations. In fact, they interrupted my education and I never went back to college, and there are many thousands of us in the same category. We just didn't rehabilitate ourselves and settle down after what we had been through. They gave them automobiles. They gave them everything that the government could give them. But this, members, is something that we have waited for thirty years. It is like some corporations that I have known that have men working for them, and when it is about up to the time of retirement, for some petty offense they are fired, whether they receive the pension or not. This is what the State of Maine is doing to the veteran of World War I.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland (Mr. McGlauffin) prevails, and when the vote is taken, I would call for a roll call vote.

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

Mr. DOW: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I cannot agree with the last speaker that this is something the State of Maine is doing for the veteran. This is something that the State of Maine is passing on to the towns.

My friend, the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, gave me, well we may say honorary mention, and I suppose I should return the compliment. (Laughter) He told us yesterday that this was a bonus, and he also said he knew what he was

talking about, so that settles that question. (Laughter)

A bonus on the State level, if the Legislature saw fit to pass it, I would not object to, but in this law as it now stands, which this bill is attempting to correct, it says to the towns: "You shall pay the bonus to any soldier who happens to be in your community, whether or not he is a resident of your town, or has been a resident of your state. If he comes there, and is there April 1st, you shall pay the bonus." And members, I know of an instance where this bonus was paid to a resident of New Hampshire in the State of Maine for a little over five years. I know of another instance where a man came clear across the State and his property was exempted; he was able to own a new Cadillac and drive it to Florida every fall and back in the spring. He was exempted. We paid him a bonus for four years.

We paid another veteran a bonus, if that is what you call it, for about twenty-one years, not the whole of it, because he owned property in two towns and they paid him in proportion to the property in our town.

I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland (Mr. McGlauffin) will not prevail. This is not a situation that is peculiar to the town of Chelsea; it is towns all over the State, and it is becoming a serious situation to some of them, and it will be more so. There are more and more reaching the age of sixty-three. Thank you.

**THE SPEAKER:** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Farley.

**MR. FARLEY:** Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to say to the members of the House that I had an agreement with the gentleman from Chelsea (Mr. Perry) that I would vote but not talk against this bill of his, but the gentleman from Bridgton (Mr. March) has made some remarks that have forced me to this speaker. It has been my pleasure to have been a member of the American Legion for thirty years. It has been my pleasure to serve as a delegate from the State of Maine, representing the American Legion, for twenty-five years. You all know

that after the First World War, for a veteran of the First World War there was no such a thing as any laws on the book to give him any protection.

For fourteen years, in the city of Biddeford, I was a Service Officer and gave my time, with the family that I had, in the interests of the veterans' dependents and their families. For years we worked the organization up to this, and from our organization, and going to national conventions each and every time, even to Frisco, out of my own pocket I paid \$700, and nobody paid my expenses, I have had the occasion to be on committees with Harold Stassen, Louis Johnson, Earl Cocke and a few more.

From that organization the Second World War Veteran came in for something that the First World War veteran never came into. It was my pleasure to sit on a committee for three years as a member of a subcommittee that finally placed before the Congress of the United States, and it was passed, the G. I. Bill of Rights that gave the veterans something that the veteran in the First World War never received, a college education, a little business, or a home, or this or that.

I don't understand some of the stands taken by some of the Second World War boys. My oldest son I lost. I had two others in; I have one in Korea now, and I have one in Alabama, all Second World War boys; I came from the First World War. If I had lost my second boy in Korea, there was nothing I could receive from the United States government. For my first boy I received not one penny. I cannot claim a dependency because I have a trucking business that pays me a revenue of over \$4,000.

Now I don't begrudge any Second World War boy anything, but I do think that the Second World War boy should recognize the First World War boy who through our organization helped to place, through Congress, the G. I. Bill of Rights. This thing may never bother me at sixty-two. I believe, in the city of Biddeford we just have a very few of those. I don't know today whether or not the gentleman is a veteran—that doesn't interest me one way or another—but I don't

like to hear any remarks from anybody to the detriment of the First World War organization that have put their money and put their time and put their civic pride into it, so that the veteran of the Second World War came out with something that we didn't get, and we only got sixty dollars for a bonus. Thank you.

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

Mr. SPEAR: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I did speak yesterday and today I would just like to set the record straight maybe. Although I do qualify as a veteran, I want you to understand that I am not speaking to you gentlemen and you gentlewomen here as a veteran, but I am a Representative; I am one of three Representatives from the city of South Portland. I have lived in South Portland practically all of my life. I have been to school there, and I feel quite well acquainted with the citizens, and I feel that I know their desires.

To be sure, I have been told by the Stuart P. Morrill Post of the American Legion—and I faced 832 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars—that they desire me to vote against this bill. I also have a duty to the citizens of South Portland too, and I can evaluate their temper—I know how they feel—and I am sure that if a public election were held tomorrow and this one issue was at stake, that my citizens would vote two to one in sympathy with the veteran.

I realize this costs money; somebody has got to pay for it. I said yesterday: "Wars blow hot and wars blow cold" and this one we are in now is blowing hot to the tune of seventy-two billion dollars this next year, and that is not hay. It is going to cost the State of Maine probably \$243,000,000. We are trying to raise \$10,000,000 now, or \$9,000,000 or \$11,000,000 through a sales tax, but nevertheless we are going to contribute to the Federal government after July 1st to the tune of \$243,000,000, whether you like it or not. Sure it will cost money. I think there have been amendments suggested here, for this and for that, but I don't see any amendments here taking away any privileges or exemptions from taxation that the

Indians receive, that the churches receive, that the blind receive. It is just the veteran who is in the front right now. But the only way I can emphasize this is that you know and I know that this was extended to the veteran as a gift from a grateful government. Do what you will with it. I hope the motion does prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Jennings.

Mr. JENNINGS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: My remarks today will be very brief. I want to clear up a few things that I omitted yesterday.

Number 1. In my mind, the situation as of today, and for two or three years ahead, is not serious. Today, in some towns there are none receiving this exemption. In some towns there are one, some two, and in some a few more. The average today of a veteran is fifty-nine years.

As I stated, in yesterday's talk, the over-all picture of the percentage is one-half of one percent.

Now I am going to bring out this point to you, something that I think will be sound and just: The American Legion appreciates the fact of this issue that we are talking about today. I have been told by officials of the American Legion that they are willing and ready to come out with a bill that I think is sound, and it seems as though we have men in the American Legion that would be sound and could present a bill to the Legislature which would be far better than the bill we have today.

We found, in the Army, good soldiers and some poor ones. The reason I am saying this is that it is a sad thing to think of where some of our men, as has been stated today, reach out their hands and ask for this exemption when they could pay. They make it hard for the majority of the others. I feel that this bill is not a good bill, the reason being it doesn't take into consideration the factors that should be considered.

I, therefore, support the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Falmouth, Mr. Dow.

Mr. DOW: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The gentleman from South Portland, in his remarks, said that this is a gift from a grateful government. I don't consider it that way. The government doesn't furnish the money to pay this bonus but simply says: "These men deserve a bonus and you go ahead and pay it to them." And you pay it to them not only this year but you pay it every year after the age of sixty-two, as long as this veteran lives and it becomes, in some cases, a very liberal bonus, far more than anything, I believe, the Legislature would support.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Norway, Mr. Lord.

Mr. LORD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I note that most of these speakers who have spoken on this measure so far have been veterans and I realize in getting up to speak I am leaving myself very vulnerable, not being a veteran of World War II or World War I either—I was only six at that time and couldn't quite make it. But I do think that the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, is right when he says we should support something we consider fair. I also want to support something I consider fair, but I think possibly our interpretation of the word "fair" differs a little bit. If I think a bill is good and fair, I want to support it and I am perfectly willing to stand up here and be counted in so doing. I do not think a special privilege bill is fair and one that extends benefits to a few at the expense of the many I do not feel that I can support.

This situation is going on right now by the younger men out of the services and the condition is going to pyramid and will get progressively worse as time goes on. I think the Taxation Committee which recommended this out with a majority "Ought to pass" report certainly gave consideration to all of the arguments that have been given here today, and I want to express my utter confidence in the committee and back their position and I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland (Mr. McGlauffin) does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, that the reports and Bill "An Act relating to Exemption from Taxation", H. P. 336, L. D. 194, be indefinitely postponed. The gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Rollins, has requested a roll call.

In order for the vote to be taken by the yeas and nays it requires the consent of one-fifth of the members present.

