

# 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

VOLUME II

MAY 12 - JUNE 17, 1961

and

SPECIAL SESSION

NOV. 27 - DEC. 2, 1961

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL

AUGUSTA, MAINE

**HOUSE**

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Joseph E. LeMaster of the Monmouth United Church.

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

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

**Papers from the Senate  
Senate Reports of Committees  
Ought Not to Pass  
Tabled and Assigned**

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Providing Funds for Thayer Hospital, Waterville, to Aid its Rehabilitation Program (S. P. 223) (L. D. 628)

Came from the Senate with the Resolve substituted for the Report and passed to be engrossed.

In the House, the Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Bragdon of Perham, tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report and specially assigned for tomorrow.)

**Ought to Pass in New Draft**

Report of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act to Exempt Industrial Waste Disposal Plants from Property Tax" (S. P. 186) (L. D. 432) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 550) (L. D. 1596) under title of "An Act to Exempt Industrial Disposal Systems from Property Tax" 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 tomorrow assigned.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair will recognize the presence in the balcony of a group of eighth grade students from the Dedham Elementary School accompanied by their Principal, Mr. Robert Hudson.

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)

**Divided Report**

Majority Report of the Committee on Health and Institutional Services reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act to Transfer Northern Maine Sanatorium to Central Maine Sanatorium" (S. P. 311) (L. D. 899)

Report was signed by the following members:

Mrs. LORD of Cumberland  
Mr. CARPENTER of Somerset  
— of the Senate.

Mrs. KNAPP of Yarmouth  
Messrs. SWETT of Howland  
GILL of South Portland  
DANES of South Portland  
HARTSHORN of Buxton  
KENNEDY of Milbridge  
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. MARDEN of Kennebec  
— of the Senate.

Mrs. HENDRICKS of Portland  
— of the House.

Came from the Senate with the Reports and Bill committed to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs.

In the House: Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Yarmouth, Mrs. Knapp.

Mrs. KNAPP: Mr. Speaker, I move that we accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentlewoman from Yarmouth, Mrs. Knapp, that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I would now move that both reports be tabled until Thursday next.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, moves that the two Reports and Bill be tabled until Thursday, pending the

motion of the gentlewoman from Yarmouth, Mrs. Knapp, that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

Mrs. Knapp of Yarmouth then requested a division on the tabling motion.

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-one having voted in the affirmative and seventy-five having voted in the negative, the motion to table did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentlewoman from Yarmouth, Mrs. Knapp, that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

All those in favor of accepting the Majority "Ought to pass" Report say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

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

#### **Non-Concurrent Matter**

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Appropriating Funds for Regional Airport to Service Augusta, Waterville and Surrounding Areas (H. P. 568) (L. D. 788) which was accepted in the House on May 4.

Came from the Senate with the Report and Resolve recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs in non-concurrence.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to recede and concur with the Senate in recommending the Report and the Bill to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs?

All those in favor say aye; those opposed, no.

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

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I move we now adhere.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that the House adhere.

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

Mr. LANE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We know how badly we need an airport in the central part of Maine, and we know how the committee report came out. But since then some of the committee members decided that we could do something about it, maybe not this year, or maybe two years from now or four years from now, or maybe they can buy some of the land for an airport in the future. And that is all we are asking, to send it back to the committee and see what the committee can do about it.

I now move — what motion shall I make? I move that we reconsider our action.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Lane, moves that the House insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

Will the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Lane, kindly approach the rostrum please.

(Conference at rostrum)

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Lane, moves that the House insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

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

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: Will the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Lane, see the Speaker in the Speaker's office immediately following today's session for the purpose of naming Conferees.

Mr. JALBERT of Lewiston: May I approach the rostrum please?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may.

(Conference at rostrum)

#### **Non-Concurrent Matter**

An Act Extending the Powers of the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority (H. P. 78)

(L. D. 121) which was passed to be enacted in the House on April 26 and passed to be engrossed on April 13.

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

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from York, Mr. Rust.

Mr. RUST: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill, relating to the Interstate Bridge Authority, is the bill of Representative Dennett of Kittery. Unfortunately Mr. Dennett is still ill and could not be here this morning. However, he has requested that I present on his behalf an amendment to Senate Amendment "A," which was adopted in the other body.

Now as you all realize, this very simple bill which is merely to extend the powers of the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority has brought up quite a dispute between two of our state departments, the Highway Department and the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority which is also a state function. Now the other body has replaced the bill with Senate Amendment "A," which would in effect require the Highway Department to make a study during the next biennium and make a report back to the 101st Legislature.

Now where the Highway Department is going to make the study and bring out the facts, and we already know that they are opposed to anything which the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority wishes to do, we feel it only fair that the Highway Department be likewise restrained or prevented from taking any action in regards to the alternative plans which they propose across the Piscataqua River.

This is really a very important bill to the southeastern part of the state. It affects a great deal of real estate, property values and there are other considerations. Therefore at this time I would move that the House concur with the Senate pending the adoption of

House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A."

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from York, Mr. Rust, moves that the House recede from its action of April 26, whereby it enacted this bill. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now understands that the gentleman from York, Mr. Rust, moves that the House recede from its action of April 13, whereby it passed this bill to be engrossed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from York, Mr. Rust, moves that the House recede from its action whereby it adopted Senate Amendment "A" for the purpose of introducing an amendment. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from York, Mr. Rust, offers House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" and moves its adoption. The Clerk will read the amendment.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 78, L. D. 121, Bill, "An Act Extending the Powers of the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority."

