

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-Ninth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

VOLUME II

1959
and
SPECIAL SESSION
1960

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL

AUGUSTA, MAINE

SENATE

Thursday, May 28, 1959

Senate called to order by the President.

Prayer by Rev. Emilie F. Pitcock of Raymond.

On motion by Mrs. Lord of Cumberland, Journal of yesterday read and approved.

The PRESIDENT: At this time the Chair would like to welcome to the Senate this morning fifty students of History and Government from Waldoboro High School accompanied by their instructor, Mr. Robert Green, and including the daughter of the Senator from Lincoln, Senator Dow. Most of these girls are a part of the girls champion Knox-Lincoln Basketball team. I would like to have the group stand up so that we may recognize the fine job you have done as champions. We trust that you have a very pleasant and educational day here in the Senate.

Papers from the House

Bill, "An Act Relating to Outdoor Advertising Devices on the Interstate System." (S. P. 401) (L. D. 1169)

In Senate on May 20, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment A (Filing No. 402) as amended by Senate Amendment A (Filing No. 403) thereto.

Comes from the House, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment A as amended by Senate Amendment A thereto, and as amended by House Amendment B (Filing No. 416), in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Parker of Piscataquis, the bill and accompanying papers were laid up on the table pending consideration.

JOINT RESOLUTION Memorializing Congress to Equalize Wage Rates Between Boston and Kittery-Portsmouth Naval Shipyards (H. P. 913) (L. D. 1287)

In Senate on May 26, indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

Comes from the House, that body having insisted upon its former action whereby the Joint Resolution

was adopted, now asks for a Committee of Conference.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Bates of Penobscot, the Senate voted to insist and join in the Committee of Conference. The President appointed as Senate Conferees, Senators: Bates of Penobscot, Ross of Sagadahoc and Lewis of Somerset.

Bill, "An Act Relating to Open Season for Fishing on Brooks and Streams in Cumberland County." (H. P. 240) (L. D. 351)

In Senate on May 26, indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

Comes from the House, that body having insisted upon its former action whereby the bill was passed to be enacted, now asks for Committee of Conference.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Carpenter of Somerset, the Senate voted to adhere.

Committee of Conference Report

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill, "An Act Exempting Hospital Thrift Shops from Sales Tax." (H. P. 700) (L. D. 1000) reported that they are Unable to Agree.

In House, report accepted.

In the Senate, the report was accepted in concurrence.

House Committee Reports Ought not to pass

The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill, "An Act Providing for the Construction of Class rooms, Laboratories and Library Building at the University of Maine in Portland." (H. P. 80) (L. D. 127) reported that the same Ought not to pass — Covered by Other Legislation.

The same Committee on Bill, "An Act Providing for the Construction of a Women's Physical Education Building at the University of Maine in Orono." (H. P. 231) (L. D. 342) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

The same Committee on Bill, "An Act Providing for the Construction of an Incinerator at the University of Maine in Orono." (H. P. 259) (L. D. 291) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

The same Committee on Bill, "An Act Providing for the Remodeling

of Wingate Hall at the University of Maine in Orono." (H. P. 261) (L. D. 393) reported that the same Ought not to pass — Covered by Other Legislation.

The same Committee on Bill, "An Act Providing for the Construction of a Building for the University Press at the University of Maine in Orono." (H. P. 262) (L. D. 394) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

The same Committee on Bill, "An Act Providing for Remodeling Aubert Hall, South End, at the University of Maine in Orono." (H. P. 263) (L. D. 395) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

The same Committee on Bill, "An Act Providing for the Remodeling of Aubert Hall, North End, at the University of Maine in Orono." (H. P. 264) (L. D. 396) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

The same Committee on Bill, "An Act Providing for Completing the Wings of Boardman Hall at the University of Maine in Orono." (H. P. 265) (L. D. 397) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

The same Committee on Bill, "An Act Providing for the Expansion of the Steam Plant at the University of Maine in Orono." (H. P. 336) (L. D. 496) reported that the same Ought not to pass — Covered by Other Legislation.

The same Committee on Bill, "An Act Providing for the Construction of Service Buildings at the University of Maine." (H. P. 337) (L. D. 497) reported that the same Ought not to pass — Covered by Other Legislation.

The same Committee on Bill, "An Act Providing for Enlarging and Extending the Sewer System at the University of Maine in Orono." (H. P. 338) (L. D. 498) reported that the same Ought not to pass — Covered by Other Legislation.

The same Committee on Bill, "An Act Appropriating Moneys for Completion of Music Section of Multi-Purpose Building at Aroostook State Teachers' College." (H. P. 380) (L. D. 563) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

The same Committee on Bill, "An Act Appropriating Moneys for Certain Projects at Gorham State Teachers' College." (H. P. 384) (L.

D. 567) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

The same Committee on Bill, "An Act Appropriating Moneys for Construction of Men's Dormitory at Maine Vocational Technical Institute." (H. P. 709) (L. D. 1014) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve to Complete the Classroom and Library Building at Gorham State Teachers' College." (H. P. 53) (L. D. 75) reported that the same Ought not to pass — Covered by Other Legislation.

The same Committee on "Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Vocational Educational Institute in Presque Isle." (H. P. 232) (L. D. 343) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of Improvements to the Women's Dormitory at Washington State Teachers' College." (H. P. 433) (L. D. 639) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

(In the Senate, on motion of Mr. Wyman of Washington, tabled pending acceptance of the report.)

The same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of an Athletic Field at Washington State Teachers' College." (H. P. 434) (L. D. 640) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

(In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Wyman of Washington, tabled pending acceptance of the report.)

The same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of a Women's Dormitory at Farmington State Teachers' College." (H. P. 467) (L. D. 685) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve Appropriating Moneys for a Natatorium Addition to the Multi-Purpose Building at Aroostook State Teachers' College." (H. P. 468) (L. D. 686) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Vocational Educational Institute in Androscoggin County." (H. P. 470) (L. D. 688) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve Appropriating Moneys for the Renovation of Corthell Hall, First and

Third Floors, at Gorham State Teachers' College." (H. P. 472) (L. D. 690) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve Appropriating Moneys for a Parking Space Adjacent to the Physical Education Building at Gorham State Teachers' College." (H. P. 473) (L. D. 691) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Campus Roads and Walks at Gorham State Teachers' College." (H. P. 474) (L. D. 692) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Stand-By Emergency Power at Gorham State Teachers' College." (H. P. 475) (L. D. 693) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve Appropriating Moneys for an Industrial Arts Building at Gorham State Teachers' College." (H. P. 476) (L. D. 694) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Primary Voltage Distribution System at Gorham State Teachers' College." (H. P. 477) (L. D. 695) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve Appropriating Moneys for a Parking Space Adjacent to the Industrial Arts Building at Gorham State Teachers' College." (H. P. 478) (L. D. 696) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of a Gymnasium at Farmington State Teachers' College." (H. P. 528) (L. D. 763) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve Providing Funds for School Lunch Subsidy." (H. P. 802) (L. D. 1141) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

Which reports were severally read and accepted in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Woodcock of Penobscot.