As many as are in favor of having the vote taken by the yeas and nays will kindly rise until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had. The SPEAKER: One-fifth not having consented to the yeas and nays, the yeas and nays are not in order.

Mr. PERRY: —

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. PERRY: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the vote be taken by division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the request is already before the House.

The Chair will repeat the question. The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, that the reports and Bill "An Act relating to Exemption from Taxation," be indefinitely postponed. A division has been requested.

All those in favor of having the reports and bill indefinitely postponed will please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

Forty-seven having voted in the affirmative and seventy-seven in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Chelsea, Mr. Perry, that the House accept the majority report "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act relating to Exemptions from Taxation," H. P. 336, L. D. 194.

All those in favor of accepting the majority report "Ought to pass" will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the majority report "Ought to pass" was ac-

cepted. Thereupon, the bill, having already been printed, was given its two several readings under suspension of the rules.

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

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: At this time, I wish to offer House Amendment "A" and I would like to ask the privilege of making a few remarks after the amendment has been read.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, presents House Amendment "A" to Bill "An Act Relating to Exemptions from Taxation." The Clerk will read the amendment.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 336, L. D. 194, Bill "An Act Relating to Exemptions from Taxation."

Amend said Bill by striking out the comma after the words "United States government" in the 25th line from the end thereof, and inserting in place thereof the following underlined words and punctuation: 'and the residence, to the value of \$1,500 of all male and female veterans who have served in the armed forces of the United States during World War I or any subsequent federally recognized war period and who were honorably discharged, or honorably separated from such service and retired to the reserve, who shall have reached the age of 62 years, or the unmarried widow of such veteran,'

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

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am a firm believer that fair compromise results in good legislation. The law as it existed or does exist at the present time, I am sure you are all familiar with, namely to the effect that a veteran having reached the age of 62 years is exempt locally to the tune of \$3500.

Now it is also true that not many, not a large percentage of the veterans having reached the age of 62 have the full thirty-five hundred in valuation. It is also true that a great many veterans were

not aware that the present law pertained to their estates; they only thought of it with respect to their residence.

What has been said by previous speakers today with respect to it being an affair which should not be borne totally by each respective local community, I can certainly sympathize with, and it is my intention that, if you adopt this amendment as a fair compromise—and I believe it to be—that at the proper time during this session of the Legislature I will present to you for your consideration an amendment or a document to the effect that the burden will be borne by the State.

I am thoroughly convinced, as many people are, that a veteran is not the belonging of a certain community but he is the belonging of the State and of the Nation, and that any exemptions, or bonuses, if you will, which are granted to him should be borne by the entire people. I do not believe for one minute that we should slice off the entire affair all at once. It may be in the future necessary to make some further revisions; but it is not, with the exception of a few communities in the State of Maine, a serious situation.

Now with the assurance—and I hope you will believe me—that if you adopt this amendment and give the veterans some protection, at the proper time a proper document, whether it be an amendment or whatever it may be, will be presented for your consideration, which will place the burden on the State. I hope you will give this amendment fair consideration.

I do not wish to go into the sympathetic angle of this. It has already been expressed. I was not a veteran. I was too young for the first World War and too old for the second, therefore I cannot speak as a veteran. I can speak, I think, as a person who has had considerable experience in local government and perhaps understands the working of these things at the local level; and it is my honest opinion that if you accept this amendment it would create no hardship that cannot be solved at the local level, even if we fail to place it on the State level.

So, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, knowing the fairness of every person in this House, and having the highest regard for your respect and esteem for the veteran who has given to his country when called such time as was needed to preserve your taxable property and my taxable property and leave it intact, I do not believe that you want to strand him at this time. I cannot, for the life of me, believe that. So I ask you sincerely from the bottom of my heart to accept this amendment as a compromise, with the assurance I have given you that I will present further legislation at the proper time when we have solved the financial problem of the State.

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

Mr. PERRY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I can ask you from the bottom of my heart also not to adopt this particular amendment. The simple reason is this. In adopting this particular amendment you put the bill and the principles involved in the bill right back to where it was in the first place. In other words, what we are doing by this amendment is asking the totally disabled veteran, who, in my opinion, and I believe in yours, needs the exemption, we are asking him to sacrifice two thousand dollars worth of his exemption to be able to give it to some other person that does not need it. Now I do not think that the person who is financially well off would like to have you make the veteran in need sacrifice two thousand dollars worth of his exemption so that this other person might get it. That is just the part that demonstrates the unfairness of the law that was in effect before.

