

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-Seventh Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

VOLUME II

1955

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Thursday, April 21, 1955

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Nelson E. Felch of Baptist Church, Freeport.

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

The gentlewoman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, presented the following Order out or order and under suspension of the rules and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that Richard Crandall of Presque Isle be appointed Page for the remainder of this week.

The Order was read and passed.

Papers from the Senate Senate Reports of Committees Ought Not to Pass

Report of the Committee on Retirements and Pensions reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Service Retirement Benefits for Employees at State Prison" (S. P. 416) (L. D. 1177) as it is covered by other legislation.

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

Ought Not to Be Adopted Tabled

Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought not to be adopted" on Joint Resolution Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States Relative to the Treaty Making Power (S. P. 188) (L. D. 440)

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed.

In the House: Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Couture of Bath, the Report with accompanying Joint Resolution was tabled pending acceptance.)

Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment

Report of the Committee on Natural Resources on Bill "An Act relating to Interstate Water Pollution Control" (S. P. 450) (L. D. 1242) 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, the 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. 450, L. D. 1242, Bill "An Act relating to Interstate Water Pollution Control."

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

Further amend said Bill, in Article V, line 20, by striking out the underlined words "of the Commission" and inserting in place thereof the underlined words 'to the Commission'

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

'Sec. 2. Appropriation. There is hereby appropriated from the general fund of the State the sum of \$650 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956 and the sum of \$650 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957 to carry out the purposes of Section 6 of Chapter 79-A of the Revised Statutes of 1954.'

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

Non-Concurrent Matter Tabled Until Later in the Day

Joint Resolution Memorializing Congress to Pass Joint Resolution Designating the Fourth Saturday in August of Each Year as "Children's Day in Sports" (H. P. 1203) (L. D. 1473) which was referred to the Committee on Judiciary in the House on April 15.

Came from the Senate adopted without reference to a committee in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. MCGLAULIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This was a proposed memorial that was

introduced by the gentleman from Bridgton (Mr. Haughn) who asked to have it referred to the Judiciary Committee. This matter went to the other side of the building. They decided that a memorial did not require any reference to any committee and without any further consideration whatever, they passed it. Now, I made it clear a day or two ago that I was opposed to these ill-considered memorials to Congress. This memorial is something that I know nothing about. I venture to say that none of you know anything about it and isn't it perfectly ridiculous for us to be memorializing Congress on something we do not know anything about? I move the indefinite postponement of the Joint Resolution.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlaufflin, moves that the Joint Resolution be indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

Mr. CHARLES: Mr. Speaker, I move that this be set aside until later in the session. This measure was proposed by the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn. He is not present here at the present time and I would like to give him that courtesy.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Charles, moves that this Joint Resolution be laid on the table pending the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlaufflin, that it be indefinitely postponed and be taken up later in today's session. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Joint Resolution was so tabled.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve Authorizing Aroostook County Commissioners to Compensate Tax Collector in Township 17, Range 5 (H. P. 690) (L. D. 758) on which the Resolve was substituted for the "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee on Towns and Counties and passed to be engrossed on April 8.

Came from the Senate with the Report and Resolve recommitted to

the Committee on Towns and Counties in non-concurrence.

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve in favor of Chester Fredericks of Norridgewock (H. P. 183) (L. D. 1457) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on April 14.

Came from the Senate recommitted to the Committee on Claims in non-concurrence.

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

Non-Concurrent Matter Tabled

An Act Providing for Compensation for Members of the Board of Education of the City of Rockland (S. P. 423) (L. D. 1169) which was passed to be enacted in the House on April 14, and passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" on April 7.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Rockland, Miss Lawry.

Miss LAWRY: Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Stilphen, is not in the House at the present time, I would ask that this matter be tabled.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Rockland, Miss Lawry, moves that this matter be tabled pending further consideration. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Bill was so tabled.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry if I may at this time off the record or on the record.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will inquire if the matter refers to an item of reconsideration?

Mr. TOTMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, it does not refer to anything on the calendar.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would request the gentleman to kindly defer until later in the morning.

Mr. TOTMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I beg the Chair's pardon but I think the business of the House would be interfered with unless this —

The SPEAKER: The Chair would request the gentleman to kindly approach the rostrum.

(Conference at rostrum)

(Off Record Remarks by Mr. Totman)

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Preference in State Purchases for Products Raised or Manufactured in State" (H. P. 924) (L. D. 1032) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" in the House on March 30.

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

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

From the Senate: The following Communication:

STATE OF MAINE
SENATE CHAMBER
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

April 19, 1955

Hon. Harvey R. Pease
Clerk of the House of Representatives
Ninety-seventh Legislature

Sir:

The President today appointed the following conferees on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on the following Bill: "An Act relating to Legislative Research Committee" (S. P. 446) (L. D. 1238)

Senators:

SINCLAIR of Somerset

REID of Kennebec
BOUCHER of Androscoggin

Respectfully,

(Signed) CHESTER T. WINSLOW
Secretary of Senate

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

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

Orders

On motion of Mr. Childs of Portland, it was

ORDERED, that Mr. Earles of South Portland be excused from attendance for the remainder of this week because of illness.

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

Mr. CHARLES: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, has arrived and I wish at this time to—

The SPEAKER: The Chair would request the gentleman to kindly defer until the end of today's calendar of assigned matters.

House Reports of Committees Leave to Withdraw

Mr. MacDonald from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to Teacher's Oath and Prohibited Teaching" (H. P. 1068) (L. D. 1256) reported Leave to Withdraw.

Mr. Rich from the Committee on Liquor Control reported same on Bill "An Act to Provide for Licenses for Employees of Liquor Licensees" (H. P. 927) (L. D. 1035)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: At this time, the Chair requests the Sergeant-at-Arms to escort the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Shaw, to the rostrum for the purpose of presiding as Speaker pro tem.

Thereupon, Mr. Shaw assumed the Chair as Speaker pro tem amid the applause of the House and

Speaker Trafton retired from the Hall.

House at Ease

Called to order by the Speaker pro tem.

Mr. Woodworth from the Committee on Towns and Counties reported "Leave to Withdraw" on Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of Sheriff of Somerset County" (H. P. 1021) (L. D. 1161)

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Pike from the Committee on Business Legislation reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Sale of Goods and Merchandise Other Than at Retail" (H. P. 1061) (L. D. 1249)

Miss Cormier from the Committee on Retirements and Pensions reported same on Resolve Providing for State Pension for George Beulieu of Madawaska (H. P. 229)

Same member from same Committee reported same on Resolve Providing for State Pension for Victor James of Princeton (H. P. 241) (L. D. 295) which was recommitted.

Same member from same Committee reported same on Resolve Providing for State Pension for Myrtle Conant of Warren (H. P. 320)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Tabled

Miss Cormier from the Committee on Retirements and Pensions reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Granting a Pension to Katharine M. Rolfe of Bridgton (H. P. 388) which was recommitted.

Report was read.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn.

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I move at this time that this be laid on the table unassigned to give me a little further time for investigation on it.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, moves that the Report with accompanying Resolve be tabled

pending acceptance. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Report with accompanying Resolve was so tabled.

Miss Cormier from the Committee on Retirements and Pensions reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Providing for State Pension for Galon Fogg of Wynn (H. P. 391)

Same member from same Committee reported same on Resolve Providing for State Pension for Roland Shaw of Farmingdale (H. P. 553)

Mr. Lindsay from same Committee reported same on Resolve Providing for an Increase in State Pension for Eddie Ouellette of St. Francis Plantation (H. P. 681)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve Providing for State Pension for Helen Daigle of New Canada (H. P. 719)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve Increasing Pension of Howard C. Hatch of Wells (H. P. 757)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Tabled

Mr. Lindsay from the Committee on Retirements and Pensions reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Providing for an Increase in State Pension for Bertha Hodge of Mechanic Falls (H. P. 845)

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Albert of Augusta, the Report with accompanying Resolve was tabled pending acceptance.)

Mr. Shaw from the Committee on Retirements and Pensions reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve in favor of Walter E. Dow of Washburn (H. P. 756)

Report was read.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hartland, Mr. Gardner.

Mr. GARDNER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table this item until July 5, 1955. (Laughter)

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Hartland, Mr. Gardner, moves that the Report with accompanying Resolve be tabled pend-

ing acceptance and be specially assigned for July 5, 1955. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

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

Thereupon, the Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Shaw from the Committee on Retirements and Pensions reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve in favor of Arthur Payson, of Brooks (H. P. 792)

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Tabled

Mr. Shaw from the Committee on Retirements and Pensions reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Increasing Pension of Ernest Rounds of Mechanic Falls (H. P. 846)

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Albert of Augusta, the Report with accompanying Resolve was tabled pending acceptance.)

Mr. Shaw from the Committee on Retirements and Pensions reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Providing for an Increase in State Pension for Napoleon Breard of Waterville (H. P. 934)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve Providing for an Increase in State Pension for Joseph William True of Garland (H. P. 1011)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve Providing for an Increase in State Pension for Charles Moore of Auburn. (H. P. 1113)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Tabled

Mr. Cianchette from the Committee on Towns and Counties reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Amending Charter of the Yorkshire Municipal Court" (H. P. 767) (L. D. 843)

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Hancock of York, the Report with accompanying Bill was tabled pending acceptance.)

Recommitted

Mr. Hilton from the Committee on Towns and Counties reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Empowering Cumberland County Commissioners to Raise Money for Roads in Pownal" (H. P. 624) (L. D. 665)

Report was read.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bremen, Mr. Hilton.

Mr. HILTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: After talking with some members of the Towns and Counties Committee, I move that this be recommitted to the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Bremen, Mr. Hilton, moves that the Report with accompanying Bill be recommitted to the Committee on Towns and Counties. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Report with accompanying Bill was recommitted to the Committee on Towns and Counties and sent up for concurrence.

Ought to Pass in New Draft Printed Bill

Mr. Wadleigh from the Committee on Towns and Counties on Bill "An Act relative to the Salary of the Judge of the Brunswick Municipal Court" (H. P. 508) (L. D. 545) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1206) (L. D. 1475) under title of "An Act relative to the Salary of the Judge and the Recorder and Clerk Hire of the Brunswick Municipal Court" and that it "Ought to pass"

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

Ought to Pass Printed Bills

Mr. Fuller from the Committee on Education reported "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to General-Purpose Educational Aid" (H. P. 645) (L. D. 722)

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

Tabled

Mr. Martin from the Committee on Natural Resources reported "Ought to pass" on Resolve for a Recess Committee to Study All Phases of Stream and Water Pollution with a View Toward Determining a Practical Solution and the Cost Thereof (H. P. 966) (L. D. 1092)

Report was read.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Pierce.

Mr. PIERCE: Mr. Speaker, as there are bills of relatively similar nature in the process of being reported, I move that this matter lie on the table and be unassigned.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Pierce, moves that the Report with accompanying Resolve be tabled pending acceptance and be unassigned. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Report with accompanying Resolve was so tabled.

**Ought to Pass with
Committee Amendment**

Mr. Browne from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to Evidence of Intoxication" (H. P. 987) (L. D. 1135) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Bill read twice.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 987, L. D. 1135, Bill "An Act relating to Evidence of Intoxication."

Amend said Bill by striking out in the 4th line the underlined word "amount" and inserting in place thereof the underlined words "percentage by weight"

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

Mr. MacDonald from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Amending the Charter of the Rumford Falls Municipal Court and Changing its Name" (H. P. 1044)

(L. D. 1219) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Bill read twice.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1044, L. D. 1219, Bill "An Act Amending the Charter of the Rumford Falls Municipal Court and Changing Its Name."

Amend said Bill by striking out all of Section 10 thereof.

Further amend said Bill by renumbering "Sec. 11." to be 'Sec. 10.'

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

Mr. McGlauffin from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to Rules and Blanks of the Courts of Probate (H. P. 1122) (L. D. 1320) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Bill read twice.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1122, L. D. 1320, Bill "An Act relating to Rules and Blanks of the Courts of Probate."

Amend said Bill by striking out the last sentence of Section 1 and inserting in place thereof the following underlined sentence: "Compensation for services rendered by the secretary by direction of the Commission and necessary clerical assistance and expense of printing reports of the Commission shall be paid from any appropriation made therefor."

Further amend said Bill by striking out Section 2 thereof.

Further amend said Bill by striking out the figures "1955" in the last line thereof and inserting in place thereof the figures '1956'

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

Mr. Lord from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act to Amend the Charter of the City of Bath" (H. P. 1045) (L. D. 1220) re-

ported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Bill read twice.

Committee Amendment "A", which was printed as Legislative Document 1474, was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Stanley from the Committee on Towns and Counties on Bill "An Act to Increase the Salary of the Register of Deeds of Somerset County" (H. P. 1168) (L. D. 1403) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Bill read twice.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1168, L. D. 1403, Bill "An Act to Increase the Salary of the Register of Deeds of Somerset County."

Amend said Bill by striking out in the last line thereof the underlined figures '\$4,000' and inserting in place thereof the underlined figures '\$3,400'.

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

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act relating to School Age in Public Schools" (H. P. 54) (L. D. 60) which was recommitted as amended by Committee Amendment "A" in the House reporting same in a new draft (H. P. 1207) (L. D. 1476) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. DOW of Lincoln
CRABTREE of Aroostook
FULLER of Oxford
— of the Senate.
Mrs. MANN of Paris
Messrs. FULLER of South Portland
CARTER of Newport
Miss CORMIER of Rumford
Messrs. ROUNDY of Portland
KNIGHT of Searsmont
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. EVANS of Cornish
— of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Fuller of South Portland, the Majority Report "Ought to pass" in New Draft was accepted.

The Bill was then given its two several readings and assigned for third reading tomorrow.

Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Providing for a Change of Ward Lines in the City of Waterville" (H. P. 919) (L. D. 1027)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WOODCOCK of Penobscot
MARTIN of Kennebec
— of the Senate.
Messrs. CHILDS of Portland
QUINN of Bangor
LORD of Augusta
BRAGDON of Perham
Mrs. THOMAS of Anson
Mr. FOSTER of Mechanic Falls
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. LESSARD of Androscoggon
— of the Senate.
Mr. MARTIN of Eagle Lake
— of the House.

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs.

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, I move that we accept the Majority Report of the Committee "Ought not to pass".

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, moves that the Majority Report of the Committee "Ought not to pass" be accepted.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Winslow, Mr. Dostie.

Mr. DOSTIE: Mr. Speaker, I move that this matter lie on the table until tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Winslow, Mr. Dostie, moves that the two Reports with accompanying Bill lie on the table pending the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that the Majority Report "Ought not to pass" be accepted, and be specially assigned for tomorrow, April 22, which is the pending motion. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the two Reports with accompanying Bill were so tabled and assigned.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Liquor Control reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Sunday Sales of Liquor by Hotels and Clubs" (H. P. 926) (L. D. 1034)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. CRABTREE of Aroostook
CARPENTER of Somerset
— of the Senate.

Mr. ANTHOINE of Windham
Mrs. CHRISTIE of Presque Isle
Messrs. CHARLES of Portland
RICH of Charleston
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee on same Bill reporting same in a new draft (H. P. 1208) (L. D. 1477) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. BOUCHER of Androscoggin
— of the Senate.

Messrs. COTE of Lewiston
DOSTIE of Winslow
PIERCE of Bucksport
— of the House.

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich.

Mr. RICH: Mr. Speaker, I move that we accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich, moves that the Majority Re-

port "Ought not to pass" be accepted.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Cote, moves that the two Reports with accompanying papers lie on the table pending the motion of the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich, that the Majority Report "Ought not to pass" be accepted. Is this the pleasure of the House?

For what purpose does the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich, arise?

Mr. RICH: Mr. Speaker, to speak briefly on this report.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair would state that the motion to table is not debatable.

The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Cote, that the two Reports with accompanying papers lie on the table pending the motion of the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich, that the Majority Report "Ought not to pass" be accepted. Is this the pleasure of the House? (Cries of "No" and "Yes")

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Pierce.

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

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Pierce, has requested a division.

All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Cote, that the two Reports with accompanying papers lie on the table pending the motion of the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich, that the Majority Report "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Sunday Sales of Liquor by Hotels and Clubs", House Paper 926, Legislative Document 1034, will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

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

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich.

Mr. RICH: Mr. Speaker, I know of no bill that has come before this Legislature that has been so badly received by the public, so much opposition to it, as this bill. I do not believe that the people of the State of Maine want Sunday sale of liquor and I move that we accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich, that the Majority Report "Ought not to pass" be accepted. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Liquor Control reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Prohibiting Minors on Certain Premises Selling Liquor" (H. P. 1108) (L. D. 1299)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. CARPENTER of Somerset
CRABTREE of Aroostook
BOUCHER of Androscoggin
— of the Senate.

Messrs. COTE of Lewiston
DOSTIE of Winslow
CHARLES of Portland
RICH of Charleston
PIERCE of Bucksport
ANTHOINE of Windham
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following member:

Mrs. CHRISTIE of Presque Isle
— of the House.

Reports were read.

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

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act relating to Execution for Attorney's Fees in Divorce Proceedings" (S. P. 218) (L. D. 559)

Bill "An Act relating to Assaults on Officers by Convicts" (S. P. 370) (L. D. 1066)

Bill "An Act relating to Age of Commitment to State School for Boys" (H. P. 1062) (L. D. 1250)

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

Third Reader Tabled

Bill "An Act relating to Marketing of Milk" (H. P. 1102) (L. D. 1292)

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

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Yesterday, when this matter came before us, we had to either accept the majority report "Ought not to pass" or the minority report "Ought to pass". At that time, we found before us for our consideration a bill of some seventeen or eighteen pages which many of us had not read. Now, it is a period in the passage of this enactor for making amendments and in order to give everyone an opportunity to read the bill, examine the bill carefully, know the bill, know what it is going to do and whether or not it needs amendment because this bill affects every citizen of the State of Maine and every home in the State of Maine and in order that you may get the reaction from your constituents as to how they feel relative to this bill, this bill affects them and you are representing them and you want to act in their behalf conscientiously. In view of those facts, I am going to ask that this bill be put on the table unassigned to give us an opportunity to do those various things.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, moves that the Bill lie on the table pending third reading. Is this the pleasure of the House?

(Cries of "Yes" and "No")

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Sharon, Mr. Caswell.

Mr. CASWELL: Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a division on the motion to table.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from New Sharon, Mr. Caswell, has requested a division.

The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, that Bill "An Act relating to Marketing of Milk," House Paper 1102, Legislative Document 1292, lie on the table pending third reading.

All those in favor of the motion will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Fifty voted in the affirmative and fifty-one voted in the negative.

Mr. BOWIE (of Durham): Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will inquire if the gentleman demands a roll call vote?

Mr. BOWIE: No, Mr. Speaker, I would just as soon have this thing counted over again because I know some people did not vote.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will state that the vote has been declared and the gentleman is out of order.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Durham, Mr. Bowie, arise?

Mr. BOWIE: Mr. Speaker, to ask for a roll call vote on whether we have a right to table here or we do not have the right to table.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Durham, Mr. Bowie, requests a ye and nay vote and the gentleman's request is in order.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I was under the assumption that the vote had been declared and a roll call vote would be out of order. I request a ruling from the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will state that the provisions of the Constitution permit a roll call vote and no other business having intervened, there is no question but what it is in order.

The gentleman from Durham, Mr. Bowie, has requested a ye and nay vote. The yeas and nays must

be taken if one-fifth of the members present desire it.

All those desiring that the vote be taken by the yeas and nays will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

Forty-three members arose.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Forty-three members having arisen and forty-three being more than one-fifth of the members present, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chair will restate the question before the House: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, that Bill "An Act relating to Marketing of Milk," House Paper 1102, Legislative Document 1292, lie on the table pending third reading.

All those in favor of the motion will answer yes when their names are called and all those opposed, no.

The Clerk will call the roll.

Roll Call

YEA — Babineau, Baird, Beal, Bernier, Bowie, Brown, Baileyville; Browne, Bangor; Call, Cianchette, Cole, Cook, Cormier, Cote, Lewiston; Courtois, Couture, Bath; Couture, Lewiston; Cyr, Dostie, Dumais, Dunn, Duquette, Edwards, Elwell, Evans, Fay, Flynn, Foss, Foster, Fuller, China; Gilmartin, Hatfield, Haughn, Henry, Hilton, Jacques, Jones, Knight, Lamb, Lawry, Lindsay, Lord, Malenfant, Mann, Michaud, Nadeau, Needham, Osborne, Palmeto, Pierce, Potter, Quinn, Reynolds, Rogerson, Sanborn, Seaward, Staples, Stiphen, Vallery, Wadleigh, Walls, Walsh, Whiting, Williams.

NAY — Allen, Anthoine, Bean, Blanchard, Bragdon, Brockway, Carter, Etna; Carter, Newport; Caswell, Caes, Charles, Childs, Christie, Coyne, Crockett, Curtis, Denbow, Dicker, Dudley, Edgar, Ferguson, Files, Finemore, Fuller, So. Portland; Getchell, Hancock, Hanson, Gardiner; Harnden, Howard, Jack, Jacobs, Jennings, Latno, Letourneau, Libby, MacDonald, Madore, Martin, W. Gardiner; Maxwell, McCluskey, McGlauffin, Olpe, Pike, Pulen, Reed, Rich, Roberts, Brooklin; Roberts, Dexter; Ross,

Bath; Ross, Brownville; Roundy, Sanford, Soule, Stanley, Bangor; Stanley, Hampden; Stanwood, Storm, Thomas, Totman, Wade, Walter, Winchenpaw, Woodworth.

ABSENT — Albert, Alden, Anderson, Bibber, Brewster, Briggs, Cote, Madison; Davis, Calais; Davis, Westbrook; Earles, Gardner, Greene, Greenleaf, Higgins, Kimball, Kinch, Martin, Eagle Lake; Porell, Sansoucy, Skolfield, Trafton, Willey.

Yes 63, No 63, Absent 22.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Sixty-three having voted in the affirmative, and sixty-three having voted in the negative, twenty-two being absent, the motion does not prevail.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. QUINN: I question the tally, Mr. Speaker. May I ask that the totals may be rechecked. I have a tally sheet. I kept the tally as we went along. I checked it as we went along and my total is slightly different by one vote which is quite an important vote with the result, and I would like to have the official tally sheet checked again to see if there might be some error.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley.

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if those boys in the first division voted as they wished —

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will state that the gentleman is out of order.

Mr. CURTIS (of Bowdoinham): Mr. Speaker —

The SPEAKER pro tem: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a motion if we are going to have a new roll call vote that each member be furnished with a tally sheet.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will state that the vote has been announced, and there was no request made for rechecking the tally before it was announced.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, there would be no purpose in asking for

a recheck before it was announced.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Cianchette.

Mr. CIANCHETTE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have Rule 41 interpreted here for the members of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will inquire if the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Cianchette, wishes to make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CIANCHETTE: Mr. Speaker, I believe under that rule I am in order to move reconsideration of the vote. I ask for another roll call.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Does the gentleman so move?

Mr. CIANCHETTE: I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will state that the motion of the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Cianchette, is out of order since he did not vote with the prevailing side.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlaufflin, for what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MCGLAUFLIN: Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have another roll call, we would like some tally sheets.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, all we want to determine is the feeling of the group here and at this time it is very much in question and I would suggest that in order to get it done and get it done accurately and correctly that tally sheets be distributed and that everyone indicate how they feel and you have your tally sheets and you have your results. I make that motion.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will state that the vote has been declared.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Cianchette, arise?

Mr. CIANCHETTE: Mr. Speaker, the vote was announced as a tie vote, was it not?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will state that the gentleman is correct.

Mr. CIANCHETTE: Mr. Speaker, under a tie vote, will you please explain to me who is in the majority?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The House will be in order.

Mr. ALBERT (of Augusta): Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tem: For what purpose does the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Albert, arise?

Mr. ALBERT: Mr. Speaker, to make an inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will state that the gentleman may make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I did not vote on either side of this question because I was not in my seat. If I am in order, I move reconsideration and a roll call.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will state that the gentleman is not in order and the motion can not be entertained as coming from the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Albert.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore.

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on the matter of about ten or twelve words.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore, requests unanimous consent to address the House. Does the Chair hear objection to the gentleman's request? The Chair hears none and the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House: I believe that most of us have confidence enough after being here the two terms I have anyway. I feel that the Clerk is very well qualified to count the vote and I believe some behind me and some in my row checked the vote and we find the vote to be okay. I would like to say that we have great faith in our Clerk and in our Speaker pro tem. (Applause)

The SPEAKER pro tem: For what purpose does the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Cianchette, arise?

Mr. CIANCHETTE: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman may state his point of order.

Mr. CIANCHETTE: Mr. Speaker, under Rule 41, as I read it, if any member who voted with the majority or in the negative on a tie vote may move to reconsider. My question has not been answered as to whether I was in the majority or minority.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will state that the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Cianchette, voted in the affirmative. Therefore, he cannot make the motion.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich.

Mr. RICH: Mr. Speaker, I voted in the negative and I believe that was declared the majority vote and I am willing to request another roll call if that is in order. I think that we are getting nowhere here and just getting a little confused and I think it would be a good thing to reconsider the vote taken. I move that we reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich, moves that the House reconsider its action just taken whereby it refused to table and the gentleman's motion is in order.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, arise?

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, I move for a division on the reconsideration.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, requests a division on the motion for reconsideration.

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

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker, I move that Item 4, Bill "An Act relating to Marketing of Milk", House Paper 1102, L. D. 1292, and accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will state that the gentleman's motion is not in order at this time.

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

Mr. OSBORNE: Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of making an inquiry through the Chair as to a rule of the House, under Item 41,

I see that a motion to reconsider shall not be in order more than once on the same question and I believe there has already been a motion made to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will state that it has not been voted on.

The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich, that the House reconsider its action whereby it refused to table Bill "An Act Relating to Marketing of Milk", House Paper 1102, Legislative Document 1292.

All those in favor of reconsideration will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had. Seventy-five having voted in the affirmative and forty-two having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Sharon, Mr. Caswell. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CASWELL: Mr. Speaker, to make a parliamentary inquiry through the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman may make the inquiry.

Mr. CASWELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know who can be permitted to vote on this roll call. It is my understanding that during the roll call no one is permitted to leave their seats or I suppose any of their seats. I do not know why that rule should not work both ways. The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Albert, stated that he was not here during the roll call and now he is here. It might be possible to get several more in here if they knew what was going on.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will state that there is no request for a roll call before the House at the present time.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Albert. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. ALBERT: Mr. Speaker, to answer the inquiry of the gentleman from New Sharon, Mr. Caswell.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will state that the inquiry was

a parliamentary inquiry and it has been answered.

Does the gentleman wish to be recognized?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Durham, Mr. Bowie.

Mr. BOWIE: Mr. Speaker, I now ask for a roll call vote. Can we have the papers distributed?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Durham, Mr. Bowie, has requested a yeas and nays vote. In order for the vote to be taken by the yeas and nays, one-fifth of the members present must desire it.

All those in favor will rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Obviously more than one-fifth of the members present having arisen, the yeas and nays are ordered.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, arise?

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, for a parliamentary inquiry. I know of no motion before the House at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, that Bill "An Act relating to Marketing of Milk", House Paper 1102, Legislative Document 1292, lie on the table pending third reading.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlaufflin, arise?

Mr. McGLAUFFLIN: Mr. Speaker, to make an explanation. I understood that the question now is whether we shall reconsider, not on the question of the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn. The motion was made to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will state that the motion to reconsider has been made and prevailed.

The question now before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, that Bill "An Act relating to Marketing of Milk", House Paper 1102, Legislative Document 1292, lie on the table pending third reading.

All those in favor of the motion will answer yes when their name is called; all those opposed will answer no.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Friendship, Mr. Winchenpaw, arise?

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker, to make another motion.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will state that the gentleman is out of order.

The Clerk will call the roll.

Roll Call

YEA—Albert, Babineau, Baird, Beal, Bernier, Bowie, Brown, Baileyville; Browne, Bangor; Call, Cianchette, Cole, Cook, Cormier, Cote, Lewiston; Courtois, Couture, Bath; Couture, Lewiston; Cyr, Davis, Westbrook; Dostie, Dumais, Dunn, Duquette, Edwards, Elwell, Evans, Fay, Flynn, Foss, Foster, Fuller, China; Gardner, Gilmartin, Greenleaf, Hatfield, Haughn, Henry, Jacques, Jones, Knight, Lamb, Lawry, Lindsay, Lord, Malenfant, Mann, Michaud, Nadeau, Needham, Osborne, Palmeter, Pierce, Potter, Quinn, Reynolds, Rogerson, Ross, Bath; Sanborn, Seaward, Staples, Stilphen, Vallery, Wadleigh, Walls, Walsh, Whiting, Williams.

NAY — Allen, Anthoine, Bean, Blanchard, Bragdon, Brockway, Carter, Etna; Carter, Newport; Caswell, Cates, Charles, Childs, Christie, Coyne, Crockett, Curtis, Denbow, Dicker, Dudley, Edgar, Ferguson, Files, Finemore, Fuller, So. Portland; Getchell, Hancock, Hanson, Gardiner; Harnden, Hilton, Howard, Jack, Jacobs, Jennings, Latno, Letourneau, Libby, MacDonald, Madore, Martin, W. Gardiner; Maxwell, McCluskey, McGlauffin, Olpe, Pike, Pullen, Reed, Rich, Roberts, Brooklin; Roberts, Dexter; Ross, Brownville; Roundy, Sanford, Soule, Stanley, Bangor; Stanley, Hampden; Stanwood, Storm, Thomas, Totman, Wade, Walter, Winchenpaw, Woodworth.

ABSENT—Alden, Anderson, Bibber, Brewster, Briggs, Cote, Madison; Davis, Calais; Earles, Greene, Higgins, Kimball, Kinch, Martin, Eagle Lake; Porell, Sansoucy, Skolfield, Willey, Trafton.

Yes 67, No 63, Absent 18.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Sixty-seven having voted in the affirmative, sixty-three having voted in the negative, eighteen being absent, the motion of the gentleman from Ban-

gor, Mr. Quinn, that Bill "An Act relating to Marketing of Milk", House Paper 1102, Legislative Document 1292, lie on the table pending third reading prevails.

The Bill was so tabled.

Third Reader Tabled

Bill "An Act for an Enabling Act for the Town of Dedham, Hancock County" (H. P. 1201) (L. D. 1472)

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

(On motion of Mr. Quinn of Bangor, the Bill was tabled pending third reading and unassigned.)

At this point, Speaker Trafton returned to the rostrum.

Thereupon, the Sergeant-at-Arms conducted the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Shaw, to his seat on the floor, amid the applause of the House, and Speaker Trafton resumed the Chair.

The SPEAKER: The Chair believes that it speaks for the House that the Speaker pro tem has just done an excellent job under trying conditions. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman from Searsmont, Mr. Knight, arise?

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr. Speaker, under suspension of the rules and out of order, I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may make his parliamentary inquiry without suspending the rules.

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: A search of the several avenues of this building having been made and the Honorable Gordon E. Brewster not having been found, may I request that the committee which was yesterday appointed to guard him from all harm now be asked to account as to the aforementioned gentleman's health and whereabouts.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the gentleman's inquiry, although most relevant, is, at this time, out of order. (Laughter)

Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Extending Pardons Powers of Governor and Coun-

cil to Offenses of Juvenile Delinquency (S. P. 429) (L. D. 1188)

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

Amended Bills

Bill "An Act relating to Possession of Firearms by Felons" (S. P. 337) (L. D. 901)

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

Third Reader

Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act relating to Right of Officer to Kill Dogs" (H. P. 411) (L. D. 458)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mount Desert, Mr. Reynolds.

Mr. REYNOLDS: Mr. Speaker, on Item 8, L. D. 458, I respectfully request that this bill be laid on the table and be specially assigned one week from today.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would inform the gentleman that if he makes that assignment it will be impossible to bring the matter up before one week from today. Does the gentleman still wish to make the assignment?

Mr. REYNOLDS: Mr. Speaker, I will change that to next Tuesday.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Mount Desert, Mr. Reynolds, now moves that this Bill lie on the table pending third reading and be specially assigned for Tuesday next, April 26. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Bill was so tabled and assigned.

The SPEAKER: It is called to the attention of the Chair that there are in the balcony of the House, twenty students from the Eighth Grade of Cornish, accompanied by Mrs. Weymouth, their teacher.

On behalf of the House, the Chair extends to you a hearty and cordial welcome. (Applause)

Finally Passed Emergency Measure

Resolve Providing for Motor Vehicle Registration Plates (S. P. 44) (L. D. 33)

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 started.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, I request a roll call vote.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, requests a yeas and nays vote. The yeas and nays must be taken if one-fifth of the members present desire it.

All those desiring that the vote be taken by the yeas and nays will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than one-fifth of the members present having arisen, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an inquiry.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his point of inquiry.

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, only in an attempt to assist the staff and the leadership, I wonder if a move to table until tomorrow would assist you or would it be in order—

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the motion is out of order as a roll call has been ordered.

The question before the House is on the final passage of Resolve Providing for Motor Vehicle Registration Plates, Senate Paper 44, Legislative Document 33.

This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House is necessary. All those in favor of the final passage of this Resolve will, when the Clerk calls their name, say yes, those opposed will respond by saying no.

Is there a request for distribution of tally sheets? The Chair has heard a request for the distribution and they will be distributed.

The pending motion is on the final passage of Resolve Providing for Motor Vehicle Registration Plates, Senate Paper 44, Legislative Document 33. All those in favor of the final passage of this Resolve will respond to the roll call by saying yes, all those opposed, no. The Clerk will call the roll.

Roll Call

YES—Allen, Anthoine, Babineau, Baird, Beal, Bean, Bernier, Blanchard, Bowie, Brockway, Brown, Baileyville; Browne, Bangor; Call, Carter, Newport; Caswell, Cates, Charles, Childs, Christie, Cianchette, Cole, Cormier, Cote, Lewiston; Courtois, Couture, Bath; Coyne, Crockett, Curtis, Davis, Westbrook; Denbow, Dick er, Dostie, Dudley, Dumais, Duquette, Edgar, Edwards, Elwell, Fay, Ferguson, Files, F i n e m o r e, Flynn, Foss, Foster, Fuller, China; Fuller, So. Portland; Gardner, Getchell, Gil-martin, Greenleaf, Hancock, Hanson, Gardiner; Harden, Hatfield, Henry, Higgins, Hilton, Howard, Jack, Jacobs, Jennings, Jones, Knight, Lamb, Lawry, Letourneau, Libby, Lindsay, Lord, MacDonald, Madore, Malenfant, Mann, Martin, Eagle Lake; Martin, W. Gardiner; Maxwell, McCluskey, McGlaufflin, Michaud, Nadeau, Needham, Olpe, Palmeter, Pierce, Pike, Potter, Quinn, Reed, Reynolds, Rich, Roberts, Brooklin; Roberts, Dexter; Rogerson, Ross, Bath; Ross, Brownville; Roundy, Sanborn, Sanford, Seaward, Shaw, Stanley, Bangor; S t a n l e y, Hampden; Stanwood, Staples, Stilphen, Storm, Thomas, Totman, Vallye, Wade, Wadleigh, Walls, Walsh, Walter, Winchenpaw, Woodworth.

NAY—Carter, Etna; Dunn, Pullen.

ABSENT—Albert, Alden, Anderson, Bibber, Bragdon, Brewster, Briggs, Cook, Cote, Madison; Couture, Lewiston; Cyr, Davis, Calais; Earles, Evans, Greene, Haughn, Jacques, Kimball, Kinch, Latno, Osborne, Porell, Sansoucy, Skolfield, Soule, Whiting, Willey, Williams.

Yes 117, No 3, Absent 28.

The SPEAKER: One hundred and seventeen having voted in the affirmative, three having voted in the negative, twenty-eight being absent, the Resolve is finally passed. It will be signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will entertain, at this time, a motion to recess until 1:45 this afternoon.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Childs of Portland, the House voted to recess until 1:45 P.M.

After Recess 1:45 P. M.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The following paper was taken up out of order and under suspension of the rules:

The following Communication:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
STATE OF MAINE
AUGUSTA

April 21, 1955

To the Honorable Willis A. Trafton, Jr., Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Ninety-seventh Legislature:

In compliance with the Constitution and laws of the State of Maine, I have the honor to herewith transmit the returns of the votes cast for Representative to the Legislature in the class towns of Amherst, Aurora, E a s t b r o o k, Franklin, Gouldsboro, Mariaville, Otis, Sorrento, Sullivan, Waltham, Winter Harbor and the Plantations of Osborn and No. 33 at a special election held April 18, 1955, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Allan M. Butler of Franklin.

Respectfully,

(Signed) HAROLD I. GOSS
Secretary of State

The Communication was read and with accompanying papers referred to the House Committee on Elections.

The following paper was taken up out of order and under suspension of the rules:

The following Communication:

STATE OF MAINE
Office of Secretary of State

April 21, 1955

To Harvey R. Pease, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Ninety-seventh Legislature:

In compliance with Section 1 of Chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes, I hereby certify that in accordance with the provisions of Section 73 of Chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes, a special election was held in the class towns of Amherst, Aurora, Eastbrook, Franklin, Gouldsboro, Mariaville, Otis, Sorrento, Sullivan, Waltham, Winter Harbor and the Plantations of Osborn and No. 33 on April 18, 1955 for the purpose of electing a representative to the Ninety-seventh Legislature to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Allan M. Butler of Franklin; that at said election John P. Tarbox of Gouldsboro, having received a plurality of all votes cast in said election according to a canvass of the returns received from the class towns of Amherst, Aurora, Eastbrook, Franklin, Gouldsboro, Mariaville, Otis, Sorrento, Sullivan, Waltham, Winter Harbor and the Plantations of Osborn and No. 33 made by the Governor and Council under date of April 21, 1955 appears to have been elected a Representative to the Ninety-seventh Legislature.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have caused the Seal of the State to be hereto affixed this twenty-first day of April in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and fifty-five and the Independence of the United States of the one hundred and seventy-ninth.

(SEAL)

(Signed) HAROLD I. GOSS
Secretary of State

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

**Enactor
Tabled**

An Act relating to Salary of Judge of Probate in Cumberland County (S. P. 277) (L. D. 707)

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

(On motion of Mr. Childs of Portland, tabled pending passage to be enacted.)

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act Repealing the Position of Director of Licensing and Enforcement Under Liquor Commission (S. P. 440) (L. D. 1210)

An Act relating to Leather Poisoning as an Occupational Disease (S. P. 466) (L. D. 1309)

An Act Increasing Salaries of Certain Officers of Lincoln County (H. P. 125) (L. D. 128)

An Act relating to the Salary of the County Attorney of Hancock County (H. P. 459) (L. D. 494)

An Act to Increase the Salary of the Judge of Western Hancock Municipal Court (H. P. 857) (L. D. 943)

An Act Increasing the Salaries of the Judge and Recorder of Ellsworth Municipal Court (H. P. 949) (L. D. 1052)

An Act Increasing Salary of County Treasurer of Hancock County (H. P. 1083) (L. D. 1244)

An Act relating to Change of Purposes of Domestic Mutual Insurance Companies (H. P. 1194) (L. D. 1461)

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.

Passed Over Temporarily

An Act Providing for Reappointment of Active Retired Justices (S. P. 157) (L. D. 351)

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

(On motion of Mr. Totman of Bangor, passed over temporarily.)

An Act to Revise the Inland Fish and Game Laws (S. P. 184) (L. D. 436)

An Act relating to Insects and Diseases of Trees (S. P. 515) (L. D. 1408)

An Act relating to Compensation of Councillors of Town of Van Buren (H. P. 236) (L. D. 215)

An Act Providing for a Contingent Account for Androscoggin County (H. P. 1139) (L. D. 1336)

An Act to Incorporate the Orono-Veazie Water District (H. P. 1156) (L. D. 1374)

An Act to Provide Fire Protection for Milton Township, Oxford County (H. P. 1170) (L. D. 1405)

Finally Passed

Resolve in Favor of Gerard Pomereau of Portland (S. P. 77) (L. D. 176)

Resolve in favor of Marcus Mitchell of Temple (H. P. 872) (L. D. 1458)

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.

The SPEAKER: The House will now return to Item 10.

An Act Providing for Reappointment of Active Retired Justices (S. P. 157) (L. D. 351)

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: My only request in having this item passed over a few moments ago was to enable me to make a brief statement clarifying perhaps a misunderstanding that occurred during debate last Friday. In opposing this bill, I and another representative from Bangor sincerely intended that we would be speaking to this bill with the understanding that it applied to one person only, and without getting into names and personalities it was fairly well known that that man was from Bangor. During the debate it was brought out by one of the proponents of the measure, the phrase was used "at the present time there is just one man that meets the qualifications, and that man is the Honorable Arthur Chapman of Portland". Subsequently there was considerable debate as to the reason that I and another representative were apparently singling out this one individual, Judge Chapman, for resistance. We did not know at that time that Judge Chapman was qualified to be reappointed, and so we did not make any further comment and let the bill go through. Since that time I have personally talked with Judge Chapman, and while there was a very interesting conversation between the two of us, I am authorized to make only one statement which I am very proud to make at this time because I certainly did

not want Judge Chapman to feel that he was involved in any way as far as I was concerned. I am sure none of the opponents of the bill thought he was included, and his statement was to the effect that he had absolutely no knowledge of this bill. Judge Chapman presently is 81 years old. The only time that he might have been reappointed was three years ago, and I checked with the sponsor of the bill who likewise said that he had no knowledge that Judge Chapman was involved, and for the purpose of the record I would like to get that straight, and I thank the House for the privilege of speaking on this bill.

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: At this time, the Chair requests the Sergeant-at-Arms to again escort the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Shaw, to the rostrum for the purpose of presiding as Speaker pro tem.

Thereupon, Mr. Shaw assumed the Chair as Speaker pro tem amid the applause of the House and Speaker Trafton retired from the Hall.

The following papers from the Senate were taken up out of order and under suspension of the rules:

Bill "An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Purchase of Salk Vaccine" (S. P. 543)

Resolve Authorizing the Maine Public Utilities Commission to Set Out and Maintain Buys on Sebago Lake (S. P. 544)

Came from the Senate received by unanimous consent and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs.

In the House, received by unanimous consent and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs in concurrence.

Orders of the Day

The SPEAKER pro tem: Under Orders of the Day, the Chair lays before the House the first item of unfinished business, House Divided Report, Majority "Ought not to pass" and Minority "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Veterans and Military Affairs on Bill "An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in

the Amount of Twenty Million Dollars for Bonus to Maine Veterans of World War II and the Korean Campaign", House Paper 1143, Legislative Document 1340, tabled on April 8 by the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, pending acceptance of either report and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. DUMAIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move that the "Ought to pass" minority report be accepted and I would like to speak on the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, moves that the Minority Report "Ought to pass" be accepted.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. DUMAIS: Mr. Speaker, I have circulated petitions in the past year trying to obtain a number of names so that we would not come to the Legislature, and go directly to the people with a referendum in regard to giving the veterans of Maine a bonus. We have obtained 24,010 bonafide signatures throughout the State of Maine. Without a doubt almost every town and hamlet where there was an American Legion, a Veterans of Foreign Wars or an Amvet Post, and we had a total of 32,000, very close to 33,000 signatures, but due to the mechanics of these petitions, the number of 8300 I believe of all signatures were void, for the simple reason of people signing like in Lewiston or Auburn or Bangor and Brewer, they would sign from one town, from Auburn sign on a Lewiston petition. Having fallen short of that the only solution that we the veterans of the State of Maine had was to appeal to the Legislature to obtain this bonus again. So if there are 33,000 people that would sign these bonus provisions, there must be some sign that someone wants it somewhere. We, as veterans, are beginning to wonder whether the people of this great State here have not forgotten the veteran. The World War I veterans did obtain a bonus in this State. The only bonus I know of that has not been paid is the Spanish American War \$78 that is due them, and it surely looks now from talking with some of my friends, that the World War II and the Korean Campaign will surely be without a

bonus. Now Maine has had its heroes. We have heard in this House of what the British have done, and we have heard of what our good veterans have done for everybody, but in return, we, the Legislators, have not given the veteran an even chance to send this proposal to the people to obtain a referendum, the way this bill is written, so that the people will declare themselves without a tax. Ever since 1946 when I returned from the armed forces, we have continuously appealed to the Legislators and to both branches, the Senate and the Legislators to obtain a bonus, and every time it has cropped up with taxes and every time that it did go to the people there were several tax measures attached to it. With these two tax measures the bill was defeated by a very small margin. Therefore, the next session of the Legislature both of the taxes that the veterans and their friends had been urged to vote against cropped up again and this time were passed but not to pay a veterans' bonus, but just to raise taxes. Being a veteran of the ETO naturally I do not know too much about the Pacific Theater, but I assure you, that the boys that I have served with in Europe and in this country here that came from the State of Maine did a splendid job, and those who I have spoken with that served in the Pacific Theater have done a wonderful job also. We have without a doubt, by reading the newspapers, we can see now that there is a possibility of calling our young men again to go and fight possibly for another war to try and make it safe for us to live here, but I wish to state now that the State of Maine has lost in Europe alone 1100 of its finest, youngest men. In the Southwest Pacific I understand that we have lost better than 1700. The provisions in this bill are to pay the widow or the survivors of these veterans.

I have done as one man, without any political affiliation to this bill whatsoever, on my own, I have spent continuously of my own money, and I repeatedly sent letters to the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion and I have a number of petitions that came back from them. Not enough,

I will warrant to you now as I said before, to go out and appeal directly to the people through referendum, but in all the mail that we have sent out, only one letter from one person from one post came back stating that they were not for a veterans bonus. I have spoken to a number of people, and the answer that I get is that the veterans bonus has been made a political issue or a football and it has been kicked around. But I am resolved to try and see that the veterans of the State are recognized and I know a lot of people here will get up after I am done saying something and stating that we cannot pay our veterans \$200. A thousand dollars is not enough. Let me assure you ladies and gentlemen, in Lewiston as in Augusta and Waterville, wherever there are manufacturers that are on strike, right now, the people are only losing \$45.00, \$50.00 and \$60.00 a week and they are hollering blue murder. I mean by that, this \$200 that will be paid to these veterans, or \$150, will stimulate business, it will be spent in this State. We have already had 17,000 of our young blood that has left this State, and whenever you speak to anybody from the twenty-six states that have paid this bonus, they all ask you has Maine already paid its veterans. Of course we answer that they have not. I feel that it is the duty of this Legislature to send it to the people and let them decide without some attachment, some tax measure, some kind of conniving measure attached to this bill to let them vote on it. There are 90,000 veterans at present residing in the State of Maine, and some day these veterans are going to wake up to the fact that if we do not do something for them they will take it upon themselves and they will see to it that they are properly represented here and that we do something in recognition for the service that they have done.

I do not know if I can elaborate any further on this. I have served and I have often thought when I landed at either Omaha or at the close of St. Lo after 27 days of mud and very little sunshine, how the people at home felt, that I wish to say to you now that my

first presence in this House in 1946 sure left a bad taste in my mouth as to the run around that we, the veterans of the State of Maine, got here at that time. And when the money was available to pay the veterans, everything was good when we went away, but when we returned the flags that we knew were waving when we left here were tucked away under somebody's desk and they were not waving when we came back. And in the last session I repeatedly had sponsored this bill and I saw some of my good friends oppose me, and I am glad to say that the people at home did remember a few of them and they did not return. I could elaborate because I know I have spoken personally to at least 20,000 veterans myself, and I know how they feel. Whenever I say I think we have a good chance, they just shake their heads and say I do not know, I do not know. We have repeatedly turned them down. Some day we will have to answer to these veterans as I said before. This veterans committee that is being organized, ladies and gentlemen, to organize 50,000 veterans under one roof in this State is certainly going to come up with something. And I still say that the people of this State should be given the chance to express their opinion without some tax measure. The cost of financing a bonus for the veterans of World War II is one-seventh of a cent of the Sales Tax, which I do not think is exorbitant. It sounds like a tremendous amount, but I have seen almost half of this amount being stuck right in that mud hole in back here, and nobody has said a word about that. I think that when they went out and voted four million and five million and six million, and before we get done with this, a statement that was made by a veteran in front of the Judiciary Committee that regardless if you put ten feet of concrete on the top of that building there, you will see the water leak through that roof, and I think his prophecy stands. You will see it leak through, and that will remind you, ladies and gentleman, of the Gold Star Mothers' tears which have run down their cheeks repeatedly after being refused by this House and Senate to pay a bonus to your vet-

erans. I certainly believe for one that we, the veterans, are entitled to this. We are not asking for any token, we have fought courageously, we have done one bang-up job over there. The boys in the Pacific did and the boys in Korea did, and I am sure that the millions we are spending for civilian defense, such old plugs as myself that will be left behind here, that have known what action is under fire, will prove more useful to you, the citizens of the State of Maine, under war conditions than any of these draft-dodgers that have stayed behind and do not know what fight is. We are definitely out to get a bonus and I believe too, we, the veterans organizations, will stop quibbling amongst themselves and organize and if we do not get it this time we will come back in greater numbers. We are bound to get a bonus and we are going to fight for it. We will fight repeatedly and I assure you, we have not only lost several defeats here, but mind you when we were in the Bulge, we were defeated too. Christmas Day in the Bulge was not Christmas to anybody. And I want to say now that we worked out of that one and we will work out of this House, automatically if you do not give us this vote now to obtain the bonus, just as sure as there is a sun up in the sky, we are going to come back and some day we will have representation here that will give us this bonus. I do hope that the ladies and gentlemen of this House, and we know that each and every one of you are affected in either one way or another, will certainly consider this measure before you vote it down. I move that the minority "Ought to pass" report be accepted.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, that the minority "Ought to pass" report be accepted.

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

Mr. JENNINGS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I feel that the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, has made an excellent explanation of the wishes and his

thoughts on this bill. I am speaking now of my reasons for signing the minority "Ought to pass" report on this bill. I feel that it should go to the people as a referendum rather than to be settled in committee or by the House and Senate. In case the people turn it down I might have a difference of opinion than my good friend the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais. It was suggested by some of the witnesses that if they were turned down that they would not attempt it again. I am not saying this for any differences of opinion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, and myself, but that really was my understanding, and I feel that passing this on to a referendum would be a better way to settle it. I do feel it my duty as Chairman of the Veterans and Military Affairs Committee to state my feelings in regard to signing the "Ought to pass" report.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jacques.

Mr. JACQUES: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have here a few figures that I would like to tell you about, that we have 1700 young men that have moved out of this State up to the present date, and Maine has lost 1100 men in Europe that died in action, and we have lost 1700 in the Pacific. Ladies and gentlemen, these veterans are not asking that you give them a bonus, all they are asking you is that you let it go to referendum for the people to vote on it. I think this is a serious thing and it should be left up to the people who are going to pay the bonus, we are not paying for it, it is the people of the State of Maine that are. We had 24,000 signatures and I should think that these signatures mean to give these veterans a bonus. Why do we not let the people of the State of Maine tell us if we are going to give them a bonus or not and not the Legislature?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Orrington, Mr. Hatfield.

Mr. HATFIELD: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is my first offense, and I am a member of the Veterans and Mili-

tary Affairs Committee. At the time that this matter came up for hearing and consideration I was absent on account of sickness. Had I been here I should have gone along with the minority report "Ought to pass". There are several reasons and you have heard the gentlemen cover them quite well I think. The main reason to me is, let us bring this thing to a head. We have heard for the last eight or nine years the soldier's bonus, the veteran's bonus, you hear it in the drug store, the country store, the garages, and when I go home now, "What are they doing about the bonus", so I feel folks that we should, we are duty bound as I see it to bring this thing before the people.

Now as I see it the thing lays right here on our laps, we are in a position to say shall these people of the State of Maine have an opportunity to vote on this, or shall they not. In other words, can they or can they not. I am going to ask you good people if you will not go along with us on the "Ought to pass" report and let the citizens of our State pass on the thing. I thank you.

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

Mr. MALENFANT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am very proud of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, who has worked hard for so many months. He has held many meetings in the City Hall in Lewiston to encourage the citizens of the State of Maine to find enough signatures to have a referendum. I have a secretary that was in the armed forces. She married a man from New York that was in the Navy. Her husband received his bonus after World War II. My secretary is still waiting for her bonus because she belongs in the State of Maine. I have a nephew that was drafted and he happened to be a German prisoner for three years. When he went in the Army he was a big fat fellow. When the Americans reached the German lines to rescue our American soldiers, he did not even weigh 100 pounds. During the three years that he spent in the German camp, he had to go out in the chicken house to eat with the chickens in order to try to save his life.

He is not the only one, if they do not deserve a bonus I would like to know who does deserve a bonus. A bonus can be financed without any expenses to the State of Maine. A bonus can be financed by a lottery. They do it in Canada, they are just as smart people as we are, and they do it in some countries in Europe. Why not do it here? We are just as smart as they are. There are people in this country buy lotteries from certain countries in Europe. I have bought some myself. There is no harm to pass a bill here to finance a bonus by a State lottery. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call.

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The last session and this session I think that I have been just as familiar with the work of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, and all I have to say, I will not take any time, he has probably worked harder than any man in the State of Maine, and I think it would be a compliment of this House to go along with him to give this to the people as a referendum. I do not always think the same as the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, because I have talked to many veterans who are opposed to it, and I have talked to many who want it, and the only fair way I can see is to give it to the people and let them decide, and I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Winthrop, Mr. Maxwell.

Mr. MAXWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I appreciate also the work that the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, has put in on this, and I also believe that veterans deserve recognition for their services. However, I do not see how the State can at this time afford to take one million dollars plus interest out of the general fund annually with no provisions for replacing it, and I feel that whenever there is a surplus in the general fund, it should be diverted to the educational and institutional services until they are brought up to the standards which they deserve.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The twenty million dollars for bonuses the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Baileyville, Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I feel that this bill should not be called a bonus bill, it should be called an appreciation bill. It is really a bill to let it go to the people to see if they will not show their appreciation. It is easy enough if we fall through a hole in the ice in the winter time and somebody pulls us out in July to say, "Oh well, we would have gotten out some way any way". We would have probably got out some way if these boys had not gone over there and died. Possibly—not probably, but just possibly. We remember back when the war was going on how we all went into the churches everywhere and prayed that these boys would come back, and we prayed for peace. It reminds me of a little verse "When the country is in danger from war and strife, both God and the Soldier was awful nice. But when the victory was won no matter how dearly it was boughten, God sometimes is remembered, but a soldier forgotten." And that is just what happened in the State of Maine. I feel that the least we should do, surely we would not begrudge the people the right to vote on this. We all thought they must have been intelligent enough to vote when they sent us here. Sometimes I question it, but we all of us think so, anyway. I feel that the least we can do is let this bill go to the people and let them decide once and for all whether or not they want to show their appreciation to these boys or not. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs.

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I kind of feel like a draft dodger standing up here now, but probably the record will show that I am not. I am opposed to this bill and for one reason. This bill is going to the people on a referendum. The question which is being proposed to the people is this: "Shall a bond issue be ratified for the purposes of setting forth in an act to authorize the issuance of bonds in the amount of

for the Maine Veterans of World War II and the Korean Campaign?" There is nothing in the bill that says how this money is going to be put back in the surplus fund. The veterans themselves will have no idea how this revenue is going to be collected. Somehow and somewhere there has got to be a tax to take care of this twenty million dollars. I do not know what that tax is. If the veterans knew what the tax was they might be opposed to it. As you and I all know, when a tax goes on it may be only for this purpose, it very, very seldom comes off, and I sincerely feel that the \$200 that the veterans get for this bonus would end up in paying taxes over and over and over again. In the long run they would be getting nothing. And I say for sound financing for the veterans and for this Legislature, this would be very, very poor legislation for putting something in referendum which does not in any way explain how it is going to be paid for. I therefore move that this bill and its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, that the minority "Ought to pass" report be accepted.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, arise?

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, my motion was that the two Reports and Bill be indefinitely postponed and I request a division.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, moves that the two Reports and Bill "An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Twenty Million Dollars for Bonus to Maine Veterans of World War II and the Korean Campaign", House Paper 1143, Legislative Document 1340, be indefinitely postponed.

The same gentleman has requested a division.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Cianchette.

Mr. CIANCHETTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It would appear to me from the state-

ments made by the previous speaker that the inference was made that the people of the State of Maine when they vote do not know what they are voting for. I just wonder who voted for the people who are sitting in this room. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs.

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, I think that the bill is quite clear. What I said was that the people did not know how this was going to be paid for. The bill in itself states nothing about how the revenue is going to be replaced. The only question which the people will vote on is this: Shall a bond issue be ratified for the purposes of setting forth in An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Twenty Million Dollars for Bonus to Maine Veterans of World War II and the Korean Campaign. There is nothing in the bill that says how it is going to be paid for. That is what I object to.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais.

Mr. DUMAIS: Mr. Speaker, I move to have a roll call vote.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair notes the gentleman's request.

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

Mr. MALENFANT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do not see why the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, is in so much of a hurry to kill this bill. Why is he afraid of the Committee of Veterans and Mr. Dumais to discuss this matter? He seems to be in an awful hurry. Perhaps there are not many in his city that went to the war. He ought to remember those that came back here with two legs cut and some blind and one leg and one hand cut. Give it good consideration, I do not see any reason to try to kill this bill as quick as that.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, has requested a ye and nay vote. The yeas and nays must be taken if one-fifth of the members present desire it. All those desiring that the vote be taken by the yeas and nays will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors

have made and returned the count.

Thirty-seven members arose.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Thirty-seven members having arisen and thirty-seven being more than one-fifth of the members present, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Chair will inquire if there is any further discussion.

The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that the two Reports and Bill "An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Twenty Million Dollars for Bonus to Maine Veterans of World War II and the Korean Campaign be indefinitely postponed.

All those in favor of the indefinite postponement of the two Reports and Bill will respond to the roll call by saying yes, all those opposed by saying no. The Clerk will call the roll.

Roll Call

YEA — Baird, Bean, Blanchard, Bragdon, Briggs, Caswell, Cates, Childs, Christie, Cole, Fay, Files, Foss, Fuller, So. Portland; Getchell, Hancock, Hanson, Gardiner; Hardden, Henry, Howard, Jacobs, Jones, Lawry, Libby, Lindsay, Lord, Mann, Martin, W. Gardiner; Maxwell, McCluskey, McGlaulin, Olpe, Pike, Reed, Rich, Rogerson, Roundy, Sanborn, Sanford, Stanley, Bangor; Stanley, Hampden; Staples, Stilphen, Storm, Totman, Wade, Wadleigh, Walter, Willey, Williams, Winchenpaw.

NAY — Albert, Allen, Anthoine, Babineau, Beal, Bernier, Brockway, Brown, Baileyville; Call, Carter, Etna; Carter, Newport; Charles, Cianchette, Cook, Cormier, Cote, Lewiston; Courtois, Couture, Bath; Couture, Lewiston; Coyne, Crockett, Curtis, Cyr, Davis, Westbrook; Denbow, Dicker, Dostie, Dudley, Dumais, Duquette, Edgar, Edwards, Elwell, Evans, Ferguson, Finemore, Flynn, Foster, Fuller, China; Gardner, Gilmartin, Greenleaf, Hatfield, Haugh, Higgins, Hilton, Jack, Jacques, Jennings, Knight, Lamb, Latno, Letourneau, MacDonald, Madore, Malenfant, Martin, Eagle Lake; Michaud, Nadeau, Needham, Osborn, Palmeter, Pierce, Pullen, Quinn, Reynolds, Roberts, Brooklin; Roberts, Dexter; Ross, Bath; Ross, Brownville; Soule, Stanwood,

Thomas, Valley, Walls, Walsh, Whiting, Woodworth.

ABSENT — Alden, Anderson, Bibber, Bowie, Brewster, Browne, Bangor; Cote, Madison; Davis, Calais; Dunn, Earles, Greene, Kimball, Kinch, Porell, Potter, Sansoucy, Seaward, Skolfield, Trafton.

Yes 51, No 78, Absent 19.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Fifty-one having voted in the affirmative, seventy-eight having voted in the negative, nineteen being absent, the motion does not prevail.

At this point, Speaker Trafton returned to the rostrum.

Thereupon, the Sergeant-at-Arms conducted the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Shaw, to his seat on the floor, amid the applause of the House, and Speaker Trafton resumed the Chair.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to state on behalf of those who voted in the affirmative that for the record it should be quite obvious from my remarks before that it is not opposition to a veteran's receiving a bonus. I, myself, would be pretty foolish if I said I did not want \$200 but it is just the idea that those opposed to this are opposed to the way it is set up because there is no way of its being financed and I just wanted to say that to clear up the record.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call.

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker, I hope the majority floor leader realizes that this referendum will probably come up two years hence and the question and the problem will be for the next Legislature to decide where the twenty million dollars is coming from.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, that the minority "Ought to pass" report of the Committee on Bill "An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Twenty Million Dollars for Bonus to Maine Veterans of World War II and the Korean Campaign", House Paper 1143, Legislative Document

1340, be accepted. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Thereupon, the Bill was given its two several readings and assigned for third reading tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the second item of unfinished business, House Divided Report, Majority "Ought not to pass" and Minority "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Veterans and Military Affairs on Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Provide for a Bonus to Maine Veterans of World War II and the Korean Campaign", House Paper 1144, Legislative Document 1341, tabled on April 8 by the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, pending acceptance of either report and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. DUMAIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the minority report be accepted.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, moves that the minority "Ought to pass" report of the committee be accepted. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Thereupon, the Resolve was given its first reading and assigned for second reading tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the third item of unfinished business, House Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Highways on Bill "An Act Designating Federal Aid Secondary Routes as State Highways", House Paper 737, Legislative Document 818, tabled on April 12 by the gentleman from Chelsea, Mr. Allen, pending acceptance, and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the fourth item of unfinished business, Bill "An Act relating to Deductions from Municipal Employees' Salaries by Town Treasurers", Senate Paper 532, Legislative Document 1446, tabled on April 13 by the gentleman from

Bremen, Mr. Hilton, pending first reading and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Thereupon, on motion of that gentleman, the Bill was given its two several readings and assigned for third reading tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the fifth item of unfinished business, Senate Report "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act relating to Chiropractic Treatment Under Workmen's Compensation Law", Senate Paper 373, Legislative Document 1069, tabled on April 13 by the gentleman from Friendship, Mr. Winchenpaw, pending acceptance and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a motion, if I am in order. I move acceptance of the "Ought to pass" report of the committee.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Friendship, Mr. Winchenpaw, moves that the "Ought to pass" report be accepted in concurrence. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Rogerson.

Mr. ROGERSON: Mr. Speaker, I understand that several members who are interested in this bill are not present. If it is in order I should like to move that it be laid on the table until Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Rogerson, moves that the Report and the Bill lie on the table pending the motion of the gentleman from Friendship, Mr. Winchenpaw, that the "Ought to pass" Report of the Committee be accepted in concurrence and be specially assigned for Tuesday next, April 26. Is this the pleasure of the House?

As many as are in favor of the matter lying on the table will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the Report and Bill were so tabled and assigned.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the sixth item of unfinished business, House Report "Ought not to pass" of the Commit-

tee on Public Utilities on Bill "An Act relating to Transmission of Electric Power Beyond Limits of State", House Paper 693, Legislative Document 761, tabled on April 13 by the gentleman from Winterport, Mr. Bean, pending acceptance and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. BEAN: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as there is another bill pending in this Legislature, I would like to retable this bill unassigned.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Winterport, Mr. Bean, moves that the Report and Bill lie on the table pending acceptance of the "Ought not to pass" Report and be unassigned. Is this the pleasure of the House?

All those in favor will signify by saying aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the Report and Bill were so tabled.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the seventh item of unfinished business, Bill "An Act Increasing Salaries of County Officials of Sagadahoc County", House Paper 802, Legislative Document 876, tabled on April 13 by the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, pending first reading, and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move the first reading of the bill and then I would like to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, moves that the Bill be given its two several readings. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Bill was given its two several readings.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis.

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: A couple of the town officials of the towns of Sagadahoc County inform me that there is some \$4,000 in bills coming in that they were not expecting and as this bill would mean another mere \$5,000 increase in the taxes, I move that an amendment be made to the bill changing the word from "January" to "July".

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, of-

fers House Amendment "A" and moves its adoption. The Clerk will read the amendment.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 802, L. D. 876, Bill "An Act Increasing Salaries of County Officials of Sagadahoc County."

Amend said Bill by striking out from the last line the word "January" and inserting in place thereof the word "July"

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that House Amendment "A" be adopted?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Couture.

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker, I move for indefinite postponement of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, to L. D. 876 and the reason is this bill was brought to me by the chairman of the county commissioners. I presented this bill last January. The County Committee had a public hearing on this bill. I appeared with the rest of the delegation from Bath. We were all in accord that this bill should go through just as it is right now. The county commissioner and the chairman were there and the county commission as a whole was in favor of this bill as it is so I see no reason for the amendment. I move that the amendment be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Couture, moves that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed, which is the pending motion.

All those in favor of the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "A" will indicate by saying aye; those opposed, no.

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

Thereupon, the Bill was assigned for third reading tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the eighth item of unfinished business, House Divided Report, Majority "Ought not to pass" and Minority "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Liquor

Control on Bill "An Act to Regulate Eligibility of Premises for Which Liquor Licenses May Be Granted", House Paper 1004, Legislative Document 1151, tabled on April 13 by the gentleman from Friendship, Mr. Winchenpaw, pending acceptance of either report, and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In order that an amendment may be presented, I move the acceptance of the minority "Ought to pass" report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Friendship, Mr. Winchenpaw, moves that the minority "Ought to pass" report be accepted.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie.

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There are other states which have such a law, but because it seemed that perhaps this was a little extreme in its demands, I have offered House Amendment A to this bill, and I would like to say that I feel there is need of quite a distance between schools and churches and places where liquor is sold. The present law requires that there be only 300 feet distance from the front entrance of any church or school to the front entrance of any place licensed to sell liquor, and I feel that that is too short a distance. As a matter of fact, in our own community last fall a place that was licensed to sell bottled malt beverages, the place was just across the street from our high school. Our high school is quite a distance from the street, and so this is outside the 300 foot limit, but it still is too near the high school, and the teachers in our school are very much disturbed about the fact that because the youngsters go over there to get lunches, they have to come in contact with the sale of malt beverages, and so I would like to ask that you consider this bill favorably. It will not deprive any licensee of his license. Any licensee who now holds a license will still hold his license, but it would prevent any new licensee from coming in within the provisions of this 500 foot limit.

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

Mr. VALLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It seems to me that back in the early '30s that the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, the Volstead Act, there were two distinct groups in our society, one called the wet and the other called the dry. Now we who have been brought up in this Neal Dow complex know that there must have been quite a fight. Now those people made certain concessions, and one of these things that was taken into consideration was that no beer parlors, and so forth would be near churches or schools. Now in our town we have the privilege that every other community has of policing ourselves. Every two years we vote. Now I am not against this amendment as a distance of 500 feet, but in our community there are many places and many people that invested money under the provision that any building within 300 feet could acquire a liquor license or a beer license for consumption on the premises, to take out, if the townspeople so voted, and I do not think that this Legislature should curb the interests of these people. Let us keep government close to the people and let each community decide for itself, and I personally think that 500 feet is too great a distance.

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

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This law has been in effect for a good many years, and I do not think it is working too much of a hardship on anybody excepting the people that want to put us out of the malt beverage business and liquor. Of course I fully agree that we have—no child is going in where that liquor is sold if it is a tavern, or a place of that kind, we do not have saloons here, and I think 300 feet as the law is written today is ample distance enough from any church, synagogue or public schools.

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

Mr. ROUNDY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am wondering if we all distinctly understand that the bill called for a thousand feet and that this amendment cuts that down one half to five hundred feet which would seem to be a reasonable change, and I certainly hope that we shall go on and accept the report so that the amendment can be added.

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

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Mrs. Christie, has come up with this amendment —

The SPEAKER: The Chair would remind the gentleman how to address other members of the House.

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker, the remarks on the amendment makes the person already in business within a thousand feet will not be affected by it. It happens that I am in business within a thousand feet. I started that business on a law of 200 feet. Of course no law is in there that will stop me from continuing to get my license, perfectly all right, but for a reason or another, by sickness or other reasons and I want to sell my business, what would my business have been if the purchaser of that business is not entitled to have a license. Of course you are not closing the business that I have got, but you are certainly affecting the man in that business if he is within that thousand feet because his business will amount to nothing then, and I really think that it is rubbing it into the people in business a little too much, and I move for the indefinite postponement of the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would state that the amendment is not even before the House.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Bernier.

Mr. BERNIER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As you have been told this bill would provide for a uniform, arbitrary, mechanical rule to determine the distance within which certain licensees can operate to churches and schools. This bill must be justified on grounds of health, safety and morals. While I do not

disagree with the purpose of this bill, I feel that the purpose is adequately taken care of by the existing 300 foot rule in Section 22 of Chapter 57. Generally Section 22 of Chapter 57 provides for a public hearing by any prospective licensees before municipal officers and the approval of those municipal officers. Now the menace of any one of these establishments is not in and of itself immoral. The immorality if it exists arises from the disorderly conduct which is apt to occur on such establishments. It seems to me that if any establishment whether it be 500 feet distant from a church or school or 1,000 feet distant from such a church or school is either potentially a source of disorderly conduct or immorality, it can be prohibited either prospectively or when an existing licensee applies for a new license. This remedy, the public hearing before municipal officers, it seems to me is a much more flexible and reasonable remedy than the existing or the proposed bill.

The liquor question is decided in each community under our local option laws. The voice and decision of the majority of each community should be respected. We should be equally solicitous of the decision of the majority opinion of a so-called dry community as of that of the so-called wet community. We should be equally vigilant to prevent indirect and roundabout encroachments upon each. The existing bill providing for a 300 foot clearance, so to speak, is reasonably justifiable. This proposed bill would riddle wet towns with liquor-free islands or areas. It results in doing indirectly what the people did not choose to do directly at the polls. I should hope that if an attempt were made to whittle away the choice or opinion of a dry community by similar legislation, we would as a body vote against it. I trust that we will do the same in this case.

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

Mr. MCGLAUFLIN: Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to say that I think five hundred feet is near enough to any church or school. If I had my way, it would be a mile.

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

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In my area we are for indefinite postponement and I will now move indefinite postponement of L. D. 1151.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Couture, moves that both Reports and Bill "An Act to Regulate Eligibility of Premises for which Liquor Licenses May Be Granted", House Paper 1004, Legislative Document 1151, be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. BRIGGS: Mr. Speaker, in order for me to attempt to vote intelligently or reasonably so on this matter, I have two questions which I would like to pose of the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, or anyone else who cares to answer them. I wonder if there is any way that the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, could allow me that privilege without interfering with his motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that while the motion is pending it is quite in order for the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Briggs, to address a question through the Chair.

Mr. BRIGGS: Mr. Speaker, the question that I have in my mind, I would like to have it made perfectly clear to me as to whether or not the 500 foot amendment, or the present bill for that matter, it makes no difference, would restrict any of the present facilities in operation. And the second question is: The present businesses that are in operation, assuming that they are not restricted, is there any legal or technical reason why they could not be sold or exchanged and their operation continued under the same ruling that they are operating under at present?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Briggs, addresses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, who may answer if she so chooses.

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to answer the first question of the gentleman from Caribou,

Mr. Briggs. It does not affect any licensee who now holds a license.

I am sorry, I can not answer the second question. I should have found that out but I can not answer the second question in regard to what would happen if the present licensee sold out to somebody else.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call.

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I heartily accord with the gentlewoman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, and I will answer the question. The way I understand it, as the Liquor Control would answer it, the minute that that building is sold that licensee who owns it at that time ceases. The new licensee would have to apply for a license and if it was within the 500 feet he would not get the license.

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

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker, when the vote is taken, I request a division.

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

Mr. CHARLES: Mr. Speaker, I will try to answer the question of the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Briggs, by saying that should either the amendment or the original bill pass, the grocery stores are not included in the grandfather clause and I refer you to L. D. 1151, about half way down. It does not say anything about bottled malt beverage licensees although it does give the grandfather clause for hotels and clubs but not for bottled malt beverage licensees.

While I am on my feet, I might as well speak as a member of the Liquor Control Committee, which I feel justified in doing so in explaining the position taken by the majority that this bill, 1151, is a cousin companion to L. D. 408, which is a bill that would limit the number of licensees. If the House will remember, L. D. 408 was defeated here for the privilege and purpose not to exclude our present licensees or limit competition or to cause any discrimination. Therefore, it would appear that if we should go along

with 1151, we would practically be contrary and contradictory to our action on L. D. 408.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Couture, that both Reports and Bill "An Act to Regulate Eligibility of Premises for Which Liquor Licenses May Be Granted", House Paper 1004, Legislative Document 1151, be indefinitely postponed.

The gentleman from Friendship, Mr. Winchenpaw, has requested a division.

As many as are in favor of the indefinite postponement of both Reports and the Bill will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Seventy-nine having voted in the affirmative and thirty-three having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed and both Reports and the Bill were indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the ninth item of unfinished business, Resolve Designating Part of Route No. 9 as State Highway, House Paper 883, Legislative Document 991, tabled on April 13 by the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Elwell, pending second reading.

The Resolve was then given its second reading.

Mr. Elwell of Brooks thereupon offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 883, L. D. 991, Resolve Designating Part of Route No. 9 as State Highway.

Amend said Resolve by striking out from the 3rd line the words and punctuation "Freedom, Waldo County" and inserting in place thereof the words and punctuation 'Albion, Kennebec County'

House Amendment "A" was adopted.

Mr. Allen of Chelsea then offered House Amendment "B" and moved its adoption. House Amendment "B" was read by the Clerk as follows:

HOUSE AMENDMENT "B" to H. P. 883, L. D. 991, Resolve Designat-

ing Part of Route No. 9 as State Highway.

Amend said Resolve by adding after the word "highway" in the 5th line the following:

‘; and be it further

Resolved: That the State Highway Commission be and hereby is authorized and directed to designate that part of Route No. 9 commencing at the junction of Route 226, in Randolph, Kennebec County, and extending to the junction of Route No. 17, in Augusta, Kennebec County, as a State highway.’

House Amendment "B" was adopted, and the Resolve, having had its two several readings in the House and the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading having reported that no further verbal amendments were necessary, was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" and House Amendment "B" and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the tenth item of unfinished business, House Report "Ought to pass" in New Draft under New Title Bill "An Act Increasing Salaries of Members of Board of Registration of Voters of City of Bath", House Paper 1198, Legislative Document 1467, of the Committee on Towns and Counties on Bill "An Act to Increase the Salaries of Members of the Boards of Registration of Voters", House Paper 801, Legislative Document 875, tabled on April 14 by the gentleman from Portage Lake, Mr. Cook, pending acceptance.

Thereupon, the "Ought to pass" in New Draft Report was accepted and the Bill was given its two several readings.

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

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker, I now offer House Amendment to House Paper 1198, Legislative Document 1467 and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Couture, offers a House Amendment and moves its adoption.

Under the rules, this matter will lie on the table pending reproduction of the amendment.

The Bill with accompanying papers was so tabled.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the eleventh item of unfinished business, House Report "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" of the Committee on Agriculture on Bill "An Act to Clarify Laws relating to Bang's Disease", House Paper 286, Legislative Document 299, tabled on April 15 by the gentleman from Milo, Mr. Brockway, pending acceptance.

The "Ought to pass" Report of the Committee was accepted and the Bill was given its two several readings.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 286, L. D. 299, Bill "An Act to Clarify Laws Relating to Bang's Disease."

Amend said Bill in the 14th line of Sec. 3 by striking out the underlined word "inclusive" after the underlined word "months"

Further amend said Bill in Sec. 3 by inserting before the 4th paragraph from the end the following underlined paragraph:

'After July 1, 1956 no milk or milk products shall be sold or offered for sale from any herd operating under Plan C.'

Further amend said Bill in Sec. 3 by striking out the last sentence of the next to last paragraph from the end.

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of Sec. 5 and inserting in place thereof the following:

"Sec. 5. R. S., c. 32, Sec. 76-A and 76-B, additional. Chapter 32 of the revised statutes is hereby amended by adding thereto 2 new sections, to be numbered 76-A and 76-B, to read as follows:

'Sec. 76-A. Sale of certain biologicals. No biological products, containing living organisms, primarily used in veterinary medicine for livestock or poultry, shall be shipped into or sold within the State of Maine without the approval of the product by the Commissioner or his agent. No brucellosis antigen shall be shipped into the State without the approval of the Commissioner or his agent.

'Sec. 76-B. Penalty for violation. Whoever violates any provision of

section 76-A or any rules and regulations promulgated thereunder shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$100 nor more than \$500, or by imprisonment for not less than 30 days nor more than 6 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.'"

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the twelfth item of unfinished business, Bill "An Act relating to Registration for Barbers and Apprentice Barbers", House Paper 1184, Legislative Document 1439, tabled on April 15 by the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, pending the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Stilphen, to recommit to Committee on Public Health.

The pending motion is the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Stilphen, that this Bill be re-committed to the Committee on Public Health.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson.

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have obtained the information desired and I hope the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Stilphen, to recommit to the committee prevails.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Stilphen, that the Bill be re-committed to the Committee on Public Health. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Bill was re-committed to the Committee on Public Health and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the thirteenth item of unfinished business, Bill "An Act relating to Transportation of Fish, Game and Fur-bearing Animals by Aircraft", House Paper 778, Legislative Document 861, tabled on April 19 by the gentleman from Medway, Mr. Potter, pending third reading and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Thereupon, on motion of that gentleman, the Bill was given its third reading, passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the fourteenth item of unfinished business, An Act Providing for Group Life Insurance for State Employees and Teachers, Senate Paper 525, Legislative Document 1429, tabled on April 19 by the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Shaw, pending passage to be enacted.

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

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Shaw, has been called away, I would like to move that this item lie on the table and be specially assigned for tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier, moves that the Bill lie on the table pending passage to be enacted and be specially assigned for tomorrow, April 22. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Bill was so tabled and assigned.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the fifteenth item of unfinished business, House Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Providing for a State Income Tax", House Paper 1151, Legislative Document 1366, tabled on April 19 by the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Bernier, pending acceptance and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. BERNIER: Mr. Speaker, I move that the original bill be substituted for the report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Bernier, moves that the Bill be substituted for the "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee.

The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. BERNIER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Governor Muskie in his budget message suggested that alternate tax sources be considered to finance his supplemental budget. He recommended that any tax adopted be anchored upon the ability to pay theory. He proposed that we consider an income tax, a sales tax with certain exemptions or a combination of both.

At the outset, I think it might be beneficial to summarize the key provisions of this bill. As it stands, it includes an individual income tax, a corporate franchise or net income tax and a partial revision of the existing sales tax providing for certain exemptions. No proper evaluation of the over all impact of this tax can be had without emphasizing the revision of the present sales tax exempting water, domestic fuel and clothing. The proposed bill would impose a tax upon the net income of residents of the State of Maine. A like tax would be imposed upon non-residents on income derived from sources within this State. Estates and trusts are also taxable under this bill. Taxable income under this bill with one exception is identical to that found in the federal Internal Revenue Code. It should be pointed out that capital gains are not treated as income under the personal income tax section of this bill. Nor correspondingly are capital losses recognized. The bill provides for rates ranging from one and one half per cent to five and one half per cent of taxable income. The bill would provide exemptions of \$1,000 to each taxpayer and if the taxpayer is over the age of sixty-five or blind, an additional \$1,000 exemption. A \$1,000 exemption for the spouse of the taxpayer if the taxpayer is making a joint return is also provided. An exemption of \$1,000 for each dependent whose gross income for the taxable year is less than \$1,000 is also provided. Certain credits are allowed for non-residents paying taxes on income derived within the State and also for taxes paid to other states and foreign nations.

The individual income tax is subject to withholding and to prepayment on estimates. The corporate income tax is not. The corporate income tax is a flat four per cent tax. Capital gains and capital losses are recognized under the corporate income tax.

I found since I introduced this measure that this income tax bill is almost a political unmentionable. I have a feeling that one reason why politicians, and I do not exclude myself from that category, will not touch it with a ten foot pole is that it is a direct tax. The tax cannot

be hidden. Each citizen knows exactly the tax burden he bears. In school and college, I was taught that the directness of a tax is a virtue. However, I think that the rules of the game of politics dictate that the tax be hidden as much as possible. I find that the rules prevailing in these halls, the inarticulate rules, I might say, run somewhat as follows: What the people do not know will not hurt them. Or, get the most with the least squawk. Or another principle which I feel determines many of our choices is this: That tax is best which another person bears. However, this tax would be easily and cheaply collected. The Citizens Tax Revision Committee in 1950 reported that the cost of administering a similar income tax over the long run would cost about 1.5 per cent of collections. The State Tax Assessor has estimated, however, that the initial cost would be somewhat greater due largely to the initial cost of setting this thing into operation. He has estimated that the first two years it would cost about 3 per cent of collections. The cost of administering a sales tax is admittedly somewhat greater.

An income tax is a good revenue raiser. It is flexible and provides for a broad base. It was estimated also by our State Tax Assessor that this tax would yield for the fiscal year 1955-1956, \$3,161,000 and would yield in the fiscal year 1956-57 somewhat over \$9,000,000. The reason for the low figure for the fiscal year 1955-56 is that the corporate income tax is not subject to withholding and of course some portions of the income tax are not subject to withholding. An income tax is a just and equitable tax being based upon ability to pay. Progressive taxation is no innovation in the State of Maine. Our estate and inheritance taxes are graduated. The gross income tax on telephone and telegraph companies ranges from $1\frac{1}{4}$ to 6 per cent of gross income. The gross receipts tax upon street railroads was graduated.

A few figures will illustrate the general impact of this tax upon the average family. Let us take a family of four, a husband, a wife, and two children. Under an income of less than \$4,000, no income tax

is paid and due to the sales tax exemptions, less sales tax is paid than at present. If the family income reaches \$5,000, the tax payable would be \$15. Actually, it would be somewhat less. That is figuring it roughly.

In conclusion, I would like to make one somewhat disconnected comment and that is to read to you a statement which appeared in last week's Time Magazine with reference to income tax on the national scene: "One secondary effect of progressive income tax rates was supposed to be the leveling down of great fortunes. This did not happen. There are scores of millionaires in the U. S. today for every one at the time the income tax was started in 1914".

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Sanford.

Mr. SANFORD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move that L. D. 1366 be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Sanford, moves that the Report and Bill be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, I would like, through the Chair, to ask the gentleman from Waterville (Mr. Bernier) two questions. The first question is this: Is the Governor in favor of the State income tax more than he is in favor of the sales tax and also does the gentleman from Waterville believe that the majority of the people are in favor of a state income tax in preference to some other tax?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, addresses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Bernier, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. BERNIER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, of an old legal maxim which has been bandied about from generation to generation and that is this: The Devil himself knoweth not the motives of man. (Laughter)

I do not know what the Governor's predilection is in terms of

this tax. I do feel that he looks upon it with some favor. What degree of favor, I do not know.

As to whether the majority of the people are in favor of this tax, again I do not know. I have a feeling that due to some misconceptions by and large the people of the State of Maine are not for this tax.

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

Mr. ROUNDY: Mr. Speaker, I am not a specialist on taxation but there is one fact that has been impressed upon me during these sessions of the Legislature when we have been talking about taxation that there was a great deal to be said for the present arrangements which we have whereby we leave the property tax to be used in municipalities and local towns and cities. That we leave to the federal government the carrying out of plans which we know something about once a year in the form of the Income Tax and that some form of sales tax is properly in order for state usage. It does seem to me that there is much to be said for the distribution of those three kinds of taxes and nobody likes to pay taxes of any kind particularly well and that we ought to have that in mind when we are considering this matter. I know that there are some states that do have income taxes but I think our situation in Maine is much better whereby we have the three different taxes for the three different parts of government under which we live. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fort Fairfield, Mr. Reed.

Mr. REED: Mr. Speaker, I think the feeling of the members of the Taxation Committee as well as many people I have talked with regarding the income tax is that this means of taxation is already fully exploited by the federal government. Probably that is a fact which a good many of you folks can attest to. Coming from Aroostook County, I can recall the years we have paid it, although in the past few years we have not been obliged to pay that tax at least. Therefore, I favor the motion of my colleague, the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Sanford.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Briggs.

Mr. BRIGGS: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say real quickly that it seems almost like we were back on the bears again. This type of tax to me seems like preparing the same old sheep for the shearing.

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

Mr. WADE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In connection with debate on other matters this afternoon, we have heard a great deal about keeping in mind what the people back home want. If we do that in connection with this measure, I think that we would go along with the report.

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

Mr. BERNIER: Mr. Speaker, I merely would like to say a word to the point which has been thrown out that the federal government is already fully exploiting this field. In the first place, all taxes are ultimately derived from income and secondly, I think that I might best illustrate my point by an example. Now, take citizen Brown, who has an income of some, say \$2,500 while citizen Jones has an income of some \$20,000. Assuming that there are the deductions and exemptions for a wife and two children, citizen Brown would pay no income tax to the federal government. However, citizen Jones with equivalent deductions and exemptions will pay a federal tax of approximately \$5,000. Brown has his original \$2,500 left. Jones has \$15,000 left. Which of the two is now better able to support his state government?

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgewater, Mr. Finemore.

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: What I am going to say I do not mean as a joke. I mean it in all seriousness. I just read in a magazine this noon where it takes the wool from ten sheep to furnish clothes for a soldier and the hides from ten taxpayers to take care of it. And if we would like to get old faster, I hope that you do pass this tax, that you make it payable four times a year

because I think there is nothing that will make us get older any quicker than a tax.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Camden, Mr. Libby.

Mr. LIBBY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask for a division on the motion now?

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Sanford, that the Report and Bill "An Act Providing for a State Income Tax", House Paper 1151, Legislative Document 1366, be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, I request a roll call vote on the question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, requests a yeas and nays vote. The yeas and nays must be taken if one-fifth of the members present desire it. All those desiring that the vote be taken by the yeas and nays will kindly rise and remain standing in their places until the monitors have made and returned the count.

Forty-three members arose.

The SPEAKER: Forty - three members having arisen and forty-three being more than one-fifth of the members present, the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Is debate in order?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that debate is in order.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, it is my intention this afternoon to go along and vote yes on this bill. The reason for doing so is to keep it alive if possible in case we should need this money later on.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Sanford, that the Report and Bill "An Act Providing for a State Income Tax", House Paper 1151, Legislative Document 1366, be indefinitely postponed.

All those in favor of the indefinite postponement of the Report and Bill will respond to the roll call by say-

ing yes, all those opposed by saying no. The Clerk will call the roll.

Roll Call

YEA — Albert, Anthoine, Baird, Bean, Bowie, Bragdon, Briggs, Brockway, Brown, Baileyville; Call, Carter, Etna; Carter, Newport; Caswell, Cates, Charles, Childs, Christie, Couture, Bath; Crockett, Curtis, Denbow, Dicker, Dunn, Duquette, Edgar, Evans, Fay, Ferguson, Files, Finemore, Flynn, Foss, Foster, Fuller, So. Portland; Gardner, Getchell, Gilmartin, Greenleaf, Hancock, Hanson, Gardiner; Harnden, Hatfield, Haughn, Henry, Higgins, Hilton, Howard, Jack, Jacobs, Jennings, Jones, Knight, Lawry, Libby, Lindsay, Lord, Madore, Mann, Martin, W. Gardiner; Maxwell, McCluskey, McGlaufflin, Michaud, Needham, Olpe, Osborne, Palmer, Pierce, Pike, Potter, Pullen, Quinn, Reed, Reynolds, Rich, Roberts, Dexter; Rogerson, Ross, Bath; Ross, Brownville; Roundy, Sanborn, Sanford, Seaward, Soule, Stanley, Bangor; Stanley, Hampden; Stanwood, Staples, Stilphen, Storm, Thomas, Totman, Wade, Wadleigh, Walter, Whiting, Willey, Williams, Winchenpaw, Woodworth.

NAY — Babineau, Bernier, Cianchette, Cormier, Cote, Lewiston; Courtois, Couture, Lewiston; Coyne, Cyr, Davis, Westbrook; Dostie, Dudley, Dumaïs, Edwards, Elwell, Jacques, Lamb, Latno, Letourneau, MacDonald, Nadeau, Valley, Walls, Walsh.

Absent — Alden, Allen, Anderson, Beal, Bibber, Blanchard, Brewster, Browne, Bangor; Cole, Cook, Cote, Madison; Davis, Calais; Earles, Fuller, China; Greene, Kimball, Kinch, Malenfant, Martin, Eagle Lake; Porell, Roberts, Brooklin; Sansoucy, Shaw, Skolfield.

Yes 100, No 24, Absent 24.

The SPEAKER: One hundred having voted in the affirmative, twenty-four having voted in the negative, twenty-four being absent, the motion prevails.

Thereupon, the Report and Bill were indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the sixteenth item

of unfinished business, House Divided Report, Majority "Ought to pass" in New Draft under new title "An Act to Create the Department of Development of Industry and Commerce", House Paper 1196, Legislative Document 1465, and Minority Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act to Create the Department of Industry and Commerce and to Amend the Laws relating to the Department of Labor and Industry and Maine Development Commission to Conform Thereto", House Paper 514, Legislative Document 620, tabled on April 14 by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, pending the motion of the gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Pierce, to accept the Minority Report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Yarmouth, Mr. Henry.

Mr. HENRY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think we should consider well the situation, before voting on this legislation, and I would like to place before this group some of the reasons why I signed the minority "Ought not to pass" report.

To me there appear to be three major viewpoints from which we might well take a look. First the viewpoint of possible results. Second, that of economy, and third, that of political significance.

From the first and certainly most important viewpoint, we are placing predictable results, based on experience, in the balance against pure guesswork. Even the proponents of this bill admit that the present setup of the Development Commission has done a splendid job. And why shouldn't they? The Commission is made up of dedicated persons who know what they are doing and why. They are specialists in a variety of fields. Men of this type cannot be hired and certainly their combined experience cannot be grouped in any one man.

Just take one of the Commission for example, a man known all over this country for his knowledge and business ability, he is the head of one of our great insurance companies and a recognized leader in his field. Do we want to give up

this type of leadership for an unknown?

It has been suggested that these Commissioners be kept on in an advisory capacity but with no authority. Do you believe that men of this type would want to stay on, knowing that any advice they gave would be rendered useless by the judgment of one man?

Under this bill what results can be expected and how soon? Who knows? Now we have a team of trained workers already in harness and used to working together. How long will it take to hitch up a new team? And will they pull together after they are hitched up?

It seems to me that we are giving up known results for something unknown and while I like to gamble in a very small way, I do not want to do it in a big way with the money of the people of this State.

It has also been suggested that a greater continuity of action could be secured under this bill. I question that. Certainly Governors come and Governors go. Is a Commissioner appointed by one Governor going to go along nicely with a new one? Particularly one from the opposition party? Or are we constantly going to be going into a highly competitive market looking for a superman who knows something about all phases of our problem?

Under the Commission form as set up now no Governor is likely to replace the entire Commission or any large portion of it. It has also been said that the Commission only meets once a month. I maintain that these men are working constantly for the State, wherever they may be, simply because of the type of men they are, because they have the interests of this State in their hearts. Are we going to slap them in the face?

I would like to mention one more point regarding possible results. Under the proposed plan are we going to have a Commissioner who will keep a proper balance between the four divisions, or may we get one that because of training and experience will swing in one direction or the other, perhaps away from Agriculture, perhaps forgetting Recreation? It could happen.

Now, let us think for a moment about the possible costs of this new Department, which is also important from my way of thinking. We have seen small Departments before, but how long do they remain small?

In this proposed setup we have a Commissioner, who, if one of reasonable experience and ability can be secured, certainly will expect a pretty fair salary. Then there are the four Division heads, who certainly will not work for a pittance. Each of them, as well as the Commissioner, will need a group around them to do their clerical work, all of which builds up into a sizable overhead before we even get to field operations.

I have been a registered professional engineer and have been connected with industry, in many capacities, from laborer to president, since I was fifteen years old. That is not a long time I will admit, since I am still a pretty young man. In that period I have been connected with the promotion and launching of perhaps a dozen new industrial concerns, and I tell you that new industries are not brought in by so-called experts sitting in an office. You have to get out into the field and dig for them and then most of the work is done at community level.

I hope many of you read former State Senator Carl Broggi's statement in last Friday's Lewiston Sun. You know this gentleman is from Sanford and he is now connected with the Chamber of Commerce over there. That town has been pretty much in the limelight in the industrial news. Mr. Broggi very plainly sets forth his stand in which he favors revamping of the present Development Committee. And he also says in part and I quote: "Sanford has announced five new industries in the last three months and those industries have been obtained by field work, leg work, ringing doorbells and not by any plushy administration."

Frankly, I am worried about the expense of this proposed new Department. All they are asking for is about \$550,000 a year and I think they will need it all. Probably at this session the appropriation could be kept down, but if that is done

what can be accomplished? It looks to me as though this proposed setup would require a lot of money before we even got down to hiring anyone to do the necessary field work and I think that we must bear in mind that every cent we appropriate, up here, for this or any other purpose, that we are reaching not only down into our own pockets but into the pockets of our relatives, into the pockets of our friends and into the pockets of our neighbors.

It looks to me that this new Department would cause us to reach deep, or that with the Commissioner and the Division Directors and their staffs, that we would have formed an Army of Generals with darn few privates to do the work.

Now for my view from the political standpoint. It has been said that this is a compromise measure. I ask you in what way except name? Certainly I do not believe that two men sitting down together and coming to a one-sided agreement constitutes a compromise between two parties. It looks to me that about the only compromise brought about is that the people are being compromised.

Actually the only significant difference I can see between this new draft and the original bill, except in terminology, is that this proposes to absorb the present setup of M.D.C. and possibly offer some kind of a job to present employees of M.D.C. Frankly, this looks to me like a sop thrown out in an attempt to quiet down some of the opposition but primarily to secure at least a few employees for the new department who know what it is all about.

I have been told that the majority party will look bad two years from now if we do not accept this plan, if there should happen to be a depression and industry in our State is in the doldrums. I do not believe this is going to happen, but if it does I certainly do not believe this plan will save the day. I think it will work in the opposite direction. If times should be good two years from today, as I believe they will be, who can claim credit for it then? Certainly not the majority party, with this plan so close to that of the minority party that it would take a Philadelphia lawyer to tell the difference.

Over the years the Commission has been comparatively free from politics. I hate to see it become a political football now, which is the way it is heading under this bill.

The Maine Development Commission was built up under the majority party. Everyone admits that they have done a good job and could do better with more funds. We all, I think, recognize that the results they can secure are in direct proportion to the funds that they have to spend in contact work. So let's stick to our own plan and not be led astray by vague promises. Let's go back to our constituents, able to say that we have not added any unnecessary frills, that we have spent their money carefully for those things that we believed were best for the State of Maine.

I certainly hope the motion of the gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Pierce, will prevail.

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

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I definitely feel that this is one problem which requires a great deal of thought and a great deal of attention on the part of this House. I believe that it is one of the important measures that will be discussed by this Legislature. First of all, let us delve into the bill slightly to see what it involves. It does set up a commissioner. Under the commissioner will be four divisions: The Division of Research, which will be the fact finding division. The Division of Planning. The Division of Development. And lastly the Division of Recreational Promotion.

The Division of Research will try to find the basic data, the labor, the sites, the space, the equipment, the housing, the transportation, the markets, the economic considerations and such. Also the field of geology will come under the Planning and the Research.

Under Planning, we also have three area divisions; one in the northern part of the State, one in the southern part of the State and one in the central part of the State. The people in that office will deal only with that section of the State in which the office is. In other words, these people in the

area office will have only these certain communities to attend to. They can go into these communities. They can find out the potentialities of that community. They can find out the labor market in that community and I think that we will all agree that bringing new industries into Maine is really a local problem. We must instill in these communities a feeling of confidence, a feeling of hope, a feeling that they can do something to bring industries into their metier and these areas will deal with only the little towns in their areas and can spend a great deal of time in doing just this sort of thing.

We will also have under development, people who can go out of the state, people who will be trained, people who will understand and who will know how to meet people, who will know the potentialities of the State, who can go out and sell the State of Maine, sell its resources, sell its industries that are already here, try to maintain those that are here and introduce others.

Also in this planning for the towns, there are federal matching funds which would be available. In order to have those matching funds, we must have a central planning system set up by the State and these little area offices which will help the communities in planning will make it available for these communities to have matching federal funds. Now, I do not believe that the present setup, the Maine Development Commission, is equipped to do this sort of work. The Maine Development Commission was formerly set up for the recreational promotion of the State of Maine. We agree that to that extent they have done a good job. However, we feel that it does not have the proper tools to carry on the research which is so essential to a scheme of this type. And to prove to you that the Maine Development Commission has not been successful in bringing in new industries I only have to quote a few figures to you. From 1940 to 1950, the State lost 16,000 people leaving our State and in the following three and a half years, the civilian population decreased by 34,000 people, people looking for jobs that they

could not find and left the borders of our State. The per capita income in the State of Maine in those same years is the lowest among the New England States. For the first time in history we have been lower in per capita income than the State of Vermont and also in the percentage figures themselves. In wage gains, we have had the lowest increase in all of the New England States. From 1907 to 1952, the expenditures for new industrial plants in Maine dropped 70 per cent as compared to the national average of 9 per cent. We dropped 70 per cent, I repeat in comparison to the New England average of 9 per cent. There is a big job to be done if we are to stabilize the economy of our State and we feel that the Maine Development Commission is not equipped to do that job.

It is not coincidental in my mind that the southern states are getting all of the industry. The national average of employees, factory employees for the United States, has been set by the Federal Bureau of Statistics and those figures are on record for anyone to see and it is proved that in the southeastern states that have adopted this same idea, the same setup, to bring industries to their states, they have increased their population, their mill population, above the national average. We are way below the national average. We must realize that this is a highly competitive affair. We must realize that states everywhere, as has been pointed out to you already, are seeking to bring industries into their states. It is no longer just an idea of sitting down and handing out pamphlets and expecting new industries to come in. We must present to those industries the potentialities of our small communities. We must tell them the sites that we have and all of that requires people who are trained, people who will not meet once a month but who will work 365 days a year to bring industries into the State of Maine.

Out of the allotment of \$350,000 which was allotted to the Maine Development Commission in the last fiscal year, only \$66,000 of that \$350,000 was spent for industry or geology. 12½ per cent of their bud-

get is given to Agriculture and to Sea and Shore Fisheries for the purpose of research. They realize that they are not equipped to do research. They give back 12½ per cent of their total appropriation to these departments to carry on their own research. And certainly if it is important that Sea and Shore Fisheries carry on its researches. If it is important that Agriculture carry on its research, why isn't it equally logical that we set up a department to take care of the great industries of this State and to do their own research. Out of all the pamphlets that were sent out by the Maine Development Commission, out of 25 pamphlets, I am told that only 2 dealt with bringing industry into Maine. The others were promotional, the reason for which the Maine Development Commission was set up. In the words of one of their very members they said, and I quote: "Our boys are trying to do a tremendous number of things at the same time." That is just what they are trying to do, a tremendous number of things at the same time and certainly they just can not do it and do it well.

All of these arguments that under this new setup, the Governor will come and go and that the Commissioner will be a political football, I ask you, how about the commissioners in the other departments? Governors have come and gone. Have they been relegated by the wayside? They say that the cost is tremendous. The price tag originally asked by the Governor was \$189,000 for each year of the biennium but under the new draft since the recreational promotion is to be retained under a separate division, naturally the appropriation that went for the Maine Development Commission must be carried into the other department if they are to do the same work or better work and consequently that has been added on to the \$189,000.

Now, I will say to you ladies and gentlemen of the House, when this bill was presented to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs, a complete report was given to them. It set up the salary of everyone that was necessary to carry on the department, in the

same way that each department presents its budget to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs. This is not a thing that was dreamed up over night. This is an idea that has been carried through for the good of the people of Maine.

The question of whether or not this bill is partisan. Ladies and gentleman, I believe that we are up here to do a job for the people of the State of Maine. What does it matter who introduced the bill? What does it matter whose name is attached to any bill? If the bill is for the life blood of the economic life of this State and for its citizens, why should we worry who introduced it if we are convinced in our minds and believe in our hearts that this is for the interest of the people of the State of Maine, why should we care whose name is attached to the bill? You and I were elected. We ran on our party ticket. It was partisan, yes, but once we come here and fill these seats, we represent both parties, we are working for the interests of the people of the State of Maine. It makes no difference to me whose name is affixed to any bill. I think that is small politics.

They claim that this is a political football. All of the arguments that they have hurled against this department, they could hurl against any department in the State. The commissioner will be appointed just like all other commissioners are appointed. He will have the clerical workers he needs just like all others. The thing that we must remember is this: The economical stability of our State is at stake. If we could do something not only to retain the industries that we have here. If we can do something to bring in new industries on the strength of those that are already here, I think that the price tag is not too large. It is something that I think we can afford to gamble with if you consider this a gamble. Figures show that we are going backwards instead of forwards in the State of Maine. Figures show that on the average we are way below and the time has come when we must do something and do it quickly. This, I believe, is the remedy. It is a non-partisan affair, I believe, and it is one which will

correct a situation which needs correction at this time.

They tell us that the Maine Development Commission could do better if it had more funds, that it could do the job just as well if it had more funds. It might interest you to know that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, that of the budget of the \$48,200 for industrial development, \$10,000 of that was not spent. In other words, they did not spend all of the appropriation that was given them for industry. How could they do a better job if more money was given to them? Ladies and gentlemen, this is more than a recreational promotion, it is a question of industry, to be worked at 365 days a year and I ask you if it is not something that merits the consideration of you and me and everyone else here in this Legislature? I certainly hope that the motion of the gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Pierce, does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Gardiner, Mr. Martin.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am all shook up from listening to oratory which I envy and which I wish that I possessed, because I assure you that I have as much sincerity as the person who has just spoken. For thirty years I have been in an occupation that is akin to publicity. I have been a newspaper reporter. I have been an Associated Press staff correspondent. I have been an Associated Press editor in three cities. As a result of those thirty years I think I know something of what I am saying. I am very serious and I am very sincere, and I have learned through varied experience that when I get too sincere unpleasant things are apt to happen.

To explain that I will explain something that happened in this House a few weeks ago when some of you were not present. I got all shook up as the saying goes, I got into my subject so deeply that I became a bull in a china shop and I became frightened, and the more I thrashed around the more my clothing, of course, got entangled in the crockery and the first thing I knew I ended up with my hide peeled off. And that is not the worst of it. When

I got home my own dog would not let me in the dooryard. My wife slipped out through the window. She had not seen me before with my hide peeled off and she did not recognize me. And I had to sleep in the car. And that is not the worst of it. The dog kept circling around that car all night and every once in a while he would lift his leg as if he was going to kick me. (Laughter)

Now, I wish it distinctly understood, before I say more, that I have no intention of entering into any personalities whatsoever. I am not mad at nobody, nowhere, nohow, and for that reason I am going to read what I have to say and then I will not get off the track.

Please allow me to make one thing very clear at the outset:

I do not pretend to be a prophet, especially assigned from on high, and possessed of a divine lantern with which to light the path for this Legislature toward a n y promised land. On the contrary, I confess to a most painful and humiliating inability to identify the correct solution to many of our problems, certainly and surely, and I presume that many of you have suffered this distressing sensation of inadequacy at times. Often it has helped me, in making decisions, to close my eyes against the confusion of details and to concentrate upon the principles involved. This has been so within the past few days, when we had under consideration the legislating of a department head out of office.

As a former selectman who has dealt both with the previous State Highway Commission and with the Chairman of the Commission as it is now constituted, I know that the proponents had just cause for complaint. These proponents are, like myself, representatives from small towns. They are my friends, my natural associates, and I felt a very strong urge to go along with them. But I voted against them. I voted upon what I believed to be a principle.

The principle is as simple as this—that the State of Maine had, in effect, entered into an agreement which stipulated a seven-year term of office, and that it is was not fair to change the rules in the middle

of the game. The gentlewoman from Rumford (Miss Cormier) expressed this principle in another way, and in words more forceful than mine, and I am sure that her statement of principle strongly influenced the action of this House in upholding the integrity of the State of Maine.

Now we are faced with yet another decision. Again I contend that principle—not expediency—not blind devotion to any leader—not politics, nor any consideration whatsoever of any personal loyalties, or enmities, should guide us in reaching this decision. For principle is the solid foundation of wise legislation. And it is the only solid foundation. Ignoring, for the moment, the details of L. D. 1465—what are the principles involved? Upon first reading this document I was struck by its denial—its utter and complete negation of a principle to which we, in Maine, have adhered to down through the generations. Maine people always have opposed the principle of mushrooming bureaucracy and the concentration of power in the hands of any one political overlord—however brilliant, however benign he might be.

An illustration is the perennial proposal to scrap our Executive Council, thereby transferring all our eggs to the basket of an all-powerful Governor—in the interests of more quickly and efficiently getting them to market. How many times has Maine been asked to consider this proposal? How many times have the people of Maine turned it down?

Yet here, ladies and gentlemen, in L. D. 1465, we are again confronted with this same principle—a concentration of power and, in this case—a great concentration of power—power in the hands of a single, solitary political appointee, beholden to but one master, the Governor who appointed him—an octopus legislated into being, equipped by statute with tentacles designed to reach into every department of state government—yes, and even into the local affairs of the smallest town.

If this sounds to you like an exaggeration I suggest that you once more study the bill. Its language is plain, its intent is clear and un-

mistakable. This did not ring true of a State of Maine bill. It does not have the sound of having been written by a Maine man, to be enacted by a Maine legislature, for the best interests of Maine people. And it is not a Maine bill. It is an alien bill, imported from Massachusetts in a political satchel. I do not profess to know whether this has been a good bill for Massachusetts. I do not believe that anyone knows, of a certainty. For even in Massachusetts it has not yet proved itself. It is, according to my information, not more than two years old.

And yet we, whose motto is *Dirigo*, which signifies "Leadership", are importuned to discard a tried and true Maine Development Commission which has been the envy of other states for twenty-and-eight years, in favor of this revolutionary, untried and utterly alien bureaucratic monstrosity. And just as the bill itself violates Maine principles, as I have understood them—so does the manner in which it was presented. As I have already pointed out—this bill was a stepchild, to begin with. But it was sponsored by honorable foster parents, having been originally introduced into this legislature by the Democratic party.

And then, very suddenly, something in the nature of a high crime was committed. The Great Snatch was perpetrated. I, for one, was astounded to learn, by reading a newspaper, that this poor stepchild had, overnight, been stolen from its foster parents. Somewhere, somehow, between dusk and dawning, the Republican Party had kidnapped the infant, and its name had been changed to a bipartisan issue.

Who says it is a bipartisan issue? By what right do they say it? Where and when was the Republican party foisted with sponsorship of this stepchild from Massachusetts? I have attended every session of this House so far. I have been present at every caucus of its Republican representatives to which I have been invited. Yet I cannot, for the life of me, recall the instance wherein this issue was approved by the Republican Party.

I now ask my fellow Republicans in this House whether they are in rapport with the principles which

have been employed to ensnare their vote in this issue. And I ask the Democrats whether they are pleased by the stratagem of a certain segment of the Republican party which has not only clambered aboard the Democratic bandwagon — but has seized the big bass drum, donned the big fur hat — and stolen the baton with the intention of leading the big parade? Things being as they are, I cannot see how any member of either party can conscientiously vote for this illegitimate offspring of an alleged union which has never been publicly solemnized.

And there is yet another principle involved. It is the first principle of all good legislation—wherever it may be proposed—and by whatever party it may be proposed. It is the principle that legislation be founded upon calm, thoughtful, mature and careful consideration.

I am informed that this bill which we are now asked to legislate upon is in something like its fourth revision. It was introduced early in the session. It has been twice considered by the Appropriations Committee. Certainly, it would seem that there has been ample time for calm, thoughtful, mature and careful consideration of its contents. And yet, as late as last week, when it received its second hearing before committee, it contained errors which strongly suggest that this bill has not received calm, thoughtful, mature nor even careful consideration by its sponsors.

I will mention but two of these errors. The first error, which would have required state and local officials to divulge to the omniscient Director of the Department of Development of Industry and Commerce upon request “all data and information within their knowledge and control” would clearly, if enacted into law, obligate the Attorney General, himself, to divulge the details, even of pending murder cases, to this all-powerful bureaucrat.

As an example of the quick recovery of a fumble I suggest that you compare Section 2, at the top of Page 2 of the mimeographed copy of this bill with Section 2, near the bottom of Page 2 of the printed version. If nothing more, it is a

remarkable and enlightening example of the legal legerdemain which can be accomplished by an adroit and last minute juggling of the words “may” and “shall”. But I do not believe that this comparison will increase your confidence in Legislative Document 1465. Another error in the bill, as offered in mimeograph at its second hearing, consists of an omission.

Now whether the sponsors were unaware of the statute which provides for liaison between the Maine Development Commission and the Maine Publicity Bureau—or whether they, in their haste, just forgot about it, I do not know. All I know is that the Maine Publicity Bureau was omitted from the version of the bill which was heard before that committee, and that it was dragged back into the statutes in the last paragraph of Section 8 in the printed version—just before the final statement of Emergency, which urges us to hurry up and get this thing passed, so that it may become effective July 1, 1955.

And so we come to a consideration of the final principle—haste. Where’s the fire? What’s the hurry? Being a small-town State of Mainer, I do not like to be pushed around. I do not like to be hurried. It makes me nervous. I get all shook up. It reminds me of the time I bought a secondhand automobile in a hurry, because the salesman told me if I did not take it, right then and there, someone else would snap it up. Now I would not advise anyone to buy a secondhand automobile in a hurry. Especially if it has been driven up, secondhand, from Massachusetts, and not one, but two parties, are trying to rush you into making the swap.

Maybe I am just a country boy, and do not know much. But what little bit country boys have learned, they have learned the hard way, and they do not forget. I certainly hope there are enough country boys—and girls—in this House to prevent the State of Maine from losing its shirt in this deal.

I hope that the two members of the Appropriations Committee who had the courage to vote no, despite goodness only knows what pressures, will be rewarded and vindicated by the vote we register here

today. I hope that somebody will tie this tin can to the tail of the celluloid dog, and sic him onto the asbestos cat, and that we will never, never see it or its likes again. And the way to do this is to vote for adoption of the minority report. I sincerely believe it and I hope you will do it.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, this is a subject that I have spoken about several times. In fear of repetition, I am going to confine my remarks to one phase of our existing industry because I feel that it is just as important to help our existing industries as it is to get other ones. When we speak of Maine industry, we quite often think of pulp and paper and textiles and shoes. Now, these corporations require tremendous capital investments. The difficulties in marketing and competition and so forth are so complex it would take a much more capable man than I to discuss the problems. But I am briefly going to discuss the problems of machinery manufacturers in Maine.

My remarks are not motivated by selfishness but this is a field that I do know something about. Aside from the standard items that these companies make, there is a tremendous potential in new fields at the present time. I will enumerate some of these and tell about the difficulties in breaking into these fields.

First, in nuclear energy. I had the honor this last week end to go to Boston with fourteen men from the State of Maine representing diverse interests and we visited several plants there and we went over to M.I.T. and we talked with two nuclear physicists there and it certainly was a most interesting experience. That day we were talking about the possibility of getting some allied new industries into Maine. But the present industries that we have in our State I do not maintain that they will ever build a complete nuclear reactor but I claim that they have, I know that they will, build parts for machinery such as this and they will do other types of things allied to it.

The next field is radar and sonar. Now, there are many opportunities for our existing businesses in these type fields. In the little City of Bath, we have built several million dollars of this type of equipment.

The next field is the electronic field. I know of one company in the State with no previous experience that had one contract for two and a half million dollars of this type of equipment but they did not get this except with a lucky contact.

The jet aircraft programs. Hundreds of our men in the State of Maine have left our State to go to places like the Pratt-Whitney Aircraft Corporation in Hartford, Connecticut.

And last, but certainly not least, the guided missile program. I was talking just a short while ago with the Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of Navy. He said that in his opinion there was more work in this particular program than in anything else in the Department of Defense and we in the State of Maine have not even scratched the surface. I do not think that we are doing anything in this yet.

Now, all of these things, the Maine Development Commission has not assisted us in getting that type of work. I will admit that it is very difficult to break into these new fields. All of the industries will admit that the prime consideration, of course, is the cost. But our industries here in Maine with Maine ingenuity and Yankee workmanship can certainly accomplish this but it will be difficult because of the ramifications involved. Not only do these programs involve all branches of the Department of Defense but it also means penetrating the shell of tremendously large corporations and that is a most difficult job. And I mean corporations like General Electric, General Motors, Westinghouse, Pratt and Whitney, Lockheed Aviation, Curtiss-Wright and many others. To learn the procedures, to learn to make entrees with companies like this is a concerted study. The average industrial concern just can not do it, it is next to impossible for them.

Now, whom am I talking about when I say machinery manufacturers? I am sure many of you know

them. The largest one that we have is the Saco-Lowell Shops in Biddeford-Saco. The next is South Portland Machine Tool Company, the Portland Company in Portland, the Hyde-Windlass Company in Bath, the Fay & Scott Machine Company in Dexter, the Southworth Machine Company in Portland, the Railroad Shops in both Derby and Waterville, the Machine Shops of the Oxford Paper Company and the other paper companies and the Bath Iron Works, and the many, many smaller machine shops employing between five and fifty men.

Now, we, of course, are justly proud of our textile industries employing some 10,000 people and when we talk of Bates with 6,000 employees, we certainly show concern and well we should. These little companies that I have enumerated, the potential there is well over 6,000 employees but most of them are now running far below capacity. Now, how can any legislation help this? To have a central organization with specific divisions and with specialists to point out to these people the places that they should go, the knowledge of procedure and most important to secure for them the proper contacts, it is most important. No one should criticize and no one does criticize the Maine Development Commission but if this Commission has done such a good job, why in the world do we not want to strengthen it? It does not seem right to me to have such an important aspect of this administration handled by a group of laymen who meet once a month for a couple of hours but you have a department with a competent full-time head and, of course, I will stress that word "competent" because that is one of the keys to the thing. But to have a competent full-time head with specific divisions and with sound rules and regulations with accompanying duties and responsibilities that certainly is a sound procedure. We can not and we should not be misled by any idealistic views that this alone is going to solve our industrial problems. But it certainly is a step in the right direction and I say let us take that step and I certainly hope that the motion of the gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Pierce, does not prevail at this time.

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: As a signer of the majority report on this issue, I would like to say that perhaps I did not consider the facts of everything that came in, and I did not consider the individual who presented this bill. I did not consider the people who are on the commission at the present time. And probably I did not give full consideration to the people who are working in the Department of the Maine Development Commission. I think the issue before us was to decide as to what type of vehicle we wanted to use in the State of Maine to develop the economy of our State and I think that the people who are on the Appropriations Committee who sat and heard the testimony and weighed it afterwards can not be criticized for the consideration which they gave to the bill. I think that I have nothing to add to what has been said. I think that the gentleman from North Yarmouth, Mr. Henry, certainly gave you the picture as he sees it from his point of view. The gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier, has certainly done a magnificent job in presenting her point of view. And I would just challenge one statement in her saying that the State of Maine is going backwards. I do not believe that the State of Maine can be going backwards when we can sit here as we have this afternoon and hear an issue as important as this issue is to the State of Maine debated without a feeling of hatred toward anyone or without sentiment brought into it, that the issues are being debated fairly and honestly as people see them. I think the only issue that we have is whether we want a commissioner form of department or a commission form. I sincerely believe that the commissioner form is a much better type of department. I would say that any commission that we have in which you have several people in authority you are not, as you probably can see from our own legislative deliberations, we are not going to get the best type of department or will we get from it

the things that we hoped that we would get.

I say that everyone in this Legislature is doing certainly the best job that they know how. That this is not a full-time job for any of us. We are here for a certain length of time and we do have to rush things. Democracy at best has its limitations. Sometime, if we would want to declare war on someone perhaps, we would be better off if we had a dictator state because we could do it immediately and let the consequences come as they would but I think that in our deliberations that we could do a much better job if in this proposal which we have before us, the Department of Development of Industry and Commerce, if we had one man heading it up and certainly I would take nothing away from the men who have been on the commission, the Maine Development Commission, over these years. I would take nothing from them and we still can have them in an advisory capacity. This bill has in there that they would still stay on in an advisory capacity but they would have no vote. I think that those people are big enough people, they certainly have proved that over the years, that they still would give their best judgment to the problems that we have and let the man who is running the department do what he feels is the best thing after considering all of their ideas. I certainly would oppose the motion of the gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Pierce.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Walsh.

Mr. WALSH: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to prolong this any great length of time but I would like to remind the members of the House of a few facts. One person heads the General Electric Company; one person heads the United States Steel; one person heads every leading organization we have in the United States and one person heads the United States. There have been words spoken here of gambling and of taking a chance. I think the people in the House should be reminded that there is a great deal of difference between gambling and taking a chance. The gambler always has the percentage in his favor. The one

who takes a chance does not care. This bill has been spoken of as an illegitimate child from Massachusetts. If this is not a good bill for Massachusetts, I wonder if the gentleman from West Gardiner, Mr. Martin, could tell me just why the industries in the electronic field alone have flocked to Massachusetts in the past three years. Is it not because they have this bill? Is it not because they have a wonderful department of research that they can turn to? I wonder why a banker in one of the leading banks in Boston, Massachusetts, stated within the past month before a public gathering of elected public officials that in his opinion the State of Maine could progress more rapidly in industry than any other state in the United States with the possible exception of California, if they woke up to what they had to do with.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Gardiner, Mr. Martin.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I will endeavor to answer the question which was put to me. The question as I got it was why did the electronics industry flock to Boston? I am not an authority upon electronics, but what little I do know about it, this is my understanding of it. It is a comparatively new field, it is a highly technical field, and it quite largely devolved from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology which is located across the Charles River from Boston in the city of Cambridge, and one of the largest electronics industries and one which has grown phenomenally probably there is nothing like it has ever happened before. It came of four young Massachusetts Institute of Technology graduates, plus their contracts with the University in manufacturing something in the nature of a geiger counter for the measuring of very, very fine thicknesses. Now there is one part of the answer to the question. I am sorry that I am not more of an authority on it. I think there was another question proposed. It had to do with the General Electric being headed by one man, General Motors being headed by one man, and with other great industries being headed by one man. I would point out that

there is a slight difference of opinion. Those industries are not headed by one man, those industries have a President who is under the direction of a Board of Directors. The Maine Development Commission is a Board of Directors, it has been for twenty-eight years, and it has done an amazingly good job and it can continue to do a good job. What we are doing with the Maine Development Commission is saying: "Sonny, you have done a fine job in this field, why did not you also get over and plow the other field". The answer to that is that this other field is a comparatively new field, it has not previously been directed to become very active in that field, and such money as it has had to spend in that field, it has done very well with. Now there was another question that has been raised, and that is the question of why is population and why is industry leaving Maine? The quoting of figures is again sometimes a dangerous thing. Figures can be quoted to signify almost either side of any question. There have been figures quoted which would indicate that Maine is on its way out. I wish to offer for your consideration this, that in the comparison of Maine, we have had it compared with southern states where there is a known trend toward more industry. I do not think that the comparison is fair. I think if we are going to compare Maine with anyone, we should compare Maine with some state which is in a comparable position, and the nearest to a comparable position that I can think of at the moment is New Hampshire, which borders it on the west, and Vermont which also is one of the northernmost of the New England States. I have here figures of the current population reports released by the United States Department of Commerce. The date is July 3rd, 1955. It gives the population trends in all of the states in the United States. I find that from July 1, 1954 to April 1, 1950 that the gain in Maine was 16,000 in population. New Hampshire at the same time lost 1,000 in population. Vermont gained 7,000 in population. In other words, our gain was more than twice the gain of any other northern New England state, and I con-

tend that that is the only thing that it is fair to compare it with is someone else in the same situation we are. Now it is getting late and I have three pages of material on population trends on new industries, old industries, increases in business. In ten years I think as I remember one of the figures, production of the value of manufactured goods has more than doubled. I have other figures like that, but you are too tired to listen to them, and so I will stop. I hope I have answered some of the questions.

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

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As one of the signers of the minority report of the Appropriations Committee, I sincerely feel that this bill should not be passed. In my opinion and the opinion of thousands of our citizens, who know the excellent work of the Development Commission, believe in its work, during the past twenty years or more, and at this time there should be no change. Why change for a Commissioner when we have twelve members with an executive secretary, Mr. Greaton, who has held this position over many years, and has given faithful service. He has acquired a knowledge partaking to this work, and his experience which would require years of study to equal this service by another, if he ever could. It seems to me it is not for this Legislature, knowing the good work accomplished by the Commission and its executive secretary, Mr. Greaton, to now cast them aside for no cause whatever. To my knowledge, no breath of scandal or suspicion has ever been made against this Commission, and yet, out of a clear sky at this very session one of the Commission members, who is also a member of this Legislature, feels that it is his duty to advocate a change, an abrupt change. His reply to questions regarding the present Commission personnel he says they have done a good job, and again he says a duty well performed, and yet, says he, the time has come when we need a change. Why? Yes, why? The old adage: "Do not change horses in the middle of the stream"

holds true I believe in this situation. I say this group of high minded men who have successfully guided the State's business for twenty years in development of industry and recreation, has brought millions of tourists and thousands of boys and girls into our state to enjoy our scenery, our woods, our lakes and streams, these good people leaving millions of their dollars for this privilege that benefit our people, and take away with them when they go only happy and pleasant memories. The Commission should be retained. Now in exchange for the horses in the middle of the stream, what are we going to receive in return? Instead of a twelve man Commission with no salaries, they serve only for the good and benefit of the State, it is proposed to have a one man Commissioner for a term of four years. He, to set up in this new Department of Development of Industry and Commerce, a division of three sets, Division of Planning, Division of Development, a Division of Recreational Promotion, and such others as he, the Commissioner, may recommend. In this new setup we will have a small army of paid executives and helpless to do a job which is now held by a twelve man Commission, a paid executive and a few office employees. The present Development Commission members shall become an advisory council only, as follows: The Governor, the Commissioner of Agriculture, the Commissioner of Inland Fisheries and Game, the Commissioner of Sea and Shore Fisheries, the Commissioner of Forestry and seven public members, twelve in all. Mind you, these men serve only in an advisory capacity without any authority or responsibility. At the present time they do have authority, and a real responsibility which they have recognized during the many years of service.

At a public hearing a few days ago in this House before the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Greaton and others appeared and gave us a very good picture of the work in regard to new industries. It was brought out that some 47 had been established in Maine during the past five years. I call that an excellent

record. It was further stated that with \$40,000 more they felt sure that with four extra men the results would have been much more, and more satisfactory to all concerned. Mr. Schnurle at this hearing made this statement: "You cannot buy new industries with dollars, but dollars are needed to assist in the work of expansion by having more men in the field". Only a few weeks ago at a testimonial banquet in his honor, in the Augusta House, over 300 friends of Mr. Schnurle were present to honor him for his faithful and untiring services as Chairman of the Development Commission during the past years. He has been a strong advocate for funds to carry on this work of the Commission before the Appropriations Committee on which I have served seven times during the past fourteen years.

Now what are we going to do about it? This, ladies and gentlemen, is the hour of decision. Thousands of our citizens all over Maine are watching us and hoping that this Commission will be retained. Letters and telegrams indicate the minds of many of our people that it may serve the State in the future as ably and well as it has in the past. I will read just two telegrams from out of the State testifying to the work of the Commission by Mr. Greaton. This comes from Belmont, Massachusetts: "As owner director of Middle Lake Camp in Maine I should like to respectfully call your attention to the invaluable work the Maine Development Commission through Mr. Greaton has done for the camping movement in Maine. I strongly oppose any bill which would change the present status of this Commission." Another one from Brookline, Massachusetts: "Please retain hard working Everett Greaton, your most far seeing genius whose effective and efficient comprehensive efforts has been and are particularly needed for development of Maine", signed by a group of citizens who come here from there. Now in passing let me just read this clipping in the press the other day under March 29. "Sanford, Maine. Executive Director, Everett S. Greaton said tonight that by assisting in the establishment of seven to ten new industries annually, the

Maine Development Commission can show a record of accomplishment achieved by few states industrial agencies. Greaton told the Sanford Lions Club that MDC has a well organized plan of industrial development, employing four full staff men, and now he wants four extra more at \$40,000 which he thinks will do a complete job. Our community development program is growing by leaps and bounds. He said during the past two years our industrial staff has assisted over 100 Maine communities to organize for industrial development. Greaton said MDC would double its efforts to help Sanford recover from the loss of most of Goodall-Sanford's operations by doing some special advertising and sending a staff man to New York to handle inequalities." The bill before us covers no dollars as you may see by looking it over. No one knows the salary of this proposed commissioner. The gentleman proposing this change says it may be \$10,000, \$12,000 or more. Then add to this the salaries of the several department heads mentioned in the bill and office help estimated to cost altogether \$185,000, besides the amount in the regular budget which we passed yesterday, passed to be enacted, \$325,000. Add these together it would be more than \$500,000 for this department if you pass this bill. I do not believe it will be worth the price. Let us think seriously today, ladies and gentlemen, before we make the change. I hope the minority report will be accepted.

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

Mr. BERNIER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The gentleman from West Gardiner, Mr. Martin, suggested that only statistics derived from states in a comparative position with our own were really significant in this debate. I have at hand a few such statistics. Percentage of increase in income payments to individuals in 1953 New England in percentage of increase in income payments in regard to industrial payroll to individuals, the percentage of increase is eight per cent, Connecticut is twelve per cent, Vermont eight per cent, Massachu-

setts eight per cent, Maine two per cent. The percentage of increase in construction awards from 1946 to 1953 the United States as a whole 132 per cent, New England as a whole 97 per cent, Maine 66 per cent, Massachusetts 90 per cent, New Hampshire 111 per cent, Maine is the lowest of them all. Percentage of increase in added volume of manufacturing from 1947 to 1952 the total of the United States 43 per cent, New England as a whole 32 per cent, Maine 22 per cent, New Hampshire 32 per cent, Vermont 76 per cent, again Maine is the lowest. Percentage of increase in average weekly wages from 1950 to 1953: The United States 20 per cent, Maine 16 per cent, New Hampshire 18 per cent, Vermont 23 per cent, Massachusetts 19 per cent, again Maine is the lowest.

I have here a clipping which I believe indicates to some degree—I realize that from one instance you cannot derive a valid general conclusion, nevertheless, I believe that to some degree it indicates the general tenor of opinions which exist and existed in Maine in regard to the Maine Development Commission. This article was published in the Bangor News on October 28th of last year following the election and just previous to the Governor's inaugural message in which this new Department of Industry and Commerce was suggested. The headline is as follows: "New York firm to aid program on Mt. Desert." The first paragraph reads as follows: "At a meeting this week of the Directors of the Mt. Desert Development Corporation the firm of Ebasco Services, Inc. of New York City was employed to assist in the economic development of the island." In nowhere throughout the article is the Maine Development Commission mentioned. The last paragraph continues: "After considering many forms of outside help to facilitate the development of the island the Ebasco Services was elected because of their world-wide industrial connections." I leave the answer to you why the citizens of Mt. Desert should resort to an outside firm for the development of their area, and I would like to point out that my mentioning this example is not consciously and

directly a criticism of the Maine Development Commission as it exists. I believe that in terms of the statistics which I quoted to you, Maine is at a juncture of her history where she has to step up her efforts to keep up with her sister states, and this new Department of Industry and Commerce represents what you might call an organizational retooling to do this job.

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

Mr. MCGLAULIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I came here this afternoon knowing nothing about this bill and having no idea how I was going to vote, but I have listened to the able arguments of both sides, and I pride myself in being able to know a good argument when I hear one. I am fully convinced that this bill ought not to pass, and I shall vote with Mr. Pierce, the gentleman from Bucksport.

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

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am not an orator like the gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier, or I am not a ball carrier like the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Walsh, who has had plenty of experience dodging the black bears, but all this debate reminds me of a little story I would like to tell. The other day I read in a newspaper, one of those little squibs, you know, one of those little ones they put in about that long. Two pugilists were having a ring duel over in England and it went along to the eighth round and in the eighth round the referee ruled that the weaker one had lost the bout on points. Now he said, I signed for ten rounds, I am supposed to fight ten rounds and he protested, so the referee let it go to ten rounds. In the tenth round he was out cold on the canvas. Now I appeal to you let us not lose this round, last Thursday we lost a round, last Friday we lost a round, and it will be the tenth round before you know it and I hope the motion by the gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Pierce, prevails.

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

Mr. COURTOIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think that we are failing to understand one point in this new development. I happen to work for the company that the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, said was Saco-Lowell Shops, I was employed with them, it was 28 years last week. I saw the company grow from just woolen textile into other products that we are doing today. Now at the same time we are still having people in our vicinity walking the streets. Each one in our area—I had the good fortune of talking with one gentleman this noontime at dinner and understand the problems he has where he comes from, but are we not forgetting just one point. We are thinking of vacations in one part of the State of Maine. We have vacations just four miles from where I live, we have Old Orchard Beach where we claim we have got one of the finest beaches in the world, but to a lot of people, even the name of Vacationland we have on the license plates is an insult because we are not all vacationing in the State of Maine, we are working. Now the whole point I think we are all missing, everyone has kept their point about what the Maine Development Commission has done, they really—I read an article in the Press Herald and I sat here and I listened to some of the answers that were given, there was nothing the Maine Development Commission did that they did not do a very good job, but they have failed in one thing, they have failed in industry that the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, brought up. In other words, in the area where I come from we have people walking the streets. I see the plant where I worked and I have seen up to 4,000 people working there, and now I see probably 1200 to 1500. By going out and doing a different kind of work than textile they have been able to employ an additional amount of people in a plant which the City of Saco themselves five years ago when I was on the Board of Aldermen voted to give them cash free in order to bring industry in, but they did that of their own volition, they

expended their own money to go out and do it, but we have a lot of areas in the State of Maine in which we need much more than just vacationing and just go out and do woodworking. In other words, in the Maine Development report which the secretary gave, he said the first thing they considered was the manufacturing of wood, and because we have plenty of wood in this area we could develop a lot of little plants where they would be able to produce different wood products. But we have to do more than that to employ our people, and I feel this way, that if we are going to go ahead in the State of Maine and we are going to furnish not only the citizens that we have now but the citizens of the future which are my children and your children, we should go out and support this even if it is not wholly the adequate solution. I know there will be other Legislatures after us, that if these problems are not all clarified in this particular group, I hope that the next time—not the next Legislature, because it would take more than one or two to do it, but in the future they will rectify and help to bring Maine the employment that we need because in other words, in every manufacturing industry we have got now, whether it is textile or whether it is in machinery, we have gone out and got the machines that are producing much more than they ever did before and we have people that are out of work. What we want to bring to Maine is some form of labor or industry whereby the people will work and keep them here where they will be satisfied. I know I am because I was born in Maine and I love Maine and I want to stay here, but I can take care of myself, but I do not know that my friends and my children after me can, and I believe the motion of "Ought not to pass" should not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bar Harbor, Mr. Edgar.

Mr. EDGAR: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Without attempting to take sides in this debate at the moment, I would merely like to clarify the clipping which was read by the gentleman from

Waterville, Mr. Bernier. According to that clipping the Mt. Desert Island Development Corporation was formed and employed the services of a corporation known as the Ebasco Services which is a company which specializes in contacting the industries and relocating them in sections for whom the Ebasco Services is working. The Mt. Desert Island Development Corporation was the brain child and creation of perhaps the wealthiest summer resident on Mt. Desert Island whose name is of national repute. This particular gentleman bought the majority of the stock in the Corporation and sold the balance of it to his closer friends among the summer colony on Mt. Desert and because Ebasco Services has for many years conducted the function of industrial location in behalf of this particular gentleman, that is why they were employed to do the job rather than having the Maine Development Commission chosen as the intermediary. In fairness to the Maine Development Commission, I would like to say that the Ebasco Services and the Maine Development Commission are cooperating very closely on the subject of bringing industry to Mt. Desert Island.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mount Desert, Mr. Reynolds.

Mr. REYNOLDS: Mr. Speaker, I think that Mr. Edgar, the gentleman from Bar Harbor, who just made the speech, has not really clarified the whole situation in Mount Desert. The issue there was that there was an association formed, and they did contact the Development Commission in Augusta at different times and very little satisfaction was obtained, and that is one of the reasons why this concern from New York was employed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Pierce, that the minority "Ought not to pass" report be accepted.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portage Lake, Mr. Cook.

Mr. COOK: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I get up with some trepidation because of all the good speakers that have preceded me, but I do get up with a

great sense of feeling that we have got perhaps before us one of the most important pieces of legislation that will come before this session of the Legislature. I was one of the fortunate few that went to Boston this last week end. I wish all of the membership could have been on that junket. I do not think anything pointed up to me so strongly the absolute essentialness of our having a very dynamic and forceful program in order to get this additional industry that we need in the State of Maine. I am not particularly concerned with the paternity of this stepchild. I know there have been a great many stepchildren that have amounted to some little stature. I do not see any reason to think that this could be otherwise. I would like to say one word about the difference between a Commission and a Commissioner as it happens to appear to me. It seems to me that a Commission is a very excellent body for deliberative matters. I think when we have a commission to sit down and go over the details of things as they come up such as on our Public Utilities Commission, that two, three or more heads are very good, it bodes for good deliberation. However, it seems to me that on industry, we are faced not with deliberation. Deliberation is perhaps the thing we want to get away from, what we need is action, and that is what this state desperately needs from the standpoint of industry.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Pierce, that the minority "Ought not to pass" report be accepted.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rumford, Miss Cormier.

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker, I would request a division.

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

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to say that a person who appeared at the last hearing we had on this bill in the House, who appeared for Mr. Greaton, has told me that he is not against the new department, but hopes in the change-over that the State will not lose the services

of Mr. Greaton in the recreation department. As a signer of the majority "Ought to pass" report it seems to me if we are to keep pace and hold our own with the other states and encourage industry to come to our state, we need this new department.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Stilphen.

Mr. STILPHEN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Probably I have been labelled before my appearance here this afternoon as a member of the majority party. We have heard of fog and smog and all those things, and here this afternoon and up to this time we have heard of this bill as being bipartisan. I was somewhat like our colleague from Portland, a distinguished gentleman, who had not definitely made up his mind when he came into the House this afternoon and who at the present moment has. Early in the afternoon I turned my radar on to look through the smog and fog and the label of bipartisanship and I had my eyes opened because sometimes you see buoys in uncharted waters that open your eyes when you look through radar.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call.

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker, we have had the most wonderful debate that I have ever heard on this floor. So we won't be skun, so we won't lose the round, I move the question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, moves the previous question.

For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. COOK (of Portage Lake): To inquire if we could have a yea and nay vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will inquire if the gentleman from Portage Lake, Mr. Cook, wishes a yea and nay vote taken on whether the previous question shall be entertained?

Mr. COOK: Not on the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will request the gentleman to kindly defer.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman

from Cumberland, Mr. Call, has moved the previous question. In order for the Chair to entertain the motion for the previous question, it requires the consent of one-third of the members present.

All those in favor of the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than one-third of the members present having arisen, the motion for the previous question is entertained.

The question now before the House is: Shall the main question be put now? All those in favor will say aye; those opposed, no.

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

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Pierce, that the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report be accepted.

The gentleman from Portage Lake, Mr. Cook, has requested a yeas and nays vote. The yeas and nays must be taken if one-fifth of the members present desire it. All those desiring that the vote be taken by the yeas and nays will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

An insufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously less than one-fifth of the members present having arisen, the yeas and nays are not ordered.

The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Pierce, that the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report be accepted.

The gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier, has requested a division.

As many as are in favor of the acceptance of the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

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

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, I now move the acceptance of the majority "Ought to pass" report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, moves that the Majority "Ought to pass" in new draft Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act to Create the Department of Industry and Commerce and to Amend the Laws relating to the Department of Labor and Industry and Maine Development Commission to Conform Thereto", House Paper 514, Legislative Document 620, be accepted. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the Majority "Ought to pass" in New Draft Report was accepted.

Thereupon, the Bill was given its two several readings.

Thereupon Miss Cormier of Rumford offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1196, L. D. 1465, Bill "An Act to Create the Department of Development of Industry and Commerce."

Amend said Bill by renumbering sections 6, 7 and 8 thereof to be sections 7, 8 and 9, respectively.

Further amend said Bill by inserting therein a new section, to be numbered 6, to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. R. S., c. 33, Sec. 7, subsection III, a m e n d e d. Subsection III of section 7 of chapter 33 of the revised statutes is hereby amended to read as follows:

'III. 66 2/3% of such moneys raised by assessments for the promotional, educational, experimental plans and the research and advertising purposes as determined by the Maine Dairy Council Committee and for the compensation of and the expenses incurred by the Maine Dairy Council Committee. All promotional and advertising plans shall be under the supervision of the Maine Development Commission.' "

Thereupon, House Amendment "A" was adopted.

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

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker, I now offer House Amendment "B" and I would say that these are merely technical changes and do not affect the bill whatsoever.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier, now offers House Amendment "B". The Clerk will read House Amendment "B".

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "B" to H. P. 1196, L. D. 1465, Bill "An Act to Create the Department of Development of Industry and Commerce."

Amend said Bill by adding after the word "Department" and before the period in the 12th line from the end thereof, the words 'and all appropriations to the Commission

made by the 97th Legislature shall be credited to the Department'

House Amendment "B" was then adopted and the Bill was assigned for third reading tomorrow.

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

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

The SPEAKER: Before the motion is put, if there are any notices not on the notice sheet the Clerk will read such notices.

The Chair understands that there are none.

On motion of Mr. Childs of Portland.

Adjourned until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.