

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

One-Hundredth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1961

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Wednesday, March 22, 1961

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. John Wriglesworth of Albion.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

At this point, the gentleman from Etna, Mr. Carter, reported that he had performed the duty with which he was charged yesterday, and that Otis J. Roberts, Sr. had taken and subscribed the oaths necessary to qualify him to enter upon the discharge of his official duties as a Member of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER: The Chair requests that the gentleman from Etna, Mr. Carter, escort the gentleman from Dexter, Mr. Roberts, to the seat that is being assigned to him, that being Seat 78. (Applause)

The gentleman from Dexter, Mr. Roberts, has been a member of this House four times previously. It is nice to be winning elections at the age of eighty-four.

I think perhaps the Speaker was a little premature on Wednesday of last week when he elevated the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Thornton, and the gentleman from Norway, Mr. Chapman, to the positions of pages in the House. I think in view of the maturity of the gentleman from Dexter, Mr. Roberts, and the gentleman from Fort Kent, Mr. Cyr, that we will have to give the gentleman from Belfast and the gentleman from Norway back the ball and bat and they are just one of the boys once again. (Applause)

The Chair will now assign the gentleman from Dexter, Mr. Roberts, as the fourth ranking member on the Joint Standing Committee on Veterans and Military Affairs.

**Papers from the Senate
Senate Reports of Committees
Ought to Pass in New Draft**

Report of the Committee on Liquor Control on Bill "An Act Prohibiting the Sale of Alcoholic Beverages in the Unorganized Ter-

ritory" (S. P. 24) L. D. 49) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 495) (L. D. 1492) under title of "An Act Limiting the Sale of Alcoholic Beverages in Certain New Retail Stores and Restaurants in the Unorganized Territory" and that it "Ought to pass"

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the New Draft passed to be engrossed.

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence, the New Draft read twice and assigned the next legislative day.

Ought to Pass

Report of the Committee on Education reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act Authorizing Acceptance of Federal Act Providing for Financial Assistance in Constructing School Facilities" (S. P. 410) (L. D. 1351)

Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting same on Bill "An Act to Ratify the Incorporation of Pierce Cemetery Association" (S. P. 114) (L. D. 259)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Limitation on Lien on Nursing Home in Town of Madawaska" (S. P. 141) (L. D. 324)

Came from the Senate with the Reports read and accepted and the Bills passed to be engrossed.

In the House, Reports were read and accepted in concurrence, the Bills read twice and assigned the next legislative day.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Majority Report of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Private Shooting Preserves" (H. P. 985) (L. D. 1372) and Minority Report reporting "Ought to pass" on which the House accepted the Majority Report on March 17.

Came from the Senate with the Reports and Bill recommitted to the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game in non-concurrence.

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Relating

to Residence Requirements to Vote for President and Vice-President (S. P. 238) (L. D. 642) which was finally passed in the House on March 15 and passed to be engrossed on March 10.

Came from the Senate recommended to the Committee on State Government in non-concurrence.

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

Petitions, Bills and Resolves Requiring Reference

The following Resolve, approved by a majority of the Committee on Reference of Bills for appearance on House Calendar, less than one-tenth of the members present objecting, was received and referred to the following Committee.

Claims

Resolve in favor of Stanley Megquier of Orient (H. P. 1085) (Presented by Mr. Williams of Hodgdon)

(Ordered Printed)

Sent up for concurrence.

Orders

On motion of Mrs. Harrington of Patten, it was

ORDERED, that Mr. Berman of Houlton be excused from attendance for the duration of his illness.

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

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would recognize the presence in the gallery of a group of twenty-five students from the Williams School of Augusta. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Marjorie Lewis.

On behalf of the House the Chair extends to you a most hearty and cordial welcome, and we hope that you will enjoy and profit by your visit with us here today. (Applause)

House Reports of Committees Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Boissonneau from the Committee on Labor reported "Ought

not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Total Amount of Weekly Benefits under Employment Security Law" (H. P. 1001) (L. D. 1402)

Mr. Kellam from the Committee on Legal Affairs reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Qualifications of Licensed Private Detectives" (H. P. 250) (L. D. 364)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Ought to Pass Printed Bills

Mr. Stewart from the Committee on Legal Affairs reported "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Public Hearing on Certain Articles in Warrant for Town Meeting" (H. P. 159) (L. D. 222)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Construction of Drains and Sewers in City of Portland" (H. P. 523) (L. D. 721)

Reports were read and accepted, the Bills read twice and assigned the next legislative day.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Business Legislation reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to Eliminate Discrimination Between Purchasers" (H. P. 792) (L. D. 1106)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. BROWN of Hancock

PORTEOUS

of Cumberland

CHASE of Lincoln

— of the Senate.

Messrs. HUGHES of St. Albans

JOHNSON of Smithfield

MORSE of Oakland

— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mrs. SHEPARD of Stonington

Messrs. EDWARDS

of Stockton Springs

BERNARD of Sanford

CHOATE of Hallowell

— of the House.

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oakland, Mr. Morse.

Mr. MORSE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Your Committee on Business Legislation has finally come in with a marked disagreement on this bill. I do not want to take very much time but I do wish to express how I feel concerning it. Any bill that comes before a Committee I think the first thing we should establish is whether there is a need for the bill or not. In this particular case, I couldn't determine that there was a need. If there is one, it was well hidden, and perhaps applied to some particular industry. So I move that we accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report.

Thereupon, a division of the House was had.

Eighty-four having voted in the affirmative and fourteen having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail, the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Labor reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Costs of Witness and Attorney Fees under Workmen's Compensation Act" (H. P. 255) (L. D. 369)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. MAYO of Sagadahoc
EDMUNDS of Aroostook
— of the Senate.

Messrs. HARDY of Hope
THAANUM of Winthrop
BOISSONNEAU
— of Westbrook
WINCHENPAW
— of Friendship
HANCOCK of Nobleboro
BROWN
— of South Portland
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. COUTURE
— of Androscoggin
— of the Senate.

Mr. JOBIN of Rumford
— of the House.

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Fogg.

Mr. FOGG: Mr. Speaker, this bill is Representative Levesque's bill, and he is pretty busy this morning. Right now he is over in the office of the Commissioner of Education, Mr. Hill, and he wanted to know if I would table this bill for him until a later date. I had thought first Friday, but I talked with the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, and he felt that Tuesday would be a better day than Friday because of the fact we are apt to be pretty well jammed up here.

Thereupon, the Reports and Bill were tabled pending acceptance of either Report and specially assigned for Tuesday, March 28.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Labor reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Shortening Waiting Period under Workmen's Compensation Act" (H. P. 760) (L. D. 1046)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. MAYO of Sagadahoc
EDMUNDS of Aroostook
— of the Senate.

Messrs. HARDY of Hope
THAANUM of Winthrop
WINCHENPAW
— of Friendship
BOISSONNEAU
— of Westbrook
HANCOCK of Nobleboro
BROWN
— of South Portland
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. COUTURE
— of Androscoggin
— of the Senate.

Mr. JOBIN of Rumford
— of the House.

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hope, Mr. Hardy.

Mr. HARDY: Mr. Speaker, I move the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Hope, Mr. Hardy, that the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report be accepted.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante.

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker, two years ago when this same legislation was introduced, to better prepare myself so that I may be fully informed concerning this particular matter, I wrote to the late Chairman, L. C. Fortier of the Maine Employment Security Commission and asked him three questions that I felt important concerning this document. I wrote this letter on March 20th and he replied on March 23rd. These were the questions which I asked Mr. Fortier. I will now read from the House Record of April 2, 1959:

"1. Would elimination of the waiting week cause any administrative difficulties? This is his answer to the first question. The elimination of the waiting week would not cause any administrative difficulties.

"2. Would the elimination of the so-called waiting period expedite benefits? This was his answer to the second question: The elimination of the so-called waiting period would expedite benefits.

"3. Do you, in your opinion, think that the claimants would benefit from the elimination of the waiting week? This was his answer to the third question: Claimants who did not exhaust their benefits would benefit from the elimination of the waiting week.

Accordingly, those that would not exhaust their benefits are being penalized because of this waiting week period, so therefore, . . ."

I certainly hope that the motion to accept the Majority Report does not pass. For one, it will cause no administrative difficulties; two, it would expedite benefits; and three, it would benefit those that do not exhaust their benefits. I

will request a roll call vote when the vote is taken.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Smithfield, Mr. Johnson.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question through the Chair of the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, if I may. This bill says "An Act Shortening Waiting Period under Workmen's Compensation Act." Now how does that exhaust benefits is what I would like to know.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Smithfield, Mr. Johnson, has asked a question through the Chair of the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, who may answer if he chooses.

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

Mr. ESTEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not attempting to answer the gentleman's question, but it seems to me that the statements that the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, has just made, are germane to the Unemployment Security Act or the Employment Security Act. The bill we are considering is a different agency entirely and is concerned with the waiting period under Workmen's Compensation Act. I believe that this bill has had a good hearing and I concur with the gentleman from Hope, Mr. Hardy, that we accept the Majority Report.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call, it must have an expression of a desire for a roll call by at least one-fifth of the members present.

Will all those who desire a roll call please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned their count.

Eighteen members arose.

The SPEAKER: Eighteen having expressed their desire for a roll call, and one hundred seventeen members being present, eighteen being less than one-fifth, a roll call is not ordered. The Chair will order a division.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Letourneau.

Mr. LETOURNEAU: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I want

to beg your indulgence, but question has been raised as whether this concerns the Unemployment Security Commission or Workmen's Compensation. In order to clarify this, I would move that this be tabled until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Letourneau, moves that the Reports and Bill be tabled until the next legislative day, being Friday, pending the motion of the gentleman from Hope, Mr. Hardy, that the Majority Report be accepted.

At the request of Mr. Baxter of Pittsfield, a division of the House was had.

Thirty-six having voted in the affirmative and seventy-eight having voted in the negative, the tabling motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Hope, Mr. Hardy, that the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report be accepted. The Chair will order a division.

All those in favor of accepting the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report, please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Ninety-two having voted in the affirmative and twenty-six having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail, the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Labor reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Employment of Persons Because of Age" (H. P. 1002) (L. D. 1403)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. MAYO of Sagadahoc
EDMUNDS of Aroostook
— of the Senate.

Messrs. HARDY of Hope
THAANUM of Winthrop
BOISSONNEAU
of Westbrook
WINCHENPAW
of Friendship
HANCOCK of Nobleboro

BROWN

of South Portland
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. COUTURE
of Androscoggin
— of the Senate.

Mr. JOBIN of Rumford
— of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Winchenpaw of Friendship, the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted on a viva voce vote and sent up for concurrence.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act relating to Public Health Nursing" (S. P. 320) (L. D. 995)

Bill "An Act to Clarify the Employment Security Law" (S. P. 351) (L. D. 1084)

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

Amended Bills

Bill "An Act relating to Purchase of Land by Municipalities for Industrial Parks" (S. P. 163) (L. D. 409)

Bill "An Act Revising the Laws Relating to the Organization and General Supervisory Powers of the Department of Banks and Banking" (H. P. 494) (L. D. 805)

Bill "An Act Revising the Savings Bank Laws" (H. P. 574) (L. D. 794)

Resolve in Favor of the Town of Harmony (H. P. 197) (L. D. 292)

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

Constitutional Amendment Tabled

Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Limit to Retirement Purposes the Use of Funds of the Maine State Re-

tirement System (S. P. 306) (L. D. 894)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon.

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I would move in regard to this Resolve that it be tabled unassigned. In explanation of that motion, I would say this. This is a Senate Paper and it does have a cost attached—

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, a tabling motion is not debatable.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman is correct. The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, that this matter be tabled unassigned pending final passage.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, through the Chair I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his question.

Mr. JALBERT: Is he tabling the matter as House Chairman of the Appropriations Committee or as the Representative from Perham?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will not permit the question to be answered and will not entertain the question since the Chair rules that that is debating the tabling motion. Is it the pleasure of the House that this Resolve be tabled? All those in favor say aye; those opposed, no.

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

Eighty having voted in the affirmative and twenty-six having voted in the negative, the tabling motion did prevail.

Passed to Be Enacted Emergency Measure

An Act to Authorize the Municipalities of Perry and Pembroke to Form a School Administrative District (H. P. 667) (L. D. 945)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a division was had. 113 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Emergency Measure

An Act to Amend the Charter of the City of Calais (H. P. 761) (L. D. 1047)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a division was had. 116 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Emergency Measure

An Act relating to Licenses and Fees Therefor by Running Horse Racing Commission (H. P. 827) (L. D. 1142)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a division was had. 114 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Emergency Measure

An Act relating to Quinellas at Harness Race Meets (H. P. 896) (L. D. 1230)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a division was had. 112 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Emergency Measure Tabled

Resolve Providing for Emergency Renovation of Existing Facilities at the Maine State Prison (S. P. 249) (L. D. 766)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon.

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As House Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I hope you will go along with me to table this bill unassigned, and I so move.

Thereupon, the Resolve was tabled unassigned pending final passage.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would recognize the presence in the balcony of approximately seventy pupils from Farmington State Teachers' College, they are of course studying Maine, accompanied by Agnes P. Manter, Instructor. On behalf of the House, the Chair extends to you a most hearty and cordial welcome, and we hope you will enjoy and profit by your visit with us here today. (Applause)

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act relating to Fee of Outside Attorneys to Practice in Maine (S. P. 169) (L. D. 415)

An Act relating to Plantations Organized Upon Application of Three or more Citizens (S. P. 257) (L. D. 774)

An Act relating to Location of State Liquor Stores (S. P. 297) (L. D. 908)

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

Tabled

An Act relating to Sales of Discontinued Items of Liquor in State Stores (S. P. 436) (L. D. 1308)

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

(On motion of Mr. Bragdon of Perham, tabled pending passage to be enacted and unassigned.)

An Act Requiring the Humane Slaughtering of Livestock (S. P. 483) (L. D. 1475)

An Act relating to Disposition of Fines for Vehicle Overload Violators (S. P. 488) (L. D. 1480)

An Act relating to Compensation of Certain Policemen under Occupational Disease Law (H. P. 151) (L. D. 214)

An Act Providing for Maine Potato Advertising by the Department of Agriculture (H. P. 284) (L. D. 436)

An Act relating to Testing Milk (H. P. 374) (L. D. 549)

An Act Increasing Membership of Superintending School Committee of Town of Harpswell (H. P. 522) (L. D. 720)

An Act Revising the Laws Relating to Organization and Powers of Credit Unions (H. P. 794) (L. D. 1108)

An Act relating to Exempting from Taxation Mothers of Deceased Veterans (H. P. 907) (L. D. 1241)

An Act relating to Form of Capital Budget Expenditure in School District Budget (H. P. 922) (L. D. 1270)

An Act relating to Procedure of Application for and Organization of School Administrative Districts (H. P. 923) (L. D. 1271)

An Act relating to Sale of Liquor in Clubs to Members of Veterans' Organizations and Auxiliaries (H. P. 1010) (L. D. 1411)

An Act Regulating Disposal of Dead Poultry (H. P. 1076) (L. D. 1484)

An Act relating to Powers and Duties of Liquor Inspectors (H. P. 1077) (L. D. 1485)

Finally Passed

Resolve in favor of David A. Hickland of Milbridge (H. P. 12) (L. D. 31)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Smithfield, Mr. Johnson.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Perham,

Mr. Bragdon, has overlooked item 24, House Paper 12, Legislative Document 31, which should be on the calendar.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Smithfield, Mr. Johnson, has asked a question of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. BRAGDON: I wouldn't be too sure on this, but I am very sure that this item does contain an appropriation, and I think if the gentleman would look it up he will find it comes out of the dedicated funds and does not affect the general fund picture.

Tabled

Resolve Reimbursing Town of Weston for Aid Extended to Henry Lee (H. P. 299) (L. D. 451)

Resolve Reimbursing Town of Exeter for Aid Extended to Mrs. Virginia Smith (H. P. 580) (L. D. 800)

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

(Upon request of Mr. Bragdon of Perham, placed on Special Appropriations Calendar.)

Resolve in favor of Sherman Denbow of Lubec (H. P. 664) (L. D. 942)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair would like to recognize the presence in the gallery at this time of a class in Problems of Democracy from Hartland Academy, accompanied by Mr. Hamlin, the Principal, and Mr. Libby, a teacher.

On behalf of the House, the Chair extends to you a most hearty and cordial welcome, and we hope you will enjoy and profit by your visit with us here today. (Applause)

(Off Record Remarks)

The SPEAKER: The Chair would like to recognize at this time twenty-five members in the gallery from Lincoln Academy, a class in United States Government. They are accompanied by Mrs. Cecil Witham,

Teacher of Social Studies Department.

Also in the gallery, the Chair would like to recognize the presence of a group of eighth grade students of Bowdoin Central School in Bowdoin. There are nineteen members, and they are accompanied by teacher Clarence Fickett.

On behalf of the House the Chair extends to you a most hearty and cordial welcome and we hope that you will enjoy and profit by your visit with us here today. (Applause)

Orders of the Day

The Chair laid before the House the first tabled and today assigned matter:

HOUSE REPORT — Ought Not to Pass — Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Creating the Maine Board of Auctioneers." (H. P. 100) (L. D. 140)

Tabled — March 14, by Mr. Morrill of Harrison.

Pending — Acceptance of Report.

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

Mr. MORRILL: Mr. Speaker, I have talked with the Senate Chairman and the House Chairman on the Business Legislation Committee and they are willing to take this bill back to study a correction in the bill. So I move that this Bill be returned to the Committee on Legal Affairs.

Thereupon, the Report and Bill were recommitted to the Committee on Legal Affairs and sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the second tabled and today assigned matter:

Bill "An Act Repealing the Tax on Quahogs" (S. P. 236) (L. D. 640) — The House on March 8, Indefinitely Postponed the Reports and Bill. The Senate on March 10, voted to insist on its former action whereby Bill was Passed to be Engrossed and asks for committee of conference.

Tabled — March 15, by Mr. Schulten of Woolwich.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Lowery of Brunswick that the House Adhere.

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

Mr. LOWERY: Mr. Speaker, I now move that the House insist and join in a Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lowery, moves that the House insist and join in a Committee of Conference. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: On the part of the House, the Chair will appoint the following conferees: the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lowery; the gentlewoman from Bristol, Mrs. Sproul; and the gentleman from Jay, Mr. Maxwell.

The Chair laid before the House the third tabled and today assigned matter:

HOUSE REPORT — Ought Not to Pass — Committee on Health and Institutional Services — on Bill "An Act relating to Qualified Assistant Pharmacists." (H. P. 924) (L. D. 1272)

Tabled — March 15, by Mr. Lacharite of Brunswick.

Pending — Acceptance of Report.

On motion of Mr. Lacharite of Brunswick, the "Ought not to Pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the fourth tabled and today assigned matter:

HOUSE DIVIDED REPORT—Majority Ought to Pass — Minority Ought Not to Pass — Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game—on Resolve Regulating Fishing in Maranacook Lake, Kennebec County (H. P. 490) (L. D. 690)

Tabled — March 17, by Mr. Thaunum of Winthrop.

Pending — Acceptance of Either Report.

On motion of Mr. Moore of Casco, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted, the Resolve read once and assigned for second reading the next legislative day.

The Chair laid before the House the fifth tabled and today assigned matter:

HOUSE REPORT — Ought Not to Pass — Committee on Agricul-

ture on Bill "An Act relating to Price Controls on Milk" (H. P. 448) (L. D. 648)

Tabled — March 17, by Mr. Curtis of Bowdoinham.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Jameson of Bangor, to Substitute the Bill for the Ought Not to Pass Report.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As I said the other day, this is one of the most serious decisions, I believe, we have to make, in regards to this L. D. Now it is true that when this law was enacted back in the early thirties, it did a great deal to stabilize the dairy industry in the State of Maine, because it was surely in chaos. Now at the last several sessions we have considered bills similar to this. And I have been requested by producers and also by a great many consumers that they might have a little longer time to study this bill. And since there are other milk L. D.'s coming before this House, I am going to ask that this might be tabled until April 5, to give a little more time for the people who are so vitally concerned in order to study it over and perhaps come up with some sort of an amendment that would help everybody out and do no one any particular harm.

The SPEAKER: In reference to item five, L. D. 648, the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, has moved that this be tabled until April 5, pending the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Jameson, that the Bill be substituted for the Report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Anderson.

Mr. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to speak briefly on this bill.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. ANDERSON: From what I have read, what I have heard, and what I have actually observed, I have come to the conclusion that the large dairies control the entire milk situation, and do just about as—

Mr. JALBERT of Lewiston: I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman is debating the tabling motion, and may not proceed.

To ask unanimous consent would also be debating the motion, so the permission for unanimous consent is not granted.

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

Mr. GARDNER: I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested on the tabling motion.

All those in favor of the tabling motion please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned their count.

A division of the House was had.

Fifty-four having voted in the affirmative and sixty having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Livermore, Mr. Boothby.

Mr. BOOTHBY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House:

As a member of your Agricultural Committee and as a dairyman, I would like to speak in opposition to L. D. 648 and try to point out some of the reasons why we who are vitally interested in the milk industry are quite happy with the law we now have on the books.

First let me say that your Committee held quite an extensive hearing on L. D. 648. We listened to all parties who had anything to say on the subject. In going over my notes, I find that the gentleman from Bangor spoke for the bill. Also a Mr. Brown appears in my notes with a question mark after his name. I would presume he was in favor, with some qualifications.

In opposition these names appeared: Mr. Swanger of the New England Milk Producers Association, Mr. Stetson Smith of the Maine Farm Bureau, Mr. Harold Libby of the Maine Dairyman's Association, Mr. Phillip Andrews of the Lewiston-Auburn Milk Producers Association, Mr. Martin Kenney of the Maine Milk Dealers Association, Mr. Bennett of Oakhurst Dairy, Mr. Denney, Mr. Har-

old Shaw and several others from the producers and dealers groups. Also conspicuously absent were members from any group of consumers.

It is from this mass of evidence that your Committee arrived at the report which was unanimous "Ought not to pass."

I feel very certain that we already have the best milk law of any New England state. To support this belief, please allow me to state that Maine pays the highest price to the producers of any state in New England. Maine consumers buy their milk the cheapest of any state in New England with the possible exception of two small areas in Vermont. And as you know, that State has more cows than people. These figures were taken from a report dated February 17, 1961, sent out by the United States Department of Agriculture, Crop Reporting Board, Washington, D. C.

These are some of the reasons why we are not interested in tampering with our present milk law by enacting an entirely new one as represented by L. D. 648.

I would like to move, Mr. Speaker, that this bill be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The prevailing question now is the motion of the gentleman from Livermore, Mr. Boothby, that this Bill be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Scarborough, Mr. Coulthard.

Mr. COULTHARD: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is in answer to the remarks made last Friday by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Jameson. I would like to say, "Yes, we did have a large day at our hearing, from one-thirty to seven o'clock that evening." I appreciate the gentleman's respect for the Agriculture Committee and I also respect my colleagues very much. At this time I would say I was the offender of the Committee who offered Mr. Jameson the liquid refreshment.

We, of the Committee, had and do now have, a strong feeling that L. D. 648 would be detrimental to the dairy and milk industry, and

if it were brought before the House for debate some of the members of the House, not having made a study of the Milk Commission, would misunderstand some of the remarks made.

I, being a neighbor of Mr. Jameson, residing in the same hotel, desired to talk further with the gentleman from Bangor; and in my remarks to Mr. Jameson, I did offer to purchase liquid refreshments, that we might sit down and talk. I admit, I should have specified "Milk."

Now in regard to L. D. 648, a bill to repeal price control and duties of the Milk Commission, I do not believe it will accomplish what the sponsors of this bill intended.

The producer now has the right to sell at his farm any and all milk he desires, at any price he desires. If we were allowed to distribute and sell away from the farm without control it would, in my opinion, result in a setback of the entire milk industry. I would like to illustrate; for example, in my own business as a vegetable grower along with my brothers, operating as Coulthard Brothers, we have a large acreage and depend on wholesale dealers or Commission Houses, so-called, to distribute the larger percentage we raise. We, the same as milk producers, also sell at the farm, by vegetable roadside stand, which the wholesale dealer takes no offense to.

Now, if we were to sell to our wholesaler's outlets, stores, supermarkets, and so on, at cutrate prices, we would not be able to sell all we produce and I believe most milk producers would not be able to either; and it would only result in a price war. We as producers, the same as milk producers, would suffer, and the consumer would not benefit, as the sponsors of this bill believe.

Now in regard to the remarks made by the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, and I quote, "The price spread from producer to consumer is too great," the Milk Commission as it stands today has the authority to control this situation. And I would like to add that the spread is less in Maine than most any other state.

I thank you for your kind attention.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Anderson.

Mr. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: From what I have read, what I have heard, and what I have actually observed, I have come to the conclusion that the large dairies control the entire milk situation and do just about as they please. You read in the papers where one dairy wants an increase and the Board grants it to them. Then when the price of milk changes and a new listing is printed in the papers,—just try and buy milk at the price the Commission quotes. The price listed is the cheapest they can sell it, but they can charge as much more for it as they like.

A few years ago, a friend of mine ran a concession and purchased both chocolate and white milk in half pint containers. He had to pay one half to three quarters of a cent more than the listing in the paper. Broken down, this is eight to twelve cents on a gallon, a generous extra bonus for the dairyman.

I would like to ask through the Chair if any opponent of this bill can tell me why milk in Boston, in most cases farther away from the product, can be sold twenty to thirty cents a gallon cheaper than it can be sold here. I can't help thinking the Commission is all for the dairyman and the consumer is the forgotten man who denies his children this health-giving product because he can't afford to pay these greedy men the outrageous price they demand.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Anderson, has asked a question through the Chair to anyone who may choose to answer.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Leeds, Mr. Buckley.

Mr. BUCKLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am a producer and always have been, and don't know enough to do anything else; and I would like to make a few brief remarks, and I will not bore you with more than a few. I would like to thank the

gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Jame-son, for the sympathy he has for the dairymen of the State, while I don't think we would be getting any more for our milk if we went along with his idea of making it for the prices of the farmer, because the experience I have had over fifty years is if the distributor doesn't get his why it falls back on the farmer, he takes it out of him. And I think that many of the consumers and possibly others do not realize that they have a lot of class two milk that has to be sold for—well, makes cheese and cream and one thing and another, so they don't get the price that many people think they get.

And I don't think the consumer has been used very bad because they are buying a quart of milk delivered on their doorstep as low as any State in New England, and if one consumer cares to take his gallon jug to most any dairyman and they will fill it for fifteen cents a quart. And the Commission loves that.

And I am quite sure that our scientists and nutritionists agree that a quart of standard milk is worth much more than it costs; in fact five years ago they came out that it was worth thirty-eight cents compared to any other food that goes on to a consumer's table. I thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pat-ten, Mrs. Harrington.

Mrs. HARRINGTON: Mr. Speak-er and Members of the House: The dairy industry is the only stabilized agricultural industry that we have today. Potatoes are being sold for low production, and you can go in to any of the good supermarkets today and buy chickens for twenty-nine cents a pound. I don't believe that that industry is very stable at this time. I would like to read to you from the Legislative Policy Statement of the Maine State Grange of 1961, "We are convinced that our present milk control laws are working very well and we be-lieve that they are furnishing ade-quate protection for both producer and consumer. We would not favor any major change at this time."

If you adopt this bill, you not only eliminate the Milk Commission but you destroy the dairy farmer.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recog-nizes the gentleman from Bow-doinham, Mr. Curtis.

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, La-dies and Gentlemen of the House: When this law was enacted back in the early thirties, there was a great deal of difference in the situ-ation than what there is now. One of the things at that particular time—a great deal of the milk was sold as natural or what they call it now, raw milk. But today there is very little milk sold as natural milk, except at the farm. Most milk is sold as pasteurized milk, and there would be no chance for the small farmer to get into the market, because the cost of a pasteurizing outfit is so expensive that he would never be able to get the interest on the money he put in this equipment. And so, he is out of the market.

Now what this control law does in setting the minimum price to the consumer is just to protect the dealer and nothing more. When this law was first enacted, the spread was eight cents and today it is anywhere from thirteen to fifteen. Another thing I would like to point out to you is this: that for a number of years when this control law was in effect, when the price of milk dropped, why the dealer took one-half of the drop and the producer the other half. Now the Control Board has seen fit, the Lord only knows why, for I have never been able to find out the reason, why they dropped the price of milk one cent a quart on the first day of March.

Now if anybody knows anything about milk, or the making of milk, or the production of milk, knows that it costs more money to make milk in March than it does in most any other time in the year than in March or February. Now February 1, the Control Board says that they are going to drop the price of milk another cent; of course the consumer is going to be happy about that, but the dealer takes nothing of that. I know be-cause I was a dealer for years. And we sold a thousand quarts a day and that just meant that we

had to put in less than — it saved us from spending eighteen dollars a day while we would have to if we had taken part of the drop.

Now what this bill is all about is just the same thing that has happened in the electrical industry of late. You know the United States Justice Department took them over the coals and sent some of the big boys to jail, for what they were doing. And if you will take notice now the retail price of electrical supplies has dropped from twenty to thirty-five percent and there is nobody going broke even now.

So this whole thing, the dealer that brought it on himself by his actions and a Control Board going along with him, now I do maintain this, that if we had had a Control Board over the years that was as interested in the farm industry and in the consumer as well as the dealer, this L. D. would never have been on the market. But because they have cornered the market to such a shape; and down at the hearing the gentleman over there told you who appeared against this bill, sure, the dealers, a whole shooting match of them, and had a lot of farmers there that didn't dare say their souls were their own. Because they knew if they did, they would probably get dropped from the market.

In fact I could give you cases, dates and everything where the dealers had said to the producer if you don't buy the particular tanks that we are selling, the chances are you will lose your market. One fellow did lose his market. Now that is what has been going on. And in fact the consumer has been practically forgotten. Now I don't think the dealer is getting — I don't think the producer is getting—any more than is coming to him. I know that after the first day of April when milk drops one cent a quart, and the producer has to take the whole of it, that he is going to be—until he gets his cows out in the pasture, he is going to be losing money every minute. In fact he is—fair if you look into the situation, that is why I wanted to table this thing so you might look into it, from the time that the ordinary consumer — the producer — from the

time he ties his cows up in the fall of the year, until he lets them out in the spring of the year, he is lucky if he breaks even. If he makes any money it will be in the summertime.

Now this bill is just simply to protect the dealer. Now I maintain that he has got himself in a position where he can protect himself. Back twenty-five or thirty years ago, why most any of the small farmers could start in and sell milk, but as I say, you cannot sell milk at any amount unless it is pasteurized. And it costs too much for a pasteurization outfit. And why should the dealer have to be protected? Who else is protecting the market? The lady from Patten told about the chicken industry, they are not protected, they are under the open market, and they are making a go of it all right. In fact I know a great many people who got out of the dairy business in producing milk, who have gone into the chicken business and doing much better than they were. And they are going into this open market.

So I say that is time that we stop and thought something about the consumer. What about him? I maintain that a thirteen-fifteen cent spread is too much for anybody selling milk, and I have sold thousands of quarts.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hope, Mr. Hardy.

Mr. HARDY: Mr. Speaker, I will admit that perhaps there is something that needs to be done about the present rules and regulations that we are producing milk under, but this particular bill is not it.

I cannot agree with Mr. Curtis in whole in regard to the condition of the Maine chicken man. It is true that perhaps this year he is having a little better luck than he had last year. But in my section I can show you a great many barns that have been converted to chickens and now they are empty. On the other hand our dairymen down there are doing very well. They are not too discontented, they do feel as I have already stated that perhaps we do need to have something done about this thing, but to do away with it en-

tirely, we don't have any implement to go to work on. So I cannot agree with the sentiments of Mr. Curtis.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Harpswell, Mr. Prince.

Mr. PRINCE: Mr. Speaker, constituents of mine in the Town of Cumberland are expressing their opinion as against this Legislative Document 648, and I would like to read a letter that I just received from one of the conspicuous dairy farmers in that section.

"Dear Jack:

I have just learned that Legislative Document 648, to revise the milk price control law will be taken from the table tomorrow. I hope this letter reaches you in time, as I am very anxious that this bill be defeated. And hope you will do whatever you can to see that this proposal does not pass.

I know that a great majority of farmers shipping milk to Maine markets share my concern. We feel that passage of this legislation would render our orderly milk pricing program ineffective and result in price wars at the retail level. This might seem harmless but we know from experience and observation that the farmer is the one who eventually absorbs the impact of such price-cutting practices.

(Signed) Richard L. Blanchard
Shady Lawn Farm
Cumberland Center, Maine"

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

Mr. BRIGGS: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Briggs, has moved the previous question.

For the Chair to entertain a motion for the previous question, it must be authorized to do so, by at least one-third of the members present. Will all those who favor the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned their count.

Obviously less than one-third having arisen, the motion is not entertained.

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

Mr. GARDNER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It was the unanimous opinion of the Committee on Agriculture that this bill was a bad bill. In my own opinion, it is a very bad bill in that it takes away from the commission the authority to fix both wholesale and retail prices. If you will refer to section 7 of the bill which is the authority to fix price, it says this "Whenever the board shall determine, either upon complaint or upon its own initiative, after public notice and hearing, that the public health is menaced, jeopardized or likely to be impaired or deteriorated by the loss or substantial lessening of a supply of milk of proper quality in a specified market, the board shall fix the just and reasonable minimum prices," and so on.

I submit to this body that this condition will not arise in the foreseeable future. There is no likelihood of the supply of milk being inadequate or there is no likelihood of its quality being questioned. In other words it takes away from the commission the authority to fix both the producer price and the consumer price.

During the past twenty-five years the producers and the dealers have—they don't see eye to eye—but they have gotten along fairly well. They have recognized that the best way to retain the fair and justifiable price in either position is by taking to the Commission, their factual information, their factual data and by having an unbiased body do the refereeing.

I want to call your attention to four or five points in connection with the bill. No other agricultural commodity is so completely surrounded by regulations and restrictions as is milk—milk is very nearly a public utility. 2. The existing law is not compulsory, acceptance rests upon the local community. 3. The producer or wholesale prices are established at a high enough figure over the Boston federal order price to insure an adequate supply of top quality milk at all times. We ship about forty percent of our milk out-of-state. At the same time the price

is not high enough to stimulate an unmanageable over-supply. Now dealer's wars invariably affect producers. We have three examples there, one has been mentioned already — price of milk in Boston. There is a firm in Boston that has been cutting prices, they control about five percent of the market and they have contributed without question to the failure of the Whiting Milk Company which was the largest, second only to Hood, in the Boston area. That failure, by the way, cost the farmers of Vermont between a half million and one million dollars. That company is presently buying milk in Vermont. They have notified the Vermont producers that as of July 1, they will no longer require their milk, that they can buy it outside of New England at a lower price and are prepared to do so.

That is what would happen here if we take off the minimum prices of milk as established by the board. A big company can set the price of milk in the State of Maine, and no company is big enough to disregard that competition, and if we have three or four big companies competing for the Maine business, the price of milk can be set down to a point where nobody can win.

The producer could not sell milk to a distributor if it was below the cost of production consistently. He couldn't put his price down to meet the price in the western and even in some of the New England areas. Milk at present is not available for this market.

Now if you will look at your prices of milk, you will find that as of April 1, the minimum price of milk in this general area is twenty-four cents a quart. That is Class 1 milk. If, on the other hand, that is too expensive for a family that thinks they can't afford it, and they want the health quality and they want the growth for children and that sort of thing, you can buy skim for sixteen cents a quart. On the other hand if you still don't think you are satisfied, you can go into the market and buy the dry de-hydrated milk from outside for about eight cents a quart. I don't think the price-saving is

enough to justify the probable loss of a thirty-five million dollar industry, and in all sincerity I believe that would happen if this bill is passed.

Now there is another point I want to make here. Periodically the Bureau of Labor Statistics puts out information that is dependable. In 1914 a factory worker had to work twenty-four minutes to buy a quart of milk; in 1929, fifteen minutes, and in 1958, seven minutes. Now all of the associations that are connected with the producer or a dealer have opposed this bill, and I very much hope that the Committee "Ought not to pass" Report is accepted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dexter, Mr. Roberts.

Mr. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The gentleman from Bowdoinham, in his statement that there is a fifteen cent profit in that quart of milk, is a little mite off base. If we can get half of that, we would be doing very well, and I defy anyone to—I have been in the business a few years—to handle milk, process milk for less, much less than eight or nine cents a quart. I feel that the statement that the gentleman made the other day that milk was only eleven cents a quart, that is the blended price of milk. That is obtained by getting the blend from the class 1 and class 2 price of milk. The price of milk to the producer was four per cent milk, \$4.88 per hundred or 14.8 cents per quart, and that is quite a — that would be only about nine cents, and that is quite a difference from fifteen cents per quart profit.

I feel that the members should know a little more about this industry, and being a milk dealer myself, I have to resent the statement of the gentleman from Bangor that the milk business is a racket. I am quite sure the gentleman is not at all familiar with the milk industry or the time and money involved in getting the milk to the dairy, clarifying, pasteurizing, homogenizing, bottling, capping, refrigerating, getting it ready for delivery and all those other things. Also the purchasing and in-

stalling and replacement of intricate and very expensive equipment necessary to process and handle milk in a sanitary and efficient manner.

I think the gentleman from Orono very well stated this. I would just like to mention in passing that the factory worker in forty hours can purchase two hundred and forty quarts of milk today. Sixty years ago a factory worker had to work sixty hours and he could purchase only one hundred and fifty quarts of milk, and there has never been a time in my memory when you could buy as much milk for the same amount of time and money involved. In Florida, the price of milk is twenty-nine or thirty cents a quart, and a gallon jug is ninety-nine cents and a dollar.

I will admit the price on the Boston market has recently been much lower than it is in Maine. Massachusetts has been getting the milk, as the gentleman told you, from all around, even in the middle-west.

As you know, the milk control law was enacted twenty-six years ago for the purpose of correcting the chaotic situation and stabilizing of the market. At that time there were almost as many milk distributors as families buying milk and as many prices as there were distributors. They were operating without any regulations and in many instances milk was handled in a very unsanitary condition not acceptable to the present-day standards. Today the quality of milk in Maine the consumer is getting is superior to milk in any other market. Soon after the milk control law was enacted, these barnyard dealers, most of them dropped out of business leaving the market open to reputable dealers whose motives were to dispense a high quality and sanitary product. It has been the object of the commission to insure an adequate supply of milk and to insure a reasonable price to the producer, the dealer and the consumer, and I feel that they have achieved the goal. There are three consumers on the Milk Commission, and I don't think that they would show any

partiality to the dealers by any means.

This bill proposes to eliminate the retail pricing by the commission and restricts minimum prices to payments to the producer, without equal representation and protection and without compensation and protection to the dealer who is compelled to pay at least a minimum price to the producer, without assurance of compensation ample to meet the many problems and operate efficiently. If this bill is enacted it will put many small local dealers out of business as they cannot compete with big city dealers who would welcome the opportunity and gladly, and are ready to cut prices to the point where there is no profit and a possible loss, until they can get a foothold and drive small dealers out and control the market and then up goes the price. All of this has happened other places and can sure happen in Maine. I hope the motion for indefinite postponement will prevail.

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

Mr. JAMESON: Mr. Speaker, I am naturally going to take exception to some of the remarks, particularly of the Milk Commission, and I must repeat, I have all the respect and the admiration in the world for the young lady, the beautiful young lady and the nine gentlemen who served on this Committee, all except, and I'll repeat, the report they sent back to you ladies and gentlemen.

Now I have been accused of using sympathy in my remarks. If it is a crime to prey upon the people here and sympathize with every single consumer, every single person in the State of Maine, then I am guilty of a very terrible crime. Now I wish to take exception first to one of the Committee, Mr. Coulthard. He was not the gentleman who offered me the couple of drinks, not milk, as I stated before, not milk. It was one of the lobbyists who stayed with me until ten minutes to twelve.

Another opponent on that Committee has notified you there are only two or three places that

sell milk below Maine. I have a few snapshots here ladies and gentlemen I would like to show you. They are selling milk for fifteen and seventeen cents a quart in Massachusetts, different cities. Quite a number of them. And again I'll take exception that the producer is allowed to sell. What a joke that is! The producer is allowed to sell you and I a quart of milk, yes, a gallon of milk, but it is frowned on very heavily, ladies and gentlemen, by the distributor. He has that power to notify that producer he no longer wants his milk and it will go back onto the Boston market at three and one-half cents a quart.

And I think as I stated before, ladies and gentlemen, regarding this milk war, I assure you one and all, before I went before that Agricultural Committee, it was the only thing that worried me, a milk price war, and I was assured by two of your most prominent agricultural members that this all powerful Milk Commission could stop it within forty-eight hours, so why worry about that.

Here we have two groups. The Speaker has introduced them as studying state government. What are they going to get out of this, when free enterprise is kicked right out the window here in democracy. Democratic form of government. When I mentioned that word "free enterprise," ladies and gentlemen, the opponents didn't remind you of this. I was ridiculed a number of times for using the words free enterprise. These students are studying state government. They understand that is one of the foundations of America, democracy, free enterprise.

I don't intend to stand here and talk to you too long on all the notes and everything I have here. Sunday, four different producers came to my house. I wasn't feeling too well; you know I wasn't last Friday or I would have talked a lot longer. Not a one of them objected to this bill. Kind of strange isn't it? Not a one of these producers. I had plenty of notes.

Now listen to this ladies and gentlemen: Your children in school today, hundreds of them, yes, thousands of them, the only milk they

get today is in the schools. One little cup. Why? Because their parents can't pay twenty-eight and twenty-nine cents a quart for milk in the stores. I discarded these notes all of them, ladies and gentlemen, and in closing and I wish to bring this remark to you. I had an assistant manager call me and ask me for two minutes of my time. He came to the house; he never even removed his hat and coat. He said: "Mr. Jameson we read your bill in the paper Saturday morning, and I wish to bring this information to you and to forward it on to the State Legislature of Maine." He is representing three large chain stores in Bangor, he is an assistant manager himself, so he knows what he is talking about. He said: "We are selling more Pepsi-Cola than we ever did, and that's all these people can afford instead of milk." Now I'm not plugging for Pepsi-Cola, I am not advertising for them. I am just bringing this fact to you, that these little children who require this milk, are being substituted with Pepsi-Cola.

I think, ladies and gentlemen, and I disagree with the Committee—I think personally that not only the consumer, the 35,000 we know of out of work and the number climbing every day, that the producer also is entrapped by this powerful committee who exercises its right to protect and guarantee the retail and wholesale market. I thank you ever so much.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Livermore, Mr. Boothby.

Mr. BOOTHBY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I don't want to carry this debate on indefinitely, but I would like to say at this time, that as a dairyman who has to make his living from milking cows, I feel justified in saying that everyone buying milk in Maine is getting a bargain. Let me repeat, we do not want to jeopardize our business by experimenting with an entirely new milk law represented by L. D. 648, and I would ask for a division.

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

Mr. WATERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a few words that I would like to say concerning this milk bill. Our esteemed gentleman from Bangor says people cannot afford to buy milk in the store he says for twenty-eight or twenty-nine cents a quart. For the sake of comparison, the food value purchased in a quart of milk, if you were to purchase the number of eggs to supply the calcium in a quart of milk you would buy some forty eggs, and these figures that I have are not up to date figures, and the price has changed, but when these were taken why it would have cost you two dollars for those forty eggs. Or twenty-six oranges the price of which at this time would have been a dollar and a half. And if you wanted proteins, sixteen slices of bread, sixteen cents. Seven tablespoons of peanut butter, four ounces, sixteen cents; or one to two servings of fish, six ounces, is twenty-five cents, and I cannot hardly agree that people cannot afford, if they realize the nutritional value that they are getting at this cost, then I think they can very well afford it.

And as far as the dealer spread is concerned, there is a little pamphlet here, the Maine Milk Industry Foundation of Washington, D. C., and what becomes of the milk distributors' income dollar. His material costs fifty-seven plus cents, I won't go into this, it is broken down into four decimal points, and I won't go that far; it costs him about twenty cents for wages and salaries; he spends a cent and a quarter for advertising; insurance, depreciation and all other expenses are almost five cents of the dollar; containers, bottles, cans and so on is almost six cents on the dollar; plant delivery and office supplies is another four and one-half cents; taxes and licenses a little more than three cents and net operating profit is about two and one-eighth cents; so the dealer is not being overpaid for all that he has to put in. And I would like to say a word about what the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis said, that you cannot sell milk without purchasing expensive pasteurizing equipment.

If you produce your own milk and your herd is tested by the State and they are Bangs and T.B. free, you can sell your own natural milk. If you purchase milk, yes, you have to have a pasteurizer, but you can sell all of the milk that you produce on your own farm without pasteurization, provided your herd and your farm meets the State requirements. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waterboro, Mr. Bradeen.

Mr. BRADEEN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It wasn't my intent to take part in this debate, but I have been sitting here and sensing the waves pass back and forth across the hall, and I have one observation to make. It has seemed to me for a long time that there was a very wide margin between what I have been given to understand as being the price paid to producers for milk in our state and the price that I have to pay over the counter. Nevertheless, I am not entirely persuaded that this particular L. D. is the proper vehicle which we should use in order to correct any present inequities in the situation. I probably wouldn't have thought very much about it if a caller hadn't dropped around to see me Sunday morning, a man who has quite a large herd of cows in my neighborhood, sells to one of the distributors I believe across the State line in New Hampshire. What he said to me at that time was almost exactly what the gentleman from Leeds, Mr. Buckley, has said this morning, and also carried some of the thoughts of the gentleman from Orono, Mr. Gardner. Because of the fact that those gentlemen named must know a great deal more about the business than I ever did or ever will, I am certainly prepared to accept their judgment, and I cannot go along with this particular piece of legislation. I thank you.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to further debate the bill, I just wish to make a few remarks for what has been given out. Someone has said that liars

will figure but figures won't lie, so I'll give you a few figures.

It has been kind of intimidated here that I was off on the wrong beat. Now the gentlemen here have said that if you couldn't afford whole milk why you use skimmed at seventeen cents. Well I don't know whoever tried to raise a calf on skimmed milk, but whoever did, it would have been a pretty poor looking calf, and I don't want to raise a child on skimmed milk either. But the producer is paid five cents for this skimmed milk. Five from seventeen leaves twelve, at least it used to.

Now I have here what the price of milk is that was paying the producer here on class 1 milk. Now class 1 milk, the gentleman mentioned here about blended price. The blended price has not a thing to do with what we are talking about. Class 1 milk is milk that is sold as fluid milk, either colored or white, either chocolate or strawberry, whatever they add to it. Class 2 milk is what is manufactured. There is no connection and no price made by the board as regard to class 2 because that price is set up about every two weeks and it is controlled by the cream market, so the price of class 1 milk in this area, the producer is being paid twelve cents a quart for it on his door, but he has to pay the cost of transportation himself, so it is costing the dealer eleven cents, and the last quart of milk that I bought I paid twenty-seven cents for. Now whether the fellow charged me more than the minimum price, I don't know, but I think the price is about twenty-six, so eleven from twenty-six makes fifteen cents, and I am very happy to see the gentleman back here because his figures don't agree with the figures I have, and I can show them to anybody.

And I also—there have been letters read here, so I will just read you one that I got, "Representative Cleveland Curtis, House of Representatives, Augusta, Maine. Dear Mr. Curtis. I was pleased to note in the Bangor Daily News that the dairymen have a friend at Augusta." I didn't know they were printing my name in the

Bangor News. "I agree wholeheartedly that the milk companies make a profit. I don't believe that they need a margin of fourteen to fifteen cents a quart to process and deliver this milk. I doubt very much if many of our consumers throughout the state knows that the farmer pays for the transportation." And she goes on to say how many cattle they have, ninety head, and what a terrific time they are having to try to make ends meet, that they are between forty and fifty years old and she didn't want me to mention her name because for fear that their market would be cut off. That's the situation as I see it.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Bearce.

Mr. BEARCE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the gentleman that I was brought up on skim milk and I don't think it stunted my growth. For one, I am ready for the question.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Livermore, Mr. Boothby, that Bill "An Act relating to Price Controls on Milk," House Paper 448, Legislative Document 648, be indefinitely postponed. A division has been requested. Will those who favor the motion to indefinitely postpone, please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned their count.

A division of the House was had.

One hundred five having voted in the affirmative and eighteen having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail, and the Bill was indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair at this time would like to mention that there has been in the balcony ninety students from the Seventh Grade from the Woolwich Central School, accompanied by their Principal, John McPhail, and Mr. Sullivan. The Chair understands that this group is in shaking hands with the Governor.

Also there has been in the balcony a group of approximately one hundred five students from the

Freeport Junior High School, in the Eighth Grade, accompanied by Phillip Barube, Mrs. Deroche and Mr. Libby.

And we have the pleasure of recognizing in the balcony at this time, and they are still with us, a group of fifteen talented young students from the Portland area under the direction of David Astor. They regularly appear, without pay, on his "For Teen-Agers Only" show.

And on behalf of the House, the Chair extends to you a most hearty and cordial welcome, and we hope that you will enjoy and profit by your visit with us here today. (Applause)

Mr. Humphrey of Augusta presented the following Order out of order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that the House of Representatives extend its congratulations to Jerry Varnam, 17-year-old Cony High School student of Augusta, who was winner of the U. S. National Junior Nordic cross-country ski race at Lake Placid N. Y.;

AND BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that an attested copy of this Order be forwarded to young Mr. Varnam; his Coach, Grady Erickson; and the Principal of Cony High School.

The Order received passage. (Applause)

Mr. Fogg of Madison was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. FOGG: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Even though I am not a representative from the City of Augusta, I do have a business right across the street from Cony High School, and I have a certain amount of pride in Cony High School the same as I have in my own home town high school.

Now, I think what might be called "the frosting on the cake" with the mention of young Mr. Varnam, is the fact that he never had a pair of skis on until this year. And he took up skiing not to develop his skiing ability as is, but to strengthen his legs for track work. Now if he becomes as good at the thing he is practicing for as his by-line, we are certainly going to have an athlete in the

State of Maine. He is a product of the Abnaki Ski Club and has been trained by young Coach Grady Erickson.

He lost his first race in Lincolnville, Vermont, I understand; but the next eight races he won first place in. He took third place in Farmington and then he went ahead to win the Maine State championship, the New England championship; and then he went to Lake Placid and he won the National Junior Nordic cross-country championship.

I think this young man has not only brought a great deal of honor to his school and the City of Augusta, but I think that all the people in the State of Maine have good reason to be immensely proud of young Mr. Varnam. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: The Chair requests that the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Humphrey, the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Philbrick, and the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Beane, assemble to the rear of the Hall of the House and escort Jerry Varnam to the well of the House, and that they be accompanied by the Sergeant-at-Arms.

Thereupon, Jerry Varnam was escorted to the well of the House by the gentlemen from Augusta, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Philbrick and Mr. Beane, and also accompanied by the Sergeant-at-Arms, amid the applause of the House.

The SPEAKER: Congratulations, Jerry, for winning the United States National Junior Nordic cross-country ski race at Lake Placid, and may many other Maine youths follow your example both athletically and scholastically. (Applause)

The Chair laid before the House the sixth tabled and today assigned matter:

Bill "An Act to Create the Fort Kent Sewerage and Water District." (H. P. 1072) (L. D. 1477)

Tabled — March 17, by Mr. Pike of Lubec.

Pending — Passage to be Engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Pike.

Mr. PIKE: Mr. Speaker, I am in some embarrassment. But this

bill has not yet been finished with its drafting, and the Public Utilities Committee has not yet had a chance to look over the changes. I now hesitantly move that this bill be again tabled until Friday of next week, and I am optimistic enough to believe that we will have it in shape by that time.

Thereupon, the Bill was tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Friday, March 31.

The Chair laid before the House the seventh tabled and today assigned matter:

Bill "An Act relating to Specifying Insurance and Other Benefits in Contracts for Sales Financing of Motor Vehicles" (H. P. 920) (L. D. 1268)

Tabled — March 17, by Mr. Crockett of Freeport.

Pending — Adoption of House Amendment "A".

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, whereas Mr. Crockett cannot be present in the House this morning, I move the Bill be tabled until March 29.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Jones, and would caution him that the tabling motion is not debatable.

Mr. JONES: Mr. Speaker, the reason why Mr. Crockett is not able—

The SPEAKER: The gentleman is debating the tabling motion and may not proceed.

Mr. JONES: I will call for a division on the tabling motion.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested on the tabling motion. The motion is that this bill be tabled until Wednesday, March 29. A division has been requested on the tabling motion.

All those in favor of the tabling motion, please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned their count.

A division of the House was had.

Eighty having voted in the affirmative and thirty-four having voted in the negative, the Bill was tabled pending adoption of House

Amendment "A" and specially assigned for Wednesday, March 29.

The Chair laid before the House the eighth tabled and today assigned matter:

Motion that the House reconsider its Action whereby it Failed to Enact An Act Revising the Law on Tax on Transient Rentals (H. P. 551) (L. D. 748) (Emergency)

Tabled — March 17, by Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston.

Pending — Consideration.

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

Mr. BAXTER: Mr. Speaker, speaking on this subject, it is obviously non-partisan, and I speak as House Chairman of Taxation. Now this bill was a Department Bill which was brought out by the Department after a biennium of experience with the transient rental law. The law was originally written outside of the Department by one of the members of the Legislature in the last session, somewhere along in the session it was reviewed by the Department but there wasn't much chance at that time to make any changes. So they decided to go along with it pretty much as it was for a couple of years and then change it based on their experience.

That is what this bill seeks to do, it has—there are various house-keeping items in there—for instance, one thing is that as the bill was originally written, there is actually no requirement that the transient rental people keep records. And this simply, among other things, provides that. And then it also makes some somewhat fundamental changes. Changes that will not increase or decrease net—the return from the transient rental law but which will make the administration better, more consistent, and which will jibe with the wishes of some of the people affected by it—There was no opposition at the hearing, the measure went through its various phases here and the final motion was for enactment and so there was never an explanation given specifically of the law, although at various times during its passage various people who wondered about

its contents did check with the Department, and were satisfied.

Now the point I think is that if there are individual parts here which individual people are not in favor of, then those parts should be considered separately, we shouldn't drop this whole house-keeping bill which has been the result of two years' experience with the law simply because of one particular thing that somebody objects to.

We are, however, at the point of no return here, having gone through engrossment and up to the enactment stage and even now being at the reconsideration stage. That being the case, I will offer my services for the next few days to help anybody with the Department and draw up amendments or whatever they might like to do. I have no specific interest in this myself, personally or any other way, except from the standpoint of the committee. And that being the case, and so that anybody can do what they wish to any particular part of this without destroying the whole thing, I will move that this be tabled until Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER: In reference to item 8, L. D. 748, the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, moves that this Bill be tabled until Tuesday, March 28, pending the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that the House reconsider its action whereby it failed to enact this Bill. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The Chair laid before the House the ninth tabled and today assigned matter:

An Act relating to Digging Clams in the Towns of Cushing, Friendship and Thomaston. (H. P. 704) (L. D. 982)

Tabled — March 21, by Mr. Winchenpaw of Friendship.

Pending — Passage to be Enacted.

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

Mr. WINCHENPAW: I have the proper amendment prepared for which I tabled this yesterday, and I now offer House Amendment "A" to L. D. 982.

Thereupon, the House voted to suspend the rules and to reconsider its action, whereby on March 10 the Bill was passed to be engrossed and to reconsider its action whereby on March 8 Committee Amendment "A" was adopted.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 704, L. D. 982, Bill, "An Act Relating to Digging Clams in the Towns of Cushing, Friendship and Thomaston."

Amend said Amendment by striking out all of the 7th paragraph and inserting in place thereof the following:

"Further amend said Bill by adding at the end of the 8th line the following underlined sentence: 'Each town shall issue licenses to such persons and may fix the fees therefor.'"

House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" was adopted.

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

Mr. Haughn of Bridgton was granted unanimous consent to briefly address the House.

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Several inquiries have come to me in the last few days in regards to what happened to the Salary Book as requested by the House. That was for the State employees and the Department heads. I have checked on that this morning and I find through the Bureau of Purchases the contract has been let and, by April 14, we are due to receive them according to the reports this morning.

Mr. Speaker, further I might add that it is the usual practice of Departments to take their time in doing things at their will and pleasure and not at the will and pleasure of this House.

Mr. Knight of Rockland was granted unanimous consent to briefly address the House.

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my purpose in rising is to call the attention of all present here to page nine, and item number four, Bill "An Act relating to Pieces of Milk Sold by Producers to Dealers by Bulk Tank," House Paper 787, Legislative Document 1102 which was tabled by myself. And rather than go through the procedure that I did yesterday, I want to present the problem now so everyone can be acquainted with it, and then I am open to any and all suggestions.

I find that I have a bill on the table and I don't know what to do with it. Not only that, but the people concerned with it, and that is the dairymen in my area, they don't know what to do with it. From what I can understand, the committees involved don't know what to do with it, and this being milk day, I would like to just briefly comment on this.

As I understand the story, this has to do with sales by bulk tanks and I have never been on a farm and I have had various farming implements pointed out to me, but I want you to know that I am a complete novice in this deal and I intend not to dabble into it. But it is my understanding that back in 1955 the problem was that producers, now a producer as I understand it, is a fellow that has the cows, the dealer is the fellow that buys the milk from him and sells it to the consumer, who drinks it. The producer would sell this milk in cans. The dealer in order to buy it would have to pick up the cans, put them on the back of the tailboard, that took labor. Also the producer had to have labor to handle the cans. So the invention of the bulk tank came in whereby it took only one man to unload the milk from the tank that the producer had and put it into the tank truck that the dealer had.

Now these bulk tanks cost money, and in order to reimburse the producer for putting them in, they decided that the producer should receive a premium for the amount of milk that he sold, that came

from a bulk tank. That was to induce him to put in a bulk tank. So in '55 they passed this law, the law was introduced by the Representative from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, and a set price was originally put on it. And the Legislature in its infinite wisdom left it in its final enactment up to the Milk Commission to decide what the premium price would be. And since 1955 they have been unable to find out what the premium should be. As a result no premium price has been set.

Now the Attorney General's Office has stated that this law is mandatory. A premium must be paid. But the milk producer says that if we get paid a premium, they will just take it off on the transportation charge. If we get paid a penny for delivery by bulk milk, they will charge us an extra penny for delivery, so we are on the horns of a dilemma.

As a result if this bill that is on the table is killed, it is still mandatory for the Milk Commission to set a premium price. If it is not killed, it would tell the Milk Commission what they should set for a premium price, and it says ten cents in the bill. And every farmer that I have talked to, and there has been quite a few of them, say if we have ten cents set, they will just add ten cents on the transportation cost, so we are in a vicious circle. The bill is on the table and I wish that some of the fellows from up country that recognize this problem for what it is, would tell me what the best disposition of this matter would be. Thank you.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Inasmuch as I presented that bill in '53 rather than in '55, now first I just want to correct my good friend over there because he has just made one mistake, and the producer pays for the cost of transportation and no one can charge him any more, because he pays for the cost of transportation. Because I hauled milk for over twenty years before the producer—

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Knight, request that this item be removed from the table at this time?

Mr. KNIGHT: No, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Therefore the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, requests unanimous consent to briefly address the House.

Is there an objection? The Chair hears none, the gentleman may proceed. A motion on this bill is not in order since it has not been removed from the table as yet. However, you have unanimous consent to talk, so you may proceed.

Mr. CURTIS: The bulk milk tank came into being because it saved a lot of money for—that the dealer was paying out. In one particular case, I know they had enlarged their business to such an extent that they would have to build an addition onto their plant which would cost probably seventy-five or hundred thousand dollars. So they went into the bulk tank, and now in this bulk tank business the producer has to buy the tank, and they cost anywhere from \$1500 to \$4000—about the average price of a tank is about \$2500 and usually they have to build a new house, and they have to have hot and cold water in that new house and that costs anywhere from \$500 to \$800 for the house, so the producer has an investment of somewhere around \$3000 or more because of this bulk tank.

Now what happens when they handle the cans? Now mind you the producer is paying for the cost of transportation. But when they handle it in cans, why you didn't have to have—well, you had to have a man to drive well, but he didn't have to be too outstanding in education to load the cans on and take them down to the dairy and load them off either on carts or on escalators, and so usually the producer could hire a man to drive the truck at a little less than it would be to run a bulk tank pick-up.

Now when this milk came down to the plant, and put on the escalator, it went up to three men—now all this machinery costs money—the escalator probably \$5000 and there's probably another \$10,-

000 worth of machinery in there and three men usually took all the forenoon to receive this milk. Because it had to be tested, it had to be weighed, and it had to be pumped and the cans had to be washed and all those things.

Well now with a bulk tank, the producer, mind you, is paying for this man, so he has to have a good man. Maybe it was a good man to drive the other one, but in other words he has got to have a man with a certain amount of knowledge. Because when he backs up his truck to this bulk tank, why he has to go in and start the agitator to agitate the milk within the tank, so that he can get a proper test taken, and he has to know about how long to agitate it, and he has to know about how long to let it set before he tries to take the measurement. Now there is no weighing of milk. But the measurement is what you call the measuring stick, it goes in the tank and is in .32 inches. And after the froth is properly settled, why this man who is in charge of the tank, the pick-up, he takes and measures this milk and he looks at the chart and it has so many pounds. So he sets it down on a place for it in this milk house and also sets it down on his book. Now the milk is weighed there. Then he takes the test. He takes some of the milk, a small amount he puts in the bottle at the dairy and if the producer wants it, he puts some in a bottle for him. When he goes down to the dealer's plant, he backs up—there's no escalator there, there's nothing whatever—oh, yes, in pumping this milk on the producer furnishes the electricity to pump it, so the dealer is at no cost whatsoever. And when he gets down here to the dealer's plant, the only cost to the dealer is the electricity to pump it off. They usually have a man there to help wash the tank, sterilize it; otherwise than that, the producer does the work.

Now you can see what a great saving there is. Now all out through the West they are paying and have paid, and you can check it over with the Commissioner of Agriculture — with him, because he showed me not too long ago, be-

cause I knew who they were, and he said yes, I have the names right here, they are paid twenty-five cents a hundred premium. Well, I maintain they cost at a saving of probably thirty or forty cents per hundred to the dealer. And surely the producer, it wasn't costing him much more and he was sure to get something out of it.

And so the bill was presented back in the fifties, this House passed it, and now it is twenty-five cents, the same as the other people. It was defeated in the other branch and then it came back to the House, it was amended to let the Control Board set the price which they never have done. And now this bill simply says that they pay the ten cents. Thank you.

Mr. Buckley of Leeds was grant-

ed unanimous consent to briefly address the House.

Mr. BUCKLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have got a little document here in my pocket that clarifies his statement, I am receiving ten cents a hundred on the Boston market. All I wanted to do was just to clarify the remarks that they are paying, H. P. Hood Company, on the Boston Market ten cents a hundred.

Mr. Boothby of Livermore failed to receive unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER: We are proceeding under Orders of the Day.

On motion of Mr. Whitman of Woodstock,

Adjourned until Friday, March 24, at nine o'clock in the morning.