A veteran who does not own a piece of property and has to pay added rent to help amortize his buddy's exemption, I think he is willing to do it as long as he is positive and knows that his buddy whose rent he is helping to pay is in need and deserving of it from the standpoint of need. But to make the particular veteran pay higher rent to give \$1500 to everybody whether they need it or not is still unfair and inequitable, and

that is what is provided in the amendment.

Now in regard to the part that the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, spoke about, having an amendment come in here on this particular bill to put it on the State level, I talked with Mr. Burgess about that this morning myself. I spent an hour in conference this morning with Mr. Johnson, the State Tax Assessor, and his assistant, Mr. Birkenwald, and we were working desperately and do plan on the presentation of an amendment to this particular bill which will carry it, if possible, to the State level. But if it cannot be done, I still do not believe it is fair to ask a veteran who is in need and who needs help to sacrifice two thousand dollars of his exemption to be able to give it to the person who does not need it.

The gentleman from Winthrop, Mr. Maxwell, who is sitting here beside me, has an amendment to be presented tomorrow morning to this particular bill with which I highly concur at the present time, and which will remove the "service connected" mentioned in the bill, and therefore it will give every veteran who is totally disabled, whether he is service connected or not, the exemption. That particular part was the part that seemed to bother everybody. I am willing, as I said, to be fair and compromise, and that amendment will be presented tomorrow morning before the third reading of this bill. But this particular amendment, as I have pointed out, to make other veterans, those that need it, to make them sacrifice to give it to everybody who does not need it, has still got the unfair principle behind it, and it is not the American way to do it. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is on the adoption of House Amendment "A", presented by the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess.

All those in favor of the adoption of House Amendment "A" will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion for the adoption of House Amendment "A" did not prevail.

Thereupon the bill was tomorrow assigned for third reading.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair lays before the House, An Act relating to Joint Operation of Schools (H. P. 883) (L. D. 525) tabled earlier in today's session by the gentlewoman from Bath, Mrs. Moffatt, pending passage to be enacted.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Bath, Mrs. Moffatt.

Mrs. **MOFFATT**: Mr. Speaker, I move the indefinite postponement of L. D. 525, An Act Relating to Joint Operation of Schools.

The **SPEAKER**: The gentlewoman from Bath, Mrs. Moffatt, moves the indefinite postponement of "An Act Relating to Joint Operation of Schools" (H. P. 883) (L. D. 525).

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Friendship, Mr. Winchenpaw.

Mr. **WINCHENPAW**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have lost the place, but I know what the bill is.

This bill has a little history and I would like to explain it. That was the bill of the gentleman from South Paris, Mr. Stewart, and the first time that came up before the Education Committee at the hearing nobody appeared before the committee, and we felt that the bill was not of any use. It is just a permissive bill, it does not cost any money. No one seemed to know anything about it, so we passed it out the first time "Ought not to pass." Then Mr. Stewart called it back and had it recommitted to the committee. At that time we got some information on it and we found out that it is not a very bad bill. I, for one, hate to see it postponed, after all of that work we put into it, so I hope that the motion made by the gentlewoman from Bath, Mrs. Moffatt, does not prevail.

The **SPEAKER**: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Bath, Mrs. Moffatt.

Mrs. **MOFFATT**: Mr. Speaker, I was sort of waiting for the other nine members of the Committee on Education to explain their position on it, but, in order to save time, I will start off, with the reservation that when I finish they pick it up

and I will have one more chance at it.

Legislative Document 525 is a very innocent-looking document. It costs no money, as you see it now. It says: "Two or more towns co-operatively may acquire property and construct, extend, enlarge, repair and maintain school projects on a common site when the plan for locating, owning, operating, administering and financing said project has been approved by each participating town and by the state board of education." That is all well and good.

We are somewhat back toward our area school bill. It does not say in here that this can very easily turn into a "shall" proposition; it does not state here that it is a beautiful club that a large city or town may hold over a small town.

In discussing and arguing on the area school bill when I was here in the Legislature in 1945, we had much the same proposition. They said it was permissive. But in looking into it, trying to get to the bottom of it, I found some very interesting answers. I asked: What would happen in case some towns did get together and build a school and in a few years' time one of those towns should have a new industry, an increase in population and were able to support their own school? At first I was told I should not ask the question. But I insisted upon an answer. Members, take this answer and weigh it carefully, because that is the answer to this bill before you today. It will be just too bad. The school will have been built, the towns will be in on their agreement, and as long as that school stands no town that was ever in on the building or the financing at the first part of it will receive one cent of state money for any school it wants to run or build in its town.

Now I think we had an answer to that question the other day in the House when we voted upon reapportionment. We were not willing to say at that time and admit that Maine was at a point where it was not progressing, that our towns would never increase in population. You are back to the same thing on this bill here.

I understand that the bill was drawn up as an enabling act for three towns. With that I have no argument at all. If three towns or five towns want to come here and ask permission to enter into any bargain or any agreement, that is all well and good with me; and if the member who put in this bill wants to put in a bill or amend this in such a way that it brings it down to those three towns, it will be perfectly all right with me; but I am heartily opposed to any legislation which will give a larger town or a city the right to force other towns into any educational agreement. I think it is unfair to the towns, and it is definitely unfair to our children.

The farther you take education away from the child, the fewer children you are going to have educated because education to your youngsters in high school is not very important, in grammar school it is less important, and many of them are looking for a very good excuse to drop out of school. If they are forced to exert themselves a little and their parents have to exert themselves a little, too many times the exertion is not made. That is why I am opposed to this bill. It looks very innocent, but I would hate very much to see it go on the books because I know what larger places try to do sometimes.

We had a rather bitter experience of it down near my home a while ago where a city tried to force the town to allow the money that it might get from the Federal government to go in to the city. It sent letters out to all of the towns who were sending children into our city and said, "If you do not allow us to count those children as pupils in our schools you cannot send them here any more." And that was right down in black and white. I do not think that is fair; I do not think that is what our Legislature wants.

Rather than carry on the same theme, I will wait, and, if necessary, get up and say a little bit more on it; but I certainly hope that this bill as it is now is indefinitely postponed. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Friendship, Mr. Winchenpaw.

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker, I hate to oppose the gentleman from Bath (Mrs. Moffatt) on this bill, but, as I see it, it is a very harmless bill and there are only two or three small towns that are interested in it: South Paris and Norway, two or three small towns over in that section. They had the plan of a building practically all drawn up. Neither of those towns really felt as though they could afford a large gymnasium or auditorium, so they were going to build a central gymnasium and have wings on the building so they could still keep their identity as South Paris High School or Norway High School or whatever they chose to call it.

Now I believe this Legislature has already passed a bill giving Brunswick permission to build a high school for Topsham and Harpswell. I believe that has already gone through, and, for one, I am glad that nobody jumped on that one, and I see no reason for jumping on this. It costs no money and it is not very much different from a school district bill except that the school building might be built in Norway with South Paris owning a share in it or vice versa.

As I understand it, we have gone into this thing very thoroughly and we have found out that some towns own gravel pits in other towns or they own waterholes or reservoirs. Some towns may own a reservoir that is ten miles away in another town. This bill simply gives a town permission to own a school building in another town if they care to do that. I certainly hope the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mrs. Moffatt, does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Paris, Mr. Stewart.

Mr. STEWART: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I had not realized that this bill was so full of dynamite. I still do not think it is. The bill was drawn by Mr. Ladd at the request of Dr. Merrill of South Paris, who originated the campus school plan. At Dr. Merrill's request, I presented the bill and then forgot about it and did not attend the hearings. Whether



or not South Paris or Norway ever have a campus school, Dr. Merrill is very much interested in this plan. I think that there is money available for some communities in Maine through the Rockefeller Foundation, and Dr. Merrill wants this legislation on the statutes so that two or more towns can, if they choose, get together to operate this campus school. I therefore hope that the motion of the gentlewoman from Bath, Mrs. Moffatt, to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Bath, Mrs. Moffatt.

Mrs. MOFFATT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think that simply by reading the bill many of you will begin to ask quite a few questions. "Two or more towns may acquire property," and so on and so forth, "after it has been approved by each participating town and the State Board of Education." All right. Who is going to control the school? Who is going to run the school? Now at least the area school bill was more definite and possibly a little more fair than this one, because in the area school bill it said that each town that was interested would have at least one person on a board to help run it.

I think we have one of two things facing us in this bill: either we are going to take this bill which is, they say, for about three towns, and let them set it up there if they want to, which is all right with me, or we are going to take this bill and write it on your books and allow any place in the State of Maine to have this. Then, after you have it on your books, somewhere along the way you are going to have a meeting and decide who is going to control. Now I think that when we have bills put in here we should have it right down in black and white, because that is the only thing we have to go on. You can only rule and regulate by what is said on the paper; you cannot take what a few people had in their minds when they drew it up, because probably each one of the people who drew it up would have a different idea in their mind. Are these other towns which in the future could be forced into this thing going to have any-

thing to say about it or not? Who is going to hire the teachers? Who is going to decide upon the courses? All the teachers are going to be in one town. Who is going to be the governing board? Is it going to be the State Department of Education or are they going to have it down on the local level? I am just trying to get down to something fair.

Now the gentleman from Friendship, Mr. Winchenpaw, has said that Brunswick already has one of these and no one said anything. I won't say anything if you bring it right down and say what town is going to have it.

Another reason that I am very much interested is due to the fact that when this was brought up before they had already been over the State — they did not want to admit it, but it is true — they had already been over the State and decided where these schools were going to be. The locations are all picked out and there is not anything you can say about it.

Now down in my end of the State children are going to be taken from the town that I vote and live in and they are going to be transported by bus about twenty or twenty-five miles. This governing board is going to say, "Georgetown, you bring in so much money; Phippsburg, you bring in so much money; Arrowsic, you bring in so much money." Are you not going to have much the same thing right here?

All I ask of you, members, is to read L. D. 525. What do you have? It may be permissive, but what is it permitting? Is it permitting something that you members want permitted? Do you want to put something on the books that is going to take the authority away from the small towns providing schools in the small towns? I certainly hope not.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Island Falls, Mr. Crabtree.

Mr. CRABTREE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I hesitate to take up time on this matter because I do not think it is so terrifically important, and I also dislike to oppose my good friend, the gentlewoman from Bath, Mrs. Moffatt; but neither do I like to see us try to make a rattlesnake out

of a hoptoad. If Town "A" and town "B" and town "C", through their town governments decide they want to get together and build a school, I can see no harm in it. I have not any strong convictions one way or another about this bill, but, after careful consideration, I cannot see any harm in it. I hope the motion to indefinitely postpone fails, and I also hope that this will end the discussion.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is on the motion of the gentlewoman from Bath, Mrs. Moffatt, that "An Act Relating to Joint Operations of Schools" (H. P. 883) (L. D. 525) be indefinitely postponed.

All those in favor of the gentlewoman's motion that the act be indefinitely postponed will say aye; those opposed, no.

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

The SPEAKER: This bill having had its three several readings in the House and having been passed to be engrossed and having had its three several readings in the Senate and having been passed to be engrossed and the Committee on Engrossed bills having reported that it is truly and strictly engrossed, is it now the pleasure of the House that it be passed to be enacted?

The motion prevailed and the bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

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

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, in view of other attractions which seem to

be drawing heavily on attendance, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER: The Chair at this time would like to appoint the conferees on the disagreeing action with the other branch on three matters:

On the disagreeing action on Bill "An Act Relating to Importation of Poisonous Snakes" (H. P. 327) (L. D. 187) the Chair appoints the following conferees:

The gentlewoman from Bath, Mrs. Moffatt,

The gentleman from Island Falls, Mr. Crabtree,

The gentleman from Hebron, Mr. Bearce.

On the disagreeing action on Bill "An Act Relating to Her Own Business Program" (H. P. 1233) (L. D. 786) the Chair appoints the following conferees:

The gentlewoman from Bath, Mrs. Moffatt,

The gentleman from Dixmont, Mr. Jacoby,

The gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer.

On the disagreeing action on Bill "An Act relating to Fishing Licenses for Boys and Girls Camps" (H. P. 1410) (L. D. 1018) the Chair appoints the following conferees:

The gentleman from Harrison, Mr. Davis,

The gentleman from Gorham, Mr. Sanborn,

The gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Brown.

The Clerk will read the notices.

On motion of Mr. Chase of Cape Elizabeth,

Adjourned until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.