Recessed for twenty minutes.

After Recess

The Senate was called to order by the President.

Majority — OTP
Minority — ONTP

The Majority of the Committee on Taxation on Bill, "An Act Relating to Sales Tax on Motor Vehicles Traded In." (H. P. 179) (L. D. 250) reported that the same Ought to pass.
(Signed)

Senators:

WILLEY of Hancock
FOURNIER of York

Representatives:

ROLLINS of Belfast
COUSINS of Bangor
WALSH of Verona
PARSONS of Harford
BAXTER of Pittsfield
CYR of Augusta
MAXWELL of Jay

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter, reported that the bill Ought not to pass.

(Signed)

Senator

WYMAN of Washington

In House, Majority Report accepted and the bill passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate:

Mr. WILLEY of Hancock: Mr. President I move the acceptance of the Majority report of the committee in concurrence.

Mr. WOODCOCK of Penobscot: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I rise in opposition to the motion made by the Senator from Hancock, Senator Willey and I wish to speak to the opposition.

Car owners in the State of Maine now are burdened by an enormous amount of taxes. The last calendar year they paid close to thirty-four million dollars in taxes one way or another. To further place upon them taxation, would place upon this item which no longer can be considered one of a luxury nature, an unbearable burden. To my way of thinking this is an item apart from other items of personal property that do receive taxation on the differences in trade in. The automobile to the average family has become a necessity. It might well be that were this tax to be enacted into law that the further tax increment would be the money item that broke the camel's back and purchases of automobiles

in some families would thereafter be impossible.

In brief, I think we have taken all we can from the car owner and that placing a further taxation burden on them would be placing too big a bite against the owners of automobiles in the State of Maine.

Mr. LESSARD of Androscoggin: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I rise in favor of the motion of the Senator from Hancock, Senator Willey. Let us consider for a moment what the trade-in tax actually is. First of all we must remember that our sales tax here in Maine is a transaction tax. It is not a personal property tax. It is not a tax upon the automobile. It is a tax upon the transaction, the sale of the car. Now in order to approach the assessment of taxes and the apportionment of taxes, we try to apportion them on a fair and equitable basis and that is to apportion the tax so everyone pays his or her fair and equitable part of that tax.

Now the trade-in tax, which is merely a broadening of the base of our sales tax which was enacted some years ago by this legislature, is not really a new tax. As I said before, it merely broadens the base. It brings into line that part of the industry or that part of the mercantile business. That is fair. In other words, the automobile industry, the automobile sales, has been given a preference under the law as it now exists. They have trade-ins in other commodities which are not exempted. So, as I said before, it actually does create a preference, and in all fairness and equitableness we feel that this preference should be set aside.

Now I agree with the good Senator from Penobscot, Senator Woodcock, that perhaps the automobile is no longer a luxury, that perhaps it is a necessity, but I believe that that is a strong argument for the equitable distribution and apportionment of this tax, because most everyone now owns an automobile. The man of small income has perhaps a very low-priced automobile, a second-hand car, if you will, and the man who can afford a better car buys a higher-priced car, and when he trades he pays his proportion, he has to pay a little more

than the man of low income who buys a second-hand car and who pays little.

Now on any tax an attempt must be made to apportion it equitably to all classes of people. Let us analyze for a moment the taxes which have been proposed or referred to throughout this session.

Now the automobile tax reaches the individual of small income, the small income group. It reaches the group who have greater income, it reaches the corporation which owns automobiles, it reaches most everyone, because most everyone in our life today owns an automobile, whether it is a corporation or an individual. So it provides a broader basis on which to apportion this tax.

Let us discuss for a moment the cigarette tax which has been proposed. That only reaches one segment of the people. I am a cigarette smoker and it will reach me. The man next to me perhaps smokes cigars, so the tax doesn't reach him. The man next below doesn't smoke at all, perhaps, so it will not reach him. So you are just taxing a small group of people who smoke cigarettes.

Let's take the wild lands tax. I do not know what surveys show or who owns these wild lands, but I am assuming that most of the wild lands in the State of Maine are owned by the corporations. So who do you reach? You reach just this little group of corporations, a small segment, and make them pay the tax. That is not fair, that is not reaching as many people as we should.

Let's talk about the transient tax, the tourists. That again reaches mostly the people coming to the state, again a small segment of people. Probably it will hit a little bit the salesmen, residents of our state who travel about the state and stay in hotels, because they must pay the tax.

So if you analyze all the tax proposals before us, I think in all fairness and equity and justice, you will find that the trade-in tax is the one that has the broadest base, reaches the most people, and the one which is apportioned more fairly.

Now the good Senator from Penobscot has said that the car owners are carrying a large burden. That is true, perhaps, but not because of the fact that they buy an automobile but because of the fact that they are taxed for the use of that car, for gas and oil. Under our constitution that money must go for construction of our highways.

Therefore, if you really break it down, the buying and selling of cars has not been taxed too much. There is not too much tax attached to that—there is the registration perhaps, but even that goes to highways—but it is the use of the car where perhaps the burden has been. But that is completely another picture, because we must have money for the construction of our highways and our streets.

I think in all fairness and to do away with unfairness and to reach a broad base, that if we have to raise money this would be the most equitable manner in which to do it. We would be reaching more people, we would be reaching all classes, corporations as well as individuals, to pay their proportionate share, whereas if we adopt other methods of taxation we will be touching just a segment of our taxpaying public.

When the vote is taken, Mr. President, I would request a division.