Amend said Amendment by striking out the single quotation mark at the end thereof and adding the following new paragraph:

"The State Highway Commission shall not enter into any contracts or agreements with the Federal Government or with any other state or highway agency relative to building any bridge across the Piscataqua River alternative to the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority until the report herein referred to is reported to the 101st Maine Legislature and finally acted upon by it."

Thereupon, House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" was adopted.

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

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would like to recognize the presence in the gallery of a group of students from the Jewell Street School, Jay, Maine, accompanied by Mrs. Alice McLaughlin.

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)

#### Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve Closing Hayden Brook, Somerset County, to All Fishing (H. P. 244) (L. D. 358) which was finally passed in the House on March 15 and passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" on March 7.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

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

#### Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Creating the Passenger Tramway Safety Board" (H. P. 1019) (L. D. 1420) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" in the House on April 28.

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

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

#### Orders

On motion of Mrs. Harrington of Patten, it was

ORDERED, that Mr. Brown of Fairfield be excused from attendance this week because of business.

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.

#### House Reports of Committees Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Labor reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Providing that Employment Shall not be Conditioned upon Membership or Nonmembership in a Labor Organization" (H. P. 999) (L. D. 1459)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. MAYO of Sagadahoc  
EDMUNDS of Aroostook  
COUTURE

— of Androscoggin  
— of the Senate.

Messrs. HANCOCK of Nobleboro  
WINCHENPAW  
— of Friendship  
BROWN of South Portland  
THAANUM of Winthrop  
JOBIN of Rumford  
BOISSONNEAU

— of Westbrook  
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee on same Bill reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. HARDY of Hope  
— of the House.

In the House: Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mars Hill, Mr. Tweedie.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill has had considerable debate in the corridors, quite a hearing. It has been held up for a long time. So, I will make my remarks quite brief.

The principle of this bill I think everyone understands, but it is certainly a question of voluntary versus compulsory unionism. Should a citizen of this country have freedom of choice as to whether or not he will join a union? I believe that the very law which gives him the right to form a union also gives him the right not to join or form a union should he choose. We have amended this bill in committee, we simply ask that you give the people of the State of Maine the chance to express their opinion on this. We have a referendum

amendment coming out of committee on it. The people of the State of Maine are very interested in this bill. It has been said by the opposition that this bill was not needed in Maine, would not help in Maine. I submit to you this bill has been extremely helpful particularly with Mr. Hoffa and the Teamsters Union in the State of Maine already. I also submit to you that Mr. Hoffa and the Teamsters Union have not signed the piecemeal contract which they settled for, they have no intentions of signing this contract. As late as Friday, fifty copies of the contract which were to be signed were marked by Mr. Hastings as proofs and returned. They have no intentions of settling for anything less than the crippling contract which they signed in Boston.

It has also been said that this bill will promote industrial activity. The figures are that during a five year period from 1953 to 1958, seventeen states had a right to work law. They increased in industrial job opportunities 9.62 percent, 989,400 more jobs. The thirty-one states without right to work had a net loss of .35 percent or a 136,000 job opportunities. Maine lost one percent during this same period. The opposition makes the claim that this bill weakens unions, that it weakens collective bargaining. This has not happened in Alabama, in Arizona, in Arkansas, in Florida, or in Georgia, or in Iowa, or in Louisiana, or in Mississippi, or in Nebraska, or Nevada, or North Carolina, or North Dakota, or South Carolina, or South Dakota, or Tennessee, or Texas, or Utah, or Virginia, or Indiana, or in Kansas. But for some reason Maine is going to be different, it's supposed to weaken unions in Maine. I want to read you some of the benefits of this law in other places. This will be very brief.

In the states with right to work trade union membership has grown in a five year period of 192 percent, in states without right to work, 187 percent during the same period. The inter-lobby elections in which no unions were chosen, right to work states 40 percent of the time, no union was chosen; in non-right to work states, 35 percent of

the time they chose no union. these certification maneuvers, now when union members decide they don't want to belong to a particular union, they petition the NLRB for a de-certification of that union. In right to work states, in the year 1956, the union won four elections, held their own and kept the union in, they lost five. In non-right to work states, the union only won nine elections, and lost thirty-two times in non-right to work states. Wage and personal income trends. You hear the argument that this is peanuts; well, in the period of from 1952 to 1956, right to work states out gained the rest of the country in income by 12.4 percent on hourly wages; retail sales trends, right to work states out gained the rest of the country by 22.9 percent; trends in value added by manufacturers these are supposed to be agricultural states, we hear, 15.2 percent is the gain over the rest of the country in the right to work states. Bank deposits, right to work states out gained the rest of the country 26.9 percent; motor vehicle registrations, 34.5 percent they out gained the rest of the country; population trends, they out gained the rest of the country by 21.3 percent; employment trends, this is very interesting, right to work states out gained the rest of the country by 61.8 percent in all occupations, by 79 percent in manufacturing, by 5.1 percent in contract construction, by 276.9 percent in transportation and public utilities. Those may be meaningless statistics to some of you, but to me they point out a great deal. These states are going places. Arkansas is thought to be a stump state, back towