

# 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

VOLUME II

1951

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

**HOUSE**

Monday, May 21, 1951.

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

Prayer by Rev. Mr. Squires of Hallowell.

The members stood at attention during the playing of the National Anthem.

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

The SPEAKER: Senate Papers in the First Reading with accompanying Bills and Resolves.

There are none.

Messages and Documents from Executives and Heads of Departments.

There are none.

Reception of Petitions, Bills and Resolves Requiring Reference to any committee.

There are none.

**Orders**

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

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, I introduce an order and move its passage, and after it has been read and distributed I should like to speak to the order.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, presents an order and moves its passage.

The Clerk will read the order.

ORDERED, that it is the considered judgment of the House that such General Fund Appropriation Bills as have been passed or enacted by this Legislature for the next biennium are not in excess of estimated General Fund Revenue, and it is further ordered that the Commissioner of Finance in his accounting determinations so establish the final General Fund tabulations as to indicate a balanced General Fund Budget.

The SPEAKER: The Pages will distribute the reproduction of the order.

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

gentlemen were permitted to remove their coats.

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

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, very late in the last legislative day there came to the House an order to which I objected. As all matters are in the closing days of the legislative session, it bore some of the marks of hasty preparation, and it seemed to say on its face to anyone who was a stranger to the situation and who read this order alone, that the Maine Legislature had appropriated considerably more money than it had raised, and that in order to justify that extravagance the Legislature was ordering the State official to revise his estimates of revenue. This order, on my motion, was defeated.

The order which I have introduced is in the customary form and is similar to an order which was passed by the Senate at the last legislative session.

It is a fact known to us here that the estimates for the biennium show that we should have for the biennium a surplus of receipts over expenditures of about two million dollars, whereas the order to which I have just referred would indicate to a stranger reading it that we were in the red about \$1,200,000. Now the difference in the picture given to the public of \$3,200,000 is pretty substantial, and it seemed to me that in our action we ought to give the public a true picture of the situation, and it is for this reason I have introduced this order today in the usual form, and I move its passage.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the order receive a passage?

Thereupon, a viva voce vote being taken, the House voted that the order receive passage.

Mr. DELAHANTY of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. DELAHANTY: For the purpose of speaking on the order.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is sorry. The vote has been taken.

Mr. DELAHANTY: I move then, Mr. Speaker, that we reconsider the passage of the order.

(Mr. Delahanty was granted unanimous consent to address the House.)

Mr. DELAHANTY: It appears, Mr. Speaker, that in the supplemental budget that was passed there was an indication that: "Whenever it appears to the commissioner of finance that the anticipated income of the state will not be sufficient to meet the expenditures authorized by the legislature he shall so report to the governor and council and they may curtail allotments so that expenditures will not exceed the anticipated income." I find that in this order it is further ordered, as part of the order "that the Commissioner of Finance in his accounting determinations so establish the final General Fund tabulations as to indicate a balanced General Fund Budget."

It appears that these two methods of procedure are inconsistent in that the order that we have just considered deletes from the previous order that we turned down in this House the so-called "magic formula" sum of \$600,000. I feel that we are left in the same position, Mr. Speaker, as we were in the consideration of the other order that this House previously turned down.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair understand that the gentleman withdraws his motion to reconsider?

Mr. DELAHANTY: I do not withdraw the motion, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Delahanty, that the House reconsider its action whereby it just passed the order under consideration.

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

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

Mr. Dorsey of Fairfield, presented the following order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that the House give Representative Bubar his office

equipment consisting of an ancient typewriter, the wastebasket he has used to gather "her apples" in, and a Chair which Old Noah sat in when he sailed the Ark.

These ancient relics were all hauled into the House on the night of the "Mock Session," when we razed Bubar about his "Rat Tax." He took it all in good grace and with a smile. Let him have the ancient equipment to pass on to his grandchildren as a souvenir. We should give the gentleman from Blaine a rising vote of appreciation for his kindly spirit and good will which he has manifested throughout the entire session.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the order receive a passage? All those in favor will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the order received passage.

The SPEAKER: According to the order the House will give the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar, a rising vote.

Whereupon, the members rose and applauded.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar.

Mr. BUBAR: Mr. Speaker and Honorable Members: I don't know as I want to make a speech over this wastebasket, that old typewriter that has bucked up on me so many times and the chair with the broken leg, but I would like to say this: I would like to give you the reason why we are here today. You may not agree with me, but I am satisfied that I know why we are here today.

Two years ago, when Paul and I left this House, on Sunday morning, we met the people going to worship on Sunday morning. Well, you know that I promised the Lord that if I returned to the 95th Legislature I would not remain to pass laws on the Sabbath Day. I intended to keep my part of the bargain.

At the beginning of this session we enacted a rule that we would not remain in this House to transact business later than 9 o'clock in the evening at any time, but Saturday night we repealed that order by a two-thirds majority vote.

I spoke to many of the members here and suggested that we adjourn

at twelve and not try to do business on the Sabbath, which procedure is certainly illegal, but without success; I couldn't seem to get any help. However, I remembered my promise to the Lord and when the hands of that clock reached twelve, I left this House and went to my room.

I went home, and Ladies and Gentlemen, I couldn't sleep, and I began to pray, and I prayed, that God would adjourn this Legislature and bring us back on Monday. You can think of it as you have a mind to, but I wrestled with God like Old Jacob did with the Angel and finally I went to sleep. In the morning the first news that came to me was: "The Legislature adjourned until Monday."

That, Ladies and Gentlemen, is why we are here today. Because our God hears and answers prayer and he shapes and rules the destinies of men and nations.

Now we can return to our homes with all the dignity due this Legislature which enacts laws to govern the highest and greatest Christian State in the Union.

I want to repeat these lines from Kipling, which has long been one of my mottoes:

"If you can keep your head when  
all about you  
Are losing theirs and blaming  
it on you;  
If you can trust yourself when  
all men doubt you,  
But make allowance for their  
doubting too;  
If you can wait and not be tired  
of waiting,  
Or, being lied about, don't deal  
in lies,  
Or being hated don't give way to  
hating,  
And yet, don't look too good, nor  
talk too wise,  
If you can bear to hear the truth  
you've spoken  
Twisted by knaves to make a  
trap for fools,  
Or watch the things you gave your  
life to, broken,  
And stoop and build 'em up with  
outworn tools;  
If you can fill the unforgiven  
minute  
With sixty seconds' worth of  
distance run,

Yours is the Earth and everything  
that's in it,

And, which is more, you'll be  
a man, my son."

I want to thank you all for the old typewriter and that old wornout basket that has been jumped on a good many times, and the chair with the broken leg. Thank you. (Prolonged applause, the members rising).

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Damariscotta, Mr. Gay.

Mr. GAY: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a moment with the members of the House.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. GAY: For twenty weeks we have been associated with each other here, and often the times have been trying and many times the issues have been humorous. But in every event we have simply spoken that which was upon our minds, trusting that our judgment in the decisions would be correct for the vast majority of the citizens of the State of Maine.

We have had calendars upon which appeared the deer, the porcupine, the worm, muskrats and snakes. That could easily have been referred to as a zoological one. These subjects have been exceedingly trying at times and often our nerves have been extremely frayed to the point of exhaustion and breaking, but we have refrained from ugly words, we have refrained from actions which would not be actions of kindness to one another, and I think we have exemplified at that time and with that spirit the spirit of an American Democracy, and I am sure that today, as we depart from the presence of each other, we are carrying to our respective homes in our hearts a respect and a love for our fellowmen.

I would like to say that when you people pass through the small coastal town of Damariscotta, that I sincerely trust that you will make it a point of coming to my home or to my place of business, that I can shake hands with you again and perpetuate that friendship that should be so lasting. Thank you. (Applause).

The SPEAKER: The next matter of business is Reports of Committees.

There are none.

First Reading of Bills and Resolves printed under the Rules.

There are none.

Bills and Resolves reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading and on their passage to be engrossed.

There are none.

#### Orders of the Day

The SPEAKER: The House will recess until the sound of the gong.

After Recess 3:07 P. M. (E.S.T.)

Called to Order by the Speaker.  
**Veto Message**

The following Communication:

State of Maine  
Office of the Governor  
Augusta

May 21, 1951

To the Honorable Senate and  
House of Representatives  
95th Legislature

There is returned herewith, without my approval, Legislative Document No. 194, "An Act Relating to Exemption from Taxation."

This is a veto of an amendment to chapter 81, section 6, paragraph X taking away certain tax exemptions provided for by preceding legislatures.

Prior to 1919 the sole tax exemptions provided for veterans applied to poll taxes for Civil War Veterans. The veterans of World War I were mainly interested in exemptions for the older veterans at first and as economic conditions arose the field was broadened to cover cases where veterans reached the age of 62 years or were totally disabled.

In the large majority of our states special tax exemptions for veterans have been in order for many years. So, Maine is no exception.

It would seem that if the legislature in times past, with full knowledge of the facts, provided certain tax exemptions for veterans, that, while within the realm of potential action, a succeeding legislature should be slow to effect a change in

a law having an origin of patriotic motives.

I am withholding my approval of this Act for the following specific reasons:

1. The Act denies exemption on all property other than "residence."
2. There is reason for grave doubt as to whether the widow of a man who was killed in action would be exempt under this Act.
3. Section X-B of the bill obligates the State to spend money on refunds to the towns and cities in 1953 for which there are now no funds in sight. It also sets a precedent for the towns and cities to ask for refunds on exemptions granted to benevolent and charitable institutions, literary and scientific institutions, property owned by the veterans organizations, chambers of commerce, the American Red Cross, church property and the estates of all Indians.
4. With approximately 16,000 young men and women from Maine now in the armed forces either in combat or in training, some of whom may today be called upon to make the supreme sacrifice, it does not seem like an appropriate time to take away benefits previously granted to our veterans.

I have confidence that where veterans have so unselfishly looked after the welfare of their own needy and disabled comrades, and where their representatives have so well guided the thoughts of state and federal legislative bodies on veterans' problems for so many years, these same veterans and their leaders will in due course solve what may be considered a current problem relating to tax exemptions, if there is any. In my opinion this subject is not in the problem stage yet, and when it is I feel it will be faced squarely.

I therefore do not approve this Act.

Respectfully submitted,  
FREDERICK G. PAYNE  
Governor of Maine

The message was read and placed on file.

The SPEAKER: This bill having been returned by the Governor together with his objections to the same, the question is: Shall this bill become law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor?

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

Mr. PERRY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Naturally I feel somewhat perturbed about a bill that not only myself but a lot of other people had a vital interest in, for it to get as far as it has gotten, going through the House and the Senate Saturday with no dissenting vote of any kind and a committee of conference, should now come back by its being vetoed.

So far as I can see now, in the particular bill, there are no changes in the bill but what was on the statutes or on the laws before this Legislature came into effect, except changing one word from "estates" to residence, and any argument that it should not be changed to "residence" of course leaves me cold. The mere fact, as I have stated on the floor of this House here before, that there are veterans who own homes, not only in one but two and three towns and they are getting tax exemption on all these homes. The original law which was put on the statutes and the original intent of the law gave the veteran the exemption on his home, or his residence, which was the word that was used in the original law. The word "estates" was put in several years later for the simple reason evidently that the veterans did want to be exempt on everything they owned, on homes in one, two or three towns, summer homes and what have you. But I maintain the original law did not intend that, it did not grant that.

The only other change in the law is the 62-year provision that I wanted taken out of the law and which the House passed here, stating that any veteran at the age of 62 would be exempt for \$3500 from taxes whether he needed it or not. To me it was a matter of fairness that it should come out and be placed on need. I maintain that any and all veterans who

fought in any war fought for the privilege of living in this country and living in a condition of fair play. I see no fair play of any kind to a veteran at the age of 62, financially well off, to be tax exempt when he could be paying and letting some father and mother of a World War II veteran, buried overseas, or father or mother who is not a father of a veteran but unable to even take their children to a movie on a Saturday night dig in and pay the taxes for a gentleman who is able to spend his winters in Florida or some other place. That is the condition that prevails in the particular law and I want to point out that that was not changed, even though I objected, the committee of conference left that in the law and its is just the same. So there is no change in that part of it at all.

I talked with Mr. McGlauffin. He came to me yesterday morning and pointed out that he thought he could go along with this bill now; that it was perfectly all right and he is one of the gentlemen of the House who objected to it before. In the other branch, the gentleman who was objecting to the bill most strenuously was put on the committee of conference with us, on which we worked a couple of hours with the able help of him and the committee of conference from the House, put back into the law almost everything that was in it except as to one feature, in the year of 1953 the plan on putting on the State level these tax exemptions. Practically everybody here in the House who spoke against the bill have inferred to me that that is what they wanted. Now, if this is put onto the State level, I see no reason then why the veterans, themselves, would be as apt to lose the exemptions they have because at that particular time there would be an equalization between the towns and one town wouldn't be giving 10, 15 or 20 per cent of taxes and another town one-half of one per cent as is going on today.

As Mr. McGlauffin said, the original intent of the law, in his opinion, was to give the veterans a bonus and I don't think that he or anyone else intended that the

bonus should be handed out at the local level, given from the towns.

And in the added section that is put on here—I am sorry it is so late in the session to try to discuss this measure because I know everybody has taken the legislative documents, this particular number, out and haven't anything to go by but the section says: "With respect to such total exemptions granted under the provisions of Sections 10 and 10-A." Now, these are the two sections that give the veterans tax exemptions, "as are in excess of two per cent of the total town valuation of any town, the treasurer of the state upon certification of the state tax assessor shall reimburse such towns for the total tax exemptions as are represented by exemptions that are in excess of two per cent of the total town valuation. This state reimbursement shall be paid in December of each year first beginning with 1953, upon certification of such tax exemption data as the state tax assessor may require of the towns." That boils down to this: This added amendment refers to nothing in any way, shape or manner except to the veterans. It does not require the State of Maine to reimburse any state, city or town the full amount of tax exemption, only those above the total valuation of two per cent. In other words, we are told right now that the total tax exemption is one-half of one per cent. The experts feel that the total exemption average over the State will not go over two per cent. Therefore, two per cent was put in here because that will be the average and there won't be too many towns supposedly go over it. But for the towns like Kittery, York and Chelsea and other towns which have gone up to ten and twelve per cent, and in the town of Chelsea we will be going up in another couple of years to twenty or twenty-five per cent, those towns will be equalized down to the point of two per cent, so they will be giving and they are willing to give the same as every other town in the State of Maine, but they do not feel that it is fair to let them, because of geographical circumstances, forgive a total amount of

sometimes up to fifty per cent of the valuation.

As I said, the only change in the particular law that would affect the World War I veterans on this law that is effective and in effect right now is changing the one word from "estates" to "residence" and in 1953 put on the State level and by 1953, if the next Legislature coming in deems it advisable to take it away and give it back to the towns, that is ample time to do it before it comes into effect. We on the conference committee assumed that this was a way to get it started so that the equalization would take place and I sincerely hope that the opposition that the bill did have—in talking with the individual members now, as you know, Mr. McGlaufflin spoke on it to quite an extent, he was against it, but he said that he was satisfied with it, yesterday morning, and also some of the people who spoke against it the same way and therefore, in fairness to everybody concerned, the towns, and the veterans and so forth we have done this particular thing, we are not losing too much—I sincerely hope that when the vote is taken that they are still in favor of adopting this particular bill. Thank you.

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

Mr. McGLAUFFLIN: Mr. Speaker, it is true that after you have completely killed the bill for which I fought so hard, I was pleased to have it come out so the veterans weren't thrown out. I did tell Mr. Perry that I thought that was a much better bill that finally came out than I expected to see and that I, at that time, had no intention of objecting to its passage.

However, there are objections to this bill which the Governor has clearly pointed out and I, for one, shall go along with the Governor's veto.

In the first place, it provides, as Mr. Perry says, that the residences are exempt and the residences only while the law has been for years that it was the estate. It makes this difference: A person might have a shop; I can think of a shoemaker who has a little shop,



he doesn't own his own home. He has to rent. He gets no exemption under the law as we passed it. A person might have a little store that he owns, or it might be a barn or something other than a residence.

In the law that was passed in 1935, I think it was, they provided that they couldn't get exemption unless they occupied the premises. That wasn't fair either because there was, at that time, quite a number of Civil War Veterans' widows who had become so old that they couldn't live by themselves, who had some little house that they got a little income from, but they didn't get anything there.

The Governor has pointed out two things that I think you should consider. One is, that there is no appropriation for the State to take care of the excess of 2 per cent. I do approve of that part of the bill that throws the burden, to some extent, on the State. I think that Mr. Dow and some of the others made a good point when they said that this, although it was a bonus, it was a bonus which the State ought to pay and not the towns, and I think that is true. Nevertheless, this isn't the session to pass this matter at this late date, if there is no appropriation to take care of the excess of the 2 per cent.

The Governor, in his message, points out another thing, and I think this is important. He says that this has been of long standing and, while I am not using just his words, I get the idea that veterans, especially World War I veterans who have known that this law stood on the statute books for many years, have believed that they were entitled to that exemption when they became sixty-two years of age; and it looks a little bit as though the State was renegeing upon what to them seemed a promise in the future.

I also believe the Governor in his statement that this is a poor time to make this change when we have men who are fighting in Korea and laying down their lives daily, and who would naturally suppose that their widow if they have one, would get the benefit of this

law. I therefore hope that the Governor's veto will be sustained.

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am in full sympathy with the gentleman from Chelsea, my comrade, Mr. Perry, and I think the case is pretty well covered by the message returned from the Governor. I have considered and talked this bill over with the Attorney General. There are some flaws in the bill. A man might own a home, a farm, which is his home: his home is on one side of the road and most of the farm that he tills for his living is on the other side of the road. There is a question in the Attorney General's mind whether the residence on that side of the road would be exempt. And the most pointed thing that the Governor brought out, and I think Judge McGlauffin stated it, was that this is an inopportune time. That bill, as the Attorney General sees it, does not cover the widow of the boy who is fighting today for us in Korea, and that is wrong. Therefore, I hope that the Governor's veto will be sustained, and when the vote is taken I shall vote no on the motion.

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

Mr. SPEAR: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have talked on this before, but I think when amendments to the bill were written that more thought was given to the town of Chelsea than was given to the veteran. Not that the veteran was not considered in this matter, but I do not think that he was given enough consideration. As I said before, I think the bill and the amendments are poorly written, and even the report of the committee of conference.

I just want to call your attention to one thing here. It is a difficult thing for me to explain, but there is a difference as far as the veteran is concerned in the words "pension" and "compensation." Even the old law does not adequately cover that. If a veteran is disabled by non-service-connected disability he draws a pension. If a veteran is

disabled because of a service-connected disability he draws compensation. The widow of a veteran who dies from a non-service-connected disability is entitled to a pension, but the widow of a veteran who dies of a service-connected disability, if he is tubercular, has coronary trouble or some other disability and he dies of this disability which is service-connected then his widow is entitled to compensation.

So the report comes back here from the committee of conference on L. D. 1411, and the old law read—this is only regarding the polls, and the polls is a small matter, but I just want to interpret it to you the best I can. It says, "The polls of all disabled veterans of World Wars I and II, namely soldiers, sailors and marines who are receiving pension or retirement pay or compensation or vocational training from the United States Government on account of disability incurred in or aggravated by service in World War II"—and then it goes on about the residences and the word "estate" is scratched out. But now they have cut out the word "compensation"—the committee of conference crossed out the words "or compensation," so where it speaks about the veterans of both wars who are receiving pension, retirement pay or compensation or vocational training, the words "or compensation" are crossed out. So that means that a veteran, because of some disability that was not incurred in the line of service, who might have developed arthritis or had some other disability which is not service-connected, he is entitled to exemption from his poll tax; but the veteran who has lost an arm or a leg or has tuberculosis or something like that, a condition which is service-connected or is assumed to have been service-connected, he is not entitled to this. He is drawing compensation, so they have scratched him off. In other words, we are giving consideration to a veteran who has got a non-service-connected disability, but we are saying to the veteran who has a service-connected disability, "We cannot grant you the same consideration."

So there are a lot of veterans who are interested in this: mem-

bers of various organizations, the Spanish War Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Legion, the Disabled American Veterans. I think that consideration should be given to them. Consideration in this draft has been given to one town and that is the town of Chelsea. It has been drawn from the thought that they are being hurt, that their income is curtailed, that their other citizens have to pay increased taxes to take care of the veteran who is exempt from taxation. It only thinks of one town. I think this amendment is poorly thought of, it is poorly written, and I hope we vote to sustain the veto of the Governor.

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

Mr. PERRY: Mr. Speaker, I have just one more brief word that I would like to put forward here. You do not have the document before you. I do not like that. I wish you had it here so you could see it. I want to make sure that you understand.

Judge McGlaulin mentioned in his talk the person who, when he was sixty-two years old, planned on getting his exemption and so forth, and that it was too bad to take it away from him. That is a misstatement, because the sixty-two year provision is there, it never was changed except in the original bill, but right now in this draft the committee of conference left it in, so it is in this bill. I want to bring out again, to make sure you understand, the part of "residence" was in the original bill, the first that was ever passed, and all that a veteran of World War I ever had to plan on was "residence." That is what the original bill stated in emphasis. So far as concerns this being an inopportune time to do anything with the bill, that bothers me by reason of the mere fact that the only change that the World War I veteran is getting in this thing is the changing of the word "estates" to "residences," and the only change is putting it on the State level. And I would think by putting it on the State level in 1953, if we could be successful, it would

be an opportune time to do it, a time when the veteran himself would be entitled to it and be more sure that he was going to continue to get the exemption than to keep it on the lower level of the town. It is a state problem without any argument, in my opinion. The Legislature has passed it, and therefore the Legislature, I think, should take the responsibility to see that it was equalized to a certain extent and put on the State level.

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

Mr. McGLAUFFIN: Mr. Speaker, my reference to the anticipation of veterans had reference to those that had not reached the age of sixty-two years.

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

Mr. DOW: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think Mr. Spear mentioned that this seemed to be principally in the interest of the Town of Chelsea. If that were the only town, I think they should receive some relief. It probably affects but very few towns in the State. I can tell you how it would affect my own town and you can figure out your towns for yourself. My town would still make exemptions up to roughly \$80,000. They probably would not make exemptions more than that amount for a number of years at least, therefore they would receive nothing from the State. If a few towns would pay exemptions far in excess of their two per cent, I think they are entitled to some relief, and I shall go along with the motion of Mr. Perry.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is: Shall this Bill "An Act Relating to Exemption from Taxation" become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor?

The Constitution provides that the vote shall be taken by the yeas and nays. A vote of "Yes" is in favor of the bill; a vote of "No" is in favor of the veto. Is the House ready for the question? The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chair will explain again.

The Chair recognizes the gentle-

man from South Portland, Mr. Spear.

Mr. SPEAR: Mr. Speaker, will you please explain that again. There seems to be a lot of confusion.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is: Shall this Bill "An Act Relating to Exemption for Taxation" become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor. A vote of yes is for the bill, a vote of no is for the Governor's veto. Is the question clear?

The Chair will repeat again: A vote of yes favors the bill; a vote of no favors the Governor's veto. The Clerk will call the roll according to the Constitution.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA—Barton, Bates, Carter; Chase, Belgrade; Chase, Cape Elizabeth; Chase, Whitefield; Clapp, Cote, Couture, Davis Delahanty; Dow, Falmouth; Emerson, Fay, Fenn, Gilman, Gosline, Hall, Hancock, Hand, Hanson, Machiasport; Harding, Hussey, Jacoby, JAlbert, Kelly, Lessard, Lord, Low, Ludwig, Maguire, March, Maxwell, Moulton, Nowell, Parent, Paterson, Perry, Peterson, Philbrook, Robbins, Roundy; Senter, Brunswick; Sinclair, Totman, Turner, Vaughan, Wood.

NAY—Albee, Albert, Archer; Bearce, Caribou; Bearce, Hebron; Berry, Boothby, Bradeen; Brown, Baileyville; Brown, Wayne; Bubar, Bucknam, Burgess, Burkett, Campbell, Carville, Castonguay; Center, Standish; Chaples, Clements, Cobb, Cole, Crabtree, Daggett, Dickey, Dorsey, Dunham, Edwards, Farley, Finnegan, Fogg, Fuller, Bangor; Fuller, South Portland; Gay, Gowell, Hamilton; Hanson, Lebanon; Hawkes, Jacobs, Jones, Keene, Knapp, Lackee, Larabee, Latno, Littlefield, Macomber; Martin, Augusta; McGlauffin, Mofatt, Morneault, O'Dell, Parker, Phillips, Pierce, Plummer, Potter, Ricker, Roberts, Rollins, Spear, Story; Taylor, Lyman; Taylor, Norridgewock; Thomas, Jr.; Travis, Wallace, Walls, West, Winchenpaw, Woodcock, Woodworth.

ABSENT—Bailey; Brown, Robinson; Caswell, DeBeck, Dennison, Dostie; Dow, Eliot; Duquette, Frechette, Gerrish, Hayes, House, Ingraham, Jamieson, Jennings, Lacharite, Leavitt, Letourneau, Lovely, Madore; Martin, Eagle Lake; Martin, Frenchville; Nadeau, Sanborn, Stevens, Stewart, St. Pierre, Watson, Williams.

Yes 48, No 72, Absent 29.

The SPEAKER: Forty-eight having voted in the affirmative and seventy-two in the negative, twenty-

ty-nine being absent, the veto is sustained.

The House will be at recess until the sound of the gong.

### IN RECESS

**After Recess—4:25 P. M. (E. S. T.)**

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

From the Senate: The following Communication:

Hon. Harvey R. Pease  
Clerk of the House of Representatives

95th Maine State Legislature  
Dear Sir:

The Governor of the State, having returned to the Senate "Resolve Providing for Indexing and Filing Old Probate Records" (S. P. 513) (L. D. 1232) with his objections to the same, the Senate proceeded to vote on the question: "Shall the bill become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor?"

A Yea and Nay vote was taken; 23 having voted in the negative and none in the affirmative, the bill failed to become a law.

Respectfully,  
(Signed) Chester T. Winslow,  
Secretary of Senate

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

### House at Ease

Called to order by the Speaker.

At 4:35 P. M. a message came from the Senate borne by Senator Savage of Somerset, informing the House that the Senate had transacted all the business before it and was ready to adjourn without day. (Applause)

On motion of Mr. Chase of Cape Elizabeth, that gentleman was charged with and conveyed a message to the Senate informing that body that the House had transacted all business before it and was ready to adjourn without day.

Subsequently, for the committee, Mr. Chase reported that he had delivered the message with which he was charged, which report was received with thanks by the Speaker on behalf of the House.

### House At Ease

Called to order by the Speaker.

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that a committee of three on the part of the Senate with such as the House may join be appointed to wait upon the Governor and inform him that both branches of the Legislature have acted upon all matters before them and they are ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make. (S. P. 601)

Came from the Senate, in that body read and passed, and the President appointed as members of the committee on the part of the Senate:

Senators:

CROSBY of Franklin  
WEEKS of Cumberland  
KAVANAGH

of Androscoggin.

The order was taken up out of order by unanimous consent, read and passed.

The SPEAKER: In accordance with the order the Chair will appoint the committee to notify the Governor:

Messrs. CHASE of Cape Elizabeth  
BATES of Orono  
LOW of Rockland  
BURGESS of Limestone  
McGLAUFN of Portland  
ARCHER of Brewer  
DELAHANTY of Lewiston

The gentlemen will assemble in the well of the House and proceed with the duty with which they are charged.

Subsequently Mr. Chase, for the Committee, reported that the committee had delivered the message with which it was charged and that a communication from the Governor would be received forthwith, which report was received with thanks by the Speaker on behalf of the House.

### House At Ease

Called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read a communication from the Governor.

To the Honorable Senate  
and House of Representatives  
95th Legislature

There is herewith submitted a tabulation of the results of the 95th Legislature:

Acts approved	535
Resolves approved	187
Vetoes presented	2

The 95th Legislature is deserving of the everlasting gratitude of the peoples of Maine for its forthright approach to and solution of numerous problems of State government.

Few Legislatures in the past have had the complexity of issues which faced this body at the outset of deliberations last January.

You truly represented the people and, in so doing, each and every one of you has kept faith with them.

You met issues fairly and squarely, and solved them realistically, always having the welfare of the majority at heart.

It is not an easy task to adopt a major tax measure, for no person likes taxation in any form. Yet, this 95th Legislature was equal to the challenge of providing for our children, the aged, the sick and the needy. Your decision to enact a Sales Tax guarantees that there will be no decrease in assistance which we, the State, now afford those less fortunate than ourselves.

By enacting legislation to remove the State from the property tax field, you took a forward step. By your decision, municipalities in the near future will be enabled to establish sound values on property for purposes of taxation. Resultant income will provide the means to improve government on the local level.

You held the line well in not undertaking, at this time, new and expanded services of government which would further increase operational costs, during a period when more and more of our resources are being mobilized at the National level.

Many projects before you had merit, but your decision to consider only those deemed essential and vital to the progress of our State at this time was noteworthy.

The major steps taken by this 95th Legislature, including approval of the Sales Tax, removal of the State from the property tax field and providing for the early improvement of our highways, constitute the most constructive and progressive approach to problems

of government since adoption of the Administrative Code in 1931.

It will of course take time to properly evaluate results of your action, but we can note with satisfaction that the 95th Legislature was not lacking in courage to solve a problem, once the problem was placed before you.

Unless major emergencies arise, you and I shall not have cause to be working together again as a legislative-executive team, yet it is my hope that in the days and years ahead we shall retain the friendships formed here as we jointly approached many difficult issues.

You may be sure that the laws you and prior legislative bodies have enacted will be administered honestly and fairly. It shall continue to be my aim to effect all possible economies and efficiencies during the remainder of my term.

It indeed has been a privilege to work with this 95th Legislature. Each and every one of you has my heartfelt thanks for a good job well done. This I say in the name of the good people of our great State.

Mrs. Payne joins me in thanking you for the many courtesies extended us and we wish you a safe return home with good health and happiness for you and yours in the years ahead.

Respectfully submitted,  
(signed)

Frederick G. Payne  
FREDERICK G. PAYNE  
Governor of Maine.

At the conclusion of the reading of the communication the members rose and applauded.

The Communication was ordered placed on file.

Mr. McGLAUFLIN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that this House extend a vote of thanks to the Governor for his final message.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauflin, moves that the House extend a vote of thanks to the Governor for his final message. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Machiasport, Mr. Hanson.

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move that this House do now adjourn sine die.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Machiasport, Mr. Hanson, the eldest member of the House, moves that this House do now ad-

journal without day. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and at 4:47 P. M., Eastern Standard Time, Monday, May 21st, the Speaker declared the House adjourned without day.