Mr. WOODCOCK of Penobscot: Mr. President, I would like to move that this bill and the committee reports be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT: The pending question is on the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Woodcock, that L. D. 250 and both reports be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. FARLEY of York: Mr. President and members of the Senate: There are a few of us here today in the Senate who are classmates or alumni of the tax bills passed by the majority party in 1951. There are a few here along with the majority in 1951 that accepted the fact that there was no exemption on automobiles. The Democratic Party at that time had in its program a graduated income tax. We were defeated then, and if you remember, those of you in the alumni of the 1951 session, many of us in the Democratic Party followed former Governor Payne on the income tax, 18

Democrats and 17 Republicans voting for this bill, but we were defeated, and then we had the sales tax. I was one of those who strongly opposed the sales tax, but finally we had to go along with it. We exempted everything that you could think of under the sun, but we never exempted the automobile. The party that put the sales tax into effect today has got to take the brunt of that sales tax because they put it through in 1951. The Democratic Party did not put it through and we were sold out by our leaders in the other branch. It was argued from morning to night, along with the young lady from Portland along with the Republican Party, that the net value was in the bill, but later in the afternoon when we went back we were defeated by one vote, and that was by the Speaker of the House.

I think this is the fairest tax that could be put on today. There is no argument amongst the public relative to this tax. I don't know how anyone can put it on the books and then make a nose-dive. The Republican party at that time placed on the books appropriation after appropriation, and in the years after that if we had followed the same tax as it was put on the books we could have been eight million dollars in the black, but we are now in the red.

Then they came back in 1953 and they took it off of automobiles, and then later after the election, they took it off of cigars. I ask you, what Governor is coming into the State of Maine here, if you are going to keep exempting and exempting and going along with the services that the people want in the State of Maine, and for which that eloquent man, the majority leader of the House, Edward Chase, who is now gone, spoke and spoke on the fact that the people of the State of Maine wanted these services—I say to you that they want these services today and it is the Republicans who want to deny them.

Mr. STILPHEN of Knox: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I rise in support of the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Woodcock. For once I am glad that I can agree with the good Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Lessard, that this tax will definite-

ly reach the most people. I agree also with some of the things that the good Senator from York County, Senator Farley, has said relative to the Republican party putting this program of taxation on the books, the sales tax. In their wisdom, they found that there was an inequity in the automobile trade-in tax and they took it off, and now I am proud to be a member of the Republican party to help keep it off. I want it well-known over the State of Maine that the Democratic party is the party that is trying to put this particular measure onto the citizens of Maine from Kittery to Fort Kent.

The good Senator from York, Senator Farley, says there is no public reaction. I do not know of any measure that I have had more phone calls on than this one. It has not been from the automobile dealers of the State of Maine, it has been from Mr. and Mrs. Maine throughout the state. They have called me on this and they are very much concerned.

We have heard the leaders and the Democrats extol the workingman, we have heard them tell how they were looking out for him. I say today that they are imposing on the working men and the working women of the State of Maine a tax which they must pay. They must have an automobile to get back and forth from their work, and if you impose this tax on them you are adding a burden on them: you claim to do something for them with one hand, with unemployment compensation and other things, and on the other hand you are reaching into their pockets and taking something away from them which they have got to have. I certainly hope that the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Woodcock, Prevails.

Mr. DOW of Lincoln: Mr. President, I rise in support of the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Woodcock.

No one can deny that an auto is the most essential tool that a taxpayer has and uses with which to earn an income. If a man has to earn enough to pay all of the other taxes with which he is saddled nowadays, I think he should be relieved of the burden of the full tax on his car as he is now, in order to be

able to pay all of the other taxes and be able to live at the same time.

Mr. FARLEY of York: Mr. President and members of the Senate: In regard to the Senator from Knox County, he says he has received an awful lot of telephone calls. I do not think there is anything in the State of Maine that carries any more publicity than the newspapers here in the State of Maine. They placed a campaign in every newspaper in the State of Maine, asking each and everyone to write to their senators and representatives opposing this tax. In York County, where I come from, I received four, and that is all I got. We can camouflage on telephone calls and this and that; they could be hotel rooms, calls back and forth.

The Senator from Lincoln, Senator Dow, has spoken relative to the automobile. Today the average workingman with a family needs a refrigerator, they need a freezer — there is no ice today — but when they trade those in they don't get anything. A man in Lewiston who runs a store told me last night that on a power-saw you don't get it, and you don't get it when you buy machinery in the contracting business. It is only fair that the Republican party who placed it on the books should now go along with the program.

Before the tax was ever enacted, many here will remember when we came here in a special session and spent over three and a half million dollars in about twenty-seven minutes through a group of Republicans so that they would be ready for a tax in 1951. The Democrats are not doing anything. I claim that the Governor is entitled to a lot of credit when he lets his own bill like this come off the table in the House so that we may take a shot at it. I think that the Republican party has got something to answer for the people of the State of Maine on this question.

Mr. WILLEY of Hancock: Mr. President, I must rise to oppose the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Woodcock.

We listened diligently all winter to taxation bills, and we found that there were only two that we could favor. This is one of them, and I hate to see it die here today. The

other ones are very inequitable. When the vote is taken I will ask for a division.

Mr. HILLMAN of Penobscot: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I rise to support the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Woodcock. To the Senator from York, Senator Farley, I would like to say this: I do not think he will doubt my word when I tell him I had many, many letters, and they were not taken out of the newspapers. This morning I had three telephone calls in opposition to this measure. The most of my calls come from the small businessman. We are trying to do something for the workingman. What about the small businessman? Do you realize what it will cost the small businessman who has to trade in one, two, three or half a dozen trucks every year? You can call it a transaction tax or whatever you want to call it, instead of two percent it is a tax that costs him more than three percent. I am proud of the Republican stand in opposition to this measure. People are taxed, taxed and taxed, and this is just one more way to hurt the small businessman and the worker.

Mr. WEEKS of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I rise in support of the motion to indefinitely postpone the trade-in tax.

I suppose that I am one of the few who sat here in 1951 and passed the sales tax—I was one of the few who campaigned to accomplish what this measure attempts to destroy. We believed that it was good legislation in 1951 and we believed that it was good legislation in 1953—I believe that was the session in which we put in the exemption for trade-ins.

I am not going to make any political speeches, but it was part of my duty to put the taxation situation in the State of Maine on a firm basis. If we chose the sales tax instead of the income tax it was because we thought it was the best bill. It was part of my responsibility and I will stand here and accept it. I am not prepared to make any political speeches as to whether the Democrats or the Republicans were responsible. If I remember

correctly, I believe there was a Democrat in that group that voted for that exemption too.

I firmly believe that there is nobody in the State of Maine who wants this tax, and therefore I stand in favor of the motion to indefinitely postpone.

Mr. COFFIN of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I have to rise in support of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Woodcock.

A great many people have come into my place of business and they are very much against this tax, and I feel, at least in my section of the state, that they are going to be very disappointed if I vote for this tax. If we have got to have a tax, I am very much in favor of the transient tax, because I feel that vacationers can very well afford to pay a small proportion of their money for the privileges which they will receive when they come into this state, I am of the opinion that when we are on vacation we do not particularly worry about twenty-five or thirty cents a day which would be paid on the transient tax.

As far as the cigarette tax, I am a cigarette smoker and if I do not want to pay the tax on cigarettes I can quit smoking. Now I was not around here to vote for the various taxes that they have been talking about, the sales tax or taking off exemptions, but I am around here now and I am going to vote the way I see fit. Thank you.

Mr. HUNT of Kennebec: Mr. President and members of the Senate: It seems to me that this a time for a quiet and careful consideration of the problem before us and for statesmanship of the highest order. We are here not as party members but as representing all of the people of the State of Maine; we are here to raise money to put into effect a program of benefits for all of the people of the State of Maine, and they certainly would not excuse us if we on this occasion mixed politics into anything of this importance. The point is that we definitely have to raise money for the services that are required and called for by the people over and above prior services. Certain tax measures have been suggested, and the Taxation

Committee, after many weeks of careful consideration, have, by a vote of nine to one, adopted this particular type of taxation as being the most equitable.

Now this committee certainly could not be charged with not doing their duty and not carefully considering all the different angles of the various tax measures. It may be incidental that the Governor has suggested this particular type of tax also, after long consideration, in his budget message, as being what he thought to be the most equitable. Of course the Governor, whoever he may be and from whichever party, it is his duty to suggest in his budget message what he feels is the proper program for new services and also the means of raising taxes for them.

As I said earlier, it seems to me, members of the Senate, that the time has come to exercise statesmanship of the highest order here today in trying to come through with the money for the services which we all agree must be paid for. There is no other tax that the Governor has suggested; there is no other tax that everyone has agreed upon. Should this be turned down, we would be in a state of chaos as far as any definite plans for raising money for the services.

I feel that we had a good taxation committee, they have given this very careful consideration, and I think it is our duty to go along with the taxation committee on this matter.

Mr. ROSS of Sagadahoc: Mr. President and members of the Senate: As the Senator from Sagadahoc County, I feel duty-bound to speak on this bill.

As has been stated, the original sales tax had no exemptions, but in the session of 1953 the Senator who occupied this very seat, the Senator from Sagadahoc, Senator Cummings, led the fight for this exemption. At first I thought that move was unwise and I thought it was discrimination, because in no other instance were trade ins allowed, i.e., stoves, refrigerators, T.V.'s and so on; but, after further consideration, I certainly realize that the automobile falls into an entirely different category. Whether we call

it a luxury or a necessity, it is the one large single expense item that almost everybody has, and this tax, this Democratic measure, is a tax to really hurt the average man.

Now there are three reasons why this is inequitable in my mind. This is the item that is traded more frequently than the other items I mentioned. It is an item which is already carrying an extremely heavy tax burden, and it certainly does not spread the liability equitably. For instance, persons who visit our state in the summertime would not be sharing in the expense of running the state one single bit under this proposal.

Now I personally oppose any increase in taxation under present economic conditions, but, as I quite often do, I this morning disagree with my good friend, the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Lesnard, because I feel that this is one of the most inequitable taxes that was presented at the present time.

A few moments ago the Senator from York, Senator Farley, said that the Governor should be given a lot of credit for letting this tax measure come before us at the present time. I just ask you as practical members of this Senate: How could he have stopped it? I think that the only person in the state who really wants this tax is Governor Clauson, and I think that he was probably sold a bill of goods on it as the path of least resistance, and I certainly support the motion to indefinitely postpone the bill.

Mr. FARLEY of York: Mr. President, I suppose I have been around here a little longer than the Senator from Sagadahoc County, Senator Ross. It is true that the Senator from Sagadahoc, Senator Cummings, opposed it, but he was an automobile dealer, and he had a right to do that. His organization was with him. He had a self-interest. I have no self-interest here this morning. When I buy a five thousand dollar truck in my business I am going to pay the tax. It isn't going to hurt me. I had to do the same thing after 1951. I have got no self-interest in this thing whatsoever.

Insofar as politics are concerned, politics do not mean a thing one way or the other to me: if I take

a stand I will take it, I don't have to live on the political game; I go out with a dirty face and an old cap and do eight hours work. There are not many politicians who do that: they hang around the court houses trying to get a living. (Laughter)

Mr. LESSARD of Androscoggin: Mr. President and members of the Senate: It is not my purpose to get up here and protect the members of the Bar Association, but there are a few of us here and a few in the back row here who I am sure will be more able than I to defend our hanging around the courthouses. However, let me say something to you men: If by chance some of you laymen should be called to the court house you might want your lawyer friends to get you out, and we will try and get you out and do the best we can with the money that you have. (Laughter)

Seriously, I listened to the words of the Senator from Knox, Senator Stilphen, on the issue that the Democratic party had espoused this act and sponsored it. Evidently, as the good Senator from Kennebec, Senator Hunt, has pointed out, the Taxation Committee by a vote of nine to one saw some good reasoning in it. They are all intelligent and good legislators. I think that perhaps the fair and equitable apportionment of the tax — even though the good Senator from Sagadahoc, Senator Ross says it is not equitable — he just says that it is not equitable and that is the end of it, it is not equitable, because it reaches the poor people and where the automobile industry has not received a preference in the past.

Be that as it may, I would like to say that the Democratic party also is cognizant of the other side of the ledger. We are cognizant of the demands which are being made upon us by the people of the state, the increased demands for education, increased demands for our colleges, our universities, increased demands for our health and welfare department and we also are aware and cognizant of the fact that these services are costing more every day. We appreciate the responsibilities which we have as a party, and

I appreciate the responsibilities which I have as a Senator from my county to do all in my power to attempt to give the people of Maine that which they want. I also appreciate the fact that in order to do these things we must tax. It would be a beautiful legislative Utopia if we could come here and vote for all spending bills and vote against all the tax bills. It would be marvelous. We would be very popular and have no trouble in being re-elected for any office for which we wanted to run.

However, we do have responsibilities, every one of us to meet those increasing demands, to meet those needs for services and in doing so we must appropriate money and obtain money for that purpose. In doing so and in realizing that responsibility, in realizing that there are these extreme demands upon us at this time, the actual needs of the people—they are not frills, they just want those things that will enable them to continue their livelihood on a decent pattern—in order to meet those demands we have got to find income for them. In proposing this tax bill we say it is a fair and equitable manner in which to raise that money in order that we may meet these demands which have been made upon us here in the state government.

Mr. HUNT of Kennebec: Mr. President and members of the Senate, it is easy to vote against this bill as far as some may desire to do but I think the important question then comes up, and knowing as we all do that three million five hundred thousand has got to be raised I would like to ask those who are intending to stand up and vote against this if they have some other method. If there is a definite other way that this money is going to be raised, because we all know that until this problem is faced and met, this legislature has got to stay in session. Here is one way—of course any tax that is suggested is going to hurt some portion of the State. There is no tax but what there will be groups who will raise an objection. This tax has this feature: The Governor has suggested it, the taxation committee after very thorough deliberation has al-

most unanimously voted for it and this is one definite way that we could raise this money today.

To those who are going to oppose this I think belong the responsibility for a protracted delaying of this session and for all of the trouble that may arise in trying to find a substitute because it is not going to be easy to find three million five hundred thousand in some other way. This is one package that will do it at one time in one bill. Any other way may have to take two or three bills or a combination of bills. So it seems to me that those who are going to vote against it have the responsibility in their own minds to determine if they have some substitute worked out which they feel will have a chance of going through. The responsibility of statesmanship here today requires that we look one step further if we are going to vote against this and have in mind something definitely to put in its place. Not something that may happen or may be voted but something concrete and I doubt if there is any such combination now.

Mr. ROGERSON of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate, since it is going to be necessary for me to oppose the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Woodcock, I would like to make a statement to make it clear why I find it necessary to take that position and why I have found it necessary to take that position ever since 1953.

I think that this argument indicates that we can start with the premise that the government of the State of Maine needs three and a half million dollars. Otherwise we would not be arguing this question. And if we start from that premise that we need three and one half million dollars, then the question becomes, "How can we raise this three and one half million dollars in a way which will impose the burden evenly upon all the people of the State of Maine?" That, it seems to me, is the main question.

Now right at this point it is a very simple matter to get distracted by other considerations. For instance, we may begin to wonder about this point how many people we are going to offend by opposing

certain types of taxes; not only how many are we going to offend but how vocal those people are. As a matter of practical politics I suppose it is fairly easy to get distracted to the point that we begin to consider things which really aren't essential in this argument.

It was refreshing to hear the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Lessard, speak of some of the fundamental things in this issue. To get back to the main question of how, if the State of Maine needs three and one half million dollars, how can it be raised most equitably? It seems to me that we must remember some of the facts which have been stated by the opponents of this measure, that the automobile is no longer a luxury, indicating that everybody owns one car or more. And it should be remembered that the poor man owns a low priced car and the man of better income owns a higher priced car and possibly even two cars. If it is true that everybody owns a car, and if he owns a car according to his ability to pay, then it appears that this bill might be quite an equitable way of raising this three and a half million dollars which must be raised in some manner, through the people.

Now let's just digress a minute and say if we don't raise this by this means, how are we going to raise it in a manner which will distribute the load equitably upon all the people. If we don't raise it in this manner, then we have to turn to another proposal; let us say, the cigarette tax. Here we find that the poor man smokes just as many cigarettes as the man who has a high income, and therefore, in proportion to his income he would be paying a great deal heavier tax load than would the man of more means. Not only that but all people don't smoke. Consequently you are not distributing the load over all the people of the State of Maine, but are placing this burden upon a segment of the people of the State of Maine. When you say the cigarette tax won't raise enough money, we have to look for another source of tax. So we look to wild life. Here again we are imposing a burden upon just a segment of our economy rather than attempting to

spread this load evenly so that every person can bear his fair share. The only justification that I can see for saying it is better is that there are fewer and less vocal opponents to this means of raising the money, because it certainly isn't as equitable to impose the load on such a small area of the Maine economy.

As I recall some of the classic tests of a good tax, two of them specifically, are: 1. Ease of collection. A good tax should be easily collected and this certainly meets that test because the machinery is already in existence to collect this tax. 2. Probably the most important test of a good tax is "where is the incidence of the tax?" Here is the precise point that you have been discussing. The incidence of this tax is evenly on all people of the State of Maine because as the opposition has said, everybody owns a car of one type or another.

And so to justify the position which I take in supporting this measure I want to state that I am thoroughly convinced that this is the most equitable way of raising the money, if the State of Maine has to raise three and one half million dollars.

Mr. NOYES of Franklin: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I am not sure at this point, and I am sure that many other Senators are not sure, of the exact amount of money that we will have to raise. Perhaps we won't have to raise any money, but if we do, we do not know the exact amount which we may have to raise. We have, as you know, three or four tax possibilities before us and in the mill. I think it is time that we started talking facts and figures and a little bit about the economy of the State of Maine.

I hope that some of you have not forgotten that last year we were in a recession and certainly in the earlier part of this term we were talking in terms of the economy of Maine and particularly as it pertained to the rank and file of our people. Now in 1958 the per capita income of the people of Maine was \$1660. Likewise the taxes last year for state and local level totaled \$170 per capita. As against income that means now 10.2 per cent of our in-

come on a per capita basis goes for state, county and local taxes. I am told that we have approximately four hundred thousand cars registered in this state and likewise I understand that we have approximately four hundred thousand people who are working in this state. The trade-in tax most definitely will hit that group of people. They are now paying the lions share of the taxes in the State of Maine and I would like to end up with the figures for the month of February 1959 to show you that the average man's income is still very low although we know that February is one of the low months in the calendar year. I hope in this tax measure and in all other tax measures you will consider just these figures I am going to give you for February, 1959. To my way of thinking they are quite appalling. Most certainly the economy is picking up but we have got to give due consideration to the economy of Maine, and the economy of Maine is the rank and file of the people in Maine and particularly those people in the medium and lower income classes.

In February 1959. All the monies received by all the people of the State of Maine including all payments of social security, unemployment compensation, all dividends, all interest payments, all salaries and all wages, totaled only \$131½ million dollars. On a per capita basis, ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, that is about thirty dollars a week. So we have got to consider what tax, if any, and we must consider where that tax is going to fall. It is more important perhaps this year than it may be in another year, but the trade-in tax is to my way of thinking the most unjust and the most unfair; particularly in our slow recovery this year, it would be the most detrimental tax we could have.

Mr. FARLEY of York: Mr. President, I happen to be right here to answer the Senator from Franklin County, Senator Ross. There is the boom in business and the ride in trade. I do not think that our economy is going to drop much. I think we can go along with the Governor in his suggested appropriation. I do not think it will hurt the average fellow like myself who swaps ev-

ery two or three years. It is true that doctors swap every year, but if anyone gets a hospital bill they will realize it. If the doctor pays \$8000 for a Cadillac, why can't he pay the tax. At that time in the House we gave plenty of exemptions for industry from the tax, and now we are going along and we want to reverse ourselves, after we have figured on that amount of money as estimated revenue coming into the State of Maine, and we have gone along with a large educational program for the State of Maine. I can hear Ed Chase down there, and Dr. Bates and Leon Sanborn, lining them up and telling them what it meant: if we did not vote for the sales tax our cities and towns were going to lose money on education. I think it is perfectly fair; I do not think anyone is going to be hurt except perhaps so far as the political angle is concerned.

I am not here for politics. I supported the Governor in the primaries. I could have ducked it but I did not want to duck it.

The PRESIDENT: The pending question is on the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Woodcock to indefinitely postpone.

A division of the Senate was had.

Sixteen having voted in the affirmative and thirteen opposed, the motion to indefinitely postpone prevailed.

On motion by Mr. Woodcock, ordered sent forthwith to the House.

Enactors

The Committee on Engrossed Bills reported as truly and strictly engrossed, the following bills and resolves:

Bill, "An Act to Revise the Inland Fish and Game Laws." (S. P. 205) (L. D. 544)

Which bill was passed to be enacted.

"Resolve Opening Wilson Lake, Franklin County, to Ice Fishing." (H. P. 66) (L. D. 104)

"Resolve Providing that the Legislative Research Committee Study the State and Municipal Tax Structure of the State." (H. P. 131) (L. D. 189)

(On motion by Mr. Rogerson of Aroostook, placed on the Special Ap-

propriations Table pending final passage.)

"Resolve Opening Portland Lake in Aroostook County to Ice Fishing for Salmon and Trout." (S. P. 114) (L. D. 264)

Which resolves were severally finally passed.

Emergency

Bill, "An Act Reactivating the State Committee on Aging." (S. P. 492) (L. D. 1370)

(On motion by Mr. Rogerson of Aroostook, placed on the Special Appropriations Table pending enactment.)

Orders of the Day

The President laid before the Senate the first tabled and today assigned item being bill, "An Act Relating to Salaries of County Officials and Clerk Hire." (S. P. 491) (L. D. 1369) tabled on May 27 by the Senator from Washington, Senator Wyman, pending adoption of Senate Amendment A; and that Senator yielded to the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Martin.

Mr. MARTIN of Kennebec: Mr. president, there is just one item on the bill that the delegation from Kennebec is concerned with, and we would like to have the privilege of tabling this until later in the session.

The motion prevailed and the bill was retabled.

On motion by Mr. Hunt of Kennebec, the Senate voted to take from the table the 7th tabled item being Senate Report from the Committee on Taxation: Ought not to pass, on bill, "An Act Relating to Definition of Casual Sales under Sales Tax Law." (S. P. 385) (L. D. 1111) tabled by that Senator on April 14 pending acceptance of the report; and on further motion by the same Senator, the Ought not to pass report was accepted.

On motion by Mr. Lessard of Androscoggin, the Senate voted to take from the table the 3rd tabled item being, Senate Reports from the Committee on State Government: Majority Report, Ought not to pass; Minority Report, Ought to pass, on "Resolve Proposing an Amendment

to the Constitution for Appointment of Attorney General by the Governor with Consent of the Senate." (S. P. 85) (L. D. 157) tabled by that Senator on March 18 pending motion by Senator Hillman of Penobscot for acceptance of the Majority report; and Mr. Lessard of Androscoggin yielded to Mr. Hillman of Penobscot.

Mr. HILLMAN of Penobscot: Mr. President and members of the Senate: This is one of the first times since I have been a member of the legislature and one of the few times that I have changed my mind, and I am happy to agree today with the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Lessard, that a change might be beneficial to the State of Maine, and I have reason for that.

This was heard earlier in the session by the State Government Committee and was tabled on March 8th. Since that time, because of certain instances, I feel that perhaps if the Governor appoints the Attorney General we might get a more experienced man and careful consideration would be taken by the Governor in appointing him and in the confirmation by the council. If the Governor appoints the justices, then why shouldn't he appoint the Attorney General. Therefore, I will say that perhaps in this one instance a change is good.

Another reason why I go along with this measure is the fact that this will be one constitutional amendment to go before the people and this won't be confused with others: they will either confirm it or they will not. Therefore I will withdraw my motion to accept the majority "Ought not to pass" report of the committee.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Penobscot, Senator Hillman, moves that he be allowed to withdraw his motion that the Senate accept the majority "Ought not to pass" report of the committee.

The motion to withdraw prevailed.

Mr. LESSARD of Androscoggin: Mr. President, I now move the acceptance of the minority report of the committee and I yield to the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Hunt.

Mr. HUNT of Kennebec: Mr. President, I might say at the outset

that I have an amendment here which I intend to introduce which strikes out the word "Senate" and have the Attorney General named by the Governor and confirmed by the Council. In this bill we are not changing the original constitution. We are going back to the original set-up here in 1820 when Maine became a state. Under Section 8 of the Constitution of Maine adopted in 1820, the Attorney General was appointed by the Governor and this continued until 1855 at which time the present change was made and the reason for that was that in 1855 or 1857 there was a governor elected of one party and the Senate and House were of the other and there was quite a bit of feuding between the two and as a result of that in order perhaps for the then legislature to embarrass the Governor, this practice of having the Attorney General appointed by the Governor was changed.

If anyone is interested in checking on that, this book, "Maine A History, Volume 2" from the Maine State Library will give the details. So for the first thirty-five years of the state history, the Attorney General was appointed by the Governor with the consent of the Council. The reason that this change was made, was not that anyone thought it would be better, or because any group had studied it and thought it would be better, but simply because of this feud that there was at that time between the then Governor and the then legislature and they had strong enough backing so that they got the Constitutional Amendment passed by the people.

Now the Attorney General stated in a talk in Hallowell, back in February I believe it was, that although Maine was the only state in the union that elected the Attorney General in the way that we do, and the only state that has for a long time elected an Attorney General the way we do, that that didn't necessarily mean it was bad, but when you check on the history of the state around that period of 1855 to 1857 and find the reason for the change in the original constitution then it certainly doesn't indicate that it was a change made for high motives or for the welfare of the state.

Another reason why I think this change will be good, to have the appointment made by the Governor with the consent of the council is that at the present time it doesn't seem to me that we have anyone responsible for the appointment of the Attorney General. As we all know, he is appointed technically, in a caucus, and going back to the records of January 7th in the papers, we find that he was named by 64 unidentified, unnamed members of the Legislature. That is barely a third. Of course, as we all know, one section of the Legislature has nothing to do, really, with his appointment, and, with regards to the majority party, he is elected usually by a bare majority of that party. So in this case technically he was elected in caucus by sixty-four votes, which is only about a third of the legislature. But since this was by secret ballot, no one knows who the sixty-four were who voted for him or who the ones were who voted against him. So it is no wonder that no other state has seen fit to keep our system which we have here of electing our Attorney General, because we have now an Attorney General elected by sixty-four unidentified people. If under a system like this the Attorney General proves to be a good appointment whom we can give credit to, we do not know who is responsible—sixty-four unidentified persons have elected him; and if the appointment proves to be bad, who are we to blame for it. Again, we have sixty-four unidentified members of the legislature who name him, and we do not know who they are.

It seems to me, definitely, that we should have the Attorney General appointed by the Governor, in which case the Governor is responsible and receives the praise or the blame, or do as is done in some states where the people elect the Attorney General, and then of course it is the people who must take the blame or the praise for the appointment of the Attorney General.

So, in the first place, I feel that we are going back to the thinking of the founding fathers in suggesting this bill, and, in the second place, the change was made not for any high motive but simply because

there was a disagreement at that time between the chief executive branch of government and the legislative branch, and this disagreement became so heated that the legislature, as I understand it, took this method of perhaps hurting the then governor. And the third reason is that I do not feel that there is definite responsibility under this system that we now have. Fourth, and lastly, the Citizens Committee on State Government in its report suggested that the Attorney General should be named by the Governor with the consent of the council, and it was one of the decisions they came to in that Citizens Committee report.

The Senator from Penobscot, Senator Hillman, who was Chairman of the Committee on State Government, has authorized me to use excerpts from two letters which he received which I think show the thinking of the members of the Committee on this point. The first one is dated March 12, 1959 and addressed to Senator Earl M. Hillman, Chairman of the Committee on State Government, and is from Frank W. Hussey. I will read just two paragraphs:

"Frankly, Earl, two years ago I was opposed to these proposals myself. However, since our committee has given a great deal of time and thought to the problems of state government, and the need for more effective legislation, I am now completely convinced of their wisdom. We have too long tolerated a condition in state government that has placed responsibility on the Governor without giving him commensurate authority. Private business would not tolerate tying the hands of its chief executive officer. It is my sincere hope that your committee will see fit to report these bills out favorably because we believe they are important steps in the development of more efficient and effective state government.

I would therefore hope that the motion for the acceptance of the minority report will prevail, and then I would present this amendment to have confirmation by the council.

Mr. ROSS of Sagadahoc: Mr. President, yesterday I opposed certain gubernatorial appointments, and I

made two points in my argument: one was the point of political patronage and the other was too much centralized control in government. But here we have an elective post at the present time that is an entirely different category.

Our Attorney Generals must be men of integrity, ability and experience, and I certainly find no fault with the present Attorney General or any of the recent men who have held that office, but I certainly feel that we should remove this job from the popularity contest class. Popularity alone should not be a deciding factor in picking our Attorney General.

I mentioned yesterday that I am in favor of certain progressive governmental changes, and, as a proof of my integrity, which is sometimes open to question, I am happy to concur with some of my habitual opponents who have been friendly enemies of mine on many occasions this year, and I am delighted to support the motion of the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Lessard.

Mr. PIERCE of Hancock: Mr. President, I have been a member of the Citizens Committee since its inception three years ago. We voted unanimously that the Attorney General should not be appointed by the Governor. Today I am very happy to reverse my feeling and go along with the distinguished Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Lessard.

Mr. WEEKS of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I rise in support of the motion of the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Lessard. I think that possibly the thinking behind my position is more that the Attorney General is truly a representative of the State of Maine. Of course he is a law enforcement officer, but he should also be the chief advisor for the Governor, and as such the Governor should have the right to select someone in whom he has confidence, and I believe that he would select a man worthy of that position.

The PRESIDENT: Is it the pleasure of the Senate to accept the minority Ought to pass report of the committee?

The motion prevailed, the Ought to pass minority report was accepted and the resolve read once.

Mr. Hunt of Kennebec presented Senate Amendment A and moved its adoption.

Senate Amendment A was read and adopted and under suspension of the rules, the resolve was read a second time, and passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Woodcock of Penobscot

Recessed to one-thirty this afternoon.

After Recess

The Senate was called to order by the President.

The PRESIDENT: At this time it gives the Chair great pleasure to welcome to the Senate another group of students, the sixth grade from the New Gloucester Memorial School, accompanied by their teacher, William Herrman. It is always a pleasure to welcome you young people and your instructors to our deliberations in the Senate. On behalf of the Senate, I extend a cordial and hearty welcome and we hope that your visit at the state capitol today will be enjoyable and educational. (Applause)

On motion by Mr. Martin of Kennebec, the Senate voted to take from the table bill, "An Act Relating to Salaries of County Officials and Clerk Hire." (S. P. 491) (L. D. 1369) tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session pending adoption of Senate Amendment A; and on motion by the same Senator, Senate Amendment A was adopted.

Mr. Martin of Kennebec presented Senate Amendment A to Senate Amendment A and moved its adoption.

Thereupon, the Senate voted to reconsider its action just taken whereby it adopted Senate Amendment A. Senate Amendment A to Senate Amendment A was read and adopted; Senate Amendment A as amended was adopted.

Mr. Wyman of Washington presented Senate Amendment B to the bill.

Which amendment was adopted, and under suspension of the rules, the bill as amended was read a second time and passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Martin of Kennebec, the Senate voted to take from the table the 26th tabled item being bill, "An Act Revising Election Provisions in Charter of City of Lewiston." (H. P. 844) (L. D. 1207) tabled by that Senator on May 21 pending consideration.

Mr. BOUCHER of Androscoggin: Mr. President, for the reason that the City of Lewiston is now in the process of passing a budget and the passage of this bill at this time would disturb that process, I would like to have this retabled until next Wednesday.

The motion prevailed and the bill was retabled and especially assigned for Wednesday next.

Mr. CHARLES of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate, we have discovered a very small error in the county salary bill, L. D. 1369, and I therefore move that the Senate reconsider its action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed earlier in today's session.

The motion to reconsider engrossing prevailed and on further motion by Mr. Charles of Cumberland, the bill was laid upon the table pending passage to be engrossed and was especially assigned for later in today's session.

On motion by Mrs. Lord of Cumberland, it was voted that the Senate Staff and members of the Senate be allowed to remove their jackets during the remainder of today's session.

Mr. WOODCOCK of Penobscot: Mr. President, I understand that there is an amendment that will be proposed to a bill which is now on the table. The amendment is being written and I have been promised that it will be here within twenty minutes. I therefore move that the Senate recess for twenty minutes.

The motion prevailed.

Recessed for twenty minutes.

After Recess

Senate called to order by the President.

On motion by Mr. Parker of Piscataquis, the Senate voted to take from the table bill, "An Act Relat-

ing to Outdoor Advertising Devices on the Interstate System." (S. P. 401) (L. D. 1169) tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session; and that Senator yielded to the Senator from Knox, Senator Stilphen.

Mr. STILPHEN of Knox: Mr. President and members of the Senate, the motion which I am going to make and the action we will be taking on this particular bill is completely agreed upon by both sides of the issue. In order that we might introduce an amendment which has been agreed on by all concerned, I now move that we reconsider our action on L. D. 1169 whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed.

Thereupon, the rules were suspended and the Senate voted to reconsider its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed; and to further reconsider its action whereby Committee Amendment A as amended by Senate Amendment A thereto was adopted.

On motion by Mr. Stilphen of Knox, Committee Amendment A as amended by Senate Amendment A thereto was indefinitely postponed, and on further motion by the same Senator, House Amendment B to the bill was indefinitely postponed.

Mr. Stilphen of Knox then presented Senate Amendment B and moved its adoption.

Which Amendment was adopted and the bill as amended was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Wyman of Washington, the Senate voted to take from the table the 27th tabled item being bill "An Act to Construct a Bridge Between Lubec and Campbell Island." (H. P. 970) (L. D. 1379) tabled by that Senator on May 22 pending passage to be engrossed; and on further motion by the same Senator, the bill was passed to be engrossed in concurrence and ordered sent forthwith to the House.

On motion by Mr. Stilphen of Knox, L. D. 1169 was ordered sent forthwith to the House.

On motion by Mr. Charles of Cumberland, the Senate voted to take from the table bill, "An Act Relating to Salaries of County Officials and Clerk Hire." (S. P. 491) (L. D. 1369) tabled by that Senator

earlier in today's session pending passage to be engrossed; and Mr. Wyman of Washington presented Senate Amendment C and moved its adoption.

Senate Amendment C was read and adopted.

Mr. Carpenter of Somerset presented Senate Amendment D and moved its adoption.

Senate Amendment D was read and adopted.

Thereupon, the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended; and on motion by Mr. Charles of Cumberland, the bill and accompanying papers were ordered sent forthwith to the House.

On motion by Mr. Woodcock of Penobscot

Recessed to the sound of the gong.

After Recess

The Senate was called to order by the President.

On motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, the Senate voted to take from the table the 14th tabled item being Senate Reports from the Committee on State Government: Majority Report, Ought not to pass; Minority Report, Ought to pass on bill, "An Act Increasing Consumer Membership on Maine Milk Commission" (S. P. 312) (L. D. 858) tabled by that Seantor on May 1 pending motion by Senator Hillman of Penobscot to indefinitely postpone; and that Senator moved the pending question.

The motion prevailed and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

On motion by Mr. Duquette of York, the Senate voted to take from the table the 20th tabled item being House Report from the Committee on Natural Resources: Ought not to pass, on "Resolves, Authorizing the Release of State of Maine's Claim on T.1. 13, W.E.L.S., Piscataquis County." (H. P. 663) (L. D. 955) tabled by that Senator on May 14 pending acceptance of the report; and on further motion by the same Senator, the resolve was indefinitely postponed in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Woodcock of Penobscot, the Senate voted to take

from the table the 5th tabled item being House Report from the Committee on State Government: Ought not to pass; on bill, "An Act Increasing Salary of Members of the Legislature." (H. P. 15) (L. D. 24) tabled by that Senator on March 26 pending consideration; and on further motion by the same Senator, the bill was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Bates of Penobscot, the Senate voted to take from the table the 23rd tabled item, being House Reports from the Committee on Labor: Report AA, Ought to pass in new Draft, (H. P. 969) (L. D. 1378) same title; Minority Report A, Ought not to pass; Minority Report B, Ought to pass; on bill, "An Act Relating to Weekly Benefits for Total Unemployment Under Employment Security Law." (H. P. 651) (L. D. 942) tabled by that Senator on May 21 pending consideration of the reports; and on motion by the same Senator, Report AA, Ought to pass in new draft as L. D. 1378, was accepted in non-concurrence, the bill read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

House Committee Report

Majority —OTP in N.D., New Title
Minority — ONTP

The Majority of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill, "An Act to Appropriate Moneys for Capital Improvements and Construction of State Government for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1960 and June 30, 1961." (H. P. 103) (L. D. 159) reported same in New Draft (H. P. 973) (L. D. 1384) under New Title: "An Act to Appropriate Moneys for Capital Improvements, Construction, Repairs, Equipment, Supplies and Furnishings for Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1960 and June 30, 1961 and to Authorize a General Fund Bond Issue in the Amount of Six Million Dollars." and that it Ought to pass.

(Signed)
Senators:

ROGERSON of Aroostook
PIERCE of Hancock
DUQUETTE of York

Representatives:

BRAGDON of Perham
 DAVIS of Calais
 EDWARDS of Raymond
 JACQUES of Lewiston

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter, reported that the bill Ought not to pass.

(Signed)

Representatives:

STANLEY of Bangor
 BROWN of Ellsworth
 SMITH of Falmouth

In House, Majority Report accepted and the bill passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A (L. D. 1385)

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Rogerson of Aroostook, the Majority

Ought to pass in new draft report was accepted in concurrence and the bill read once; and on motion by Mr. Noyes of Franklin, the bill was tabled pending adoption of House Amendment A.

Subsequently, on motion by Mr. Noyes of Franklin, the bill was removed from the table; and on motion by Mr. Rogerson of Aroostook, House Amendment A was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence and under suspension of the rules, the bill was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Duquette of York

Adjourned until tomorrow morning at nine-thirty o'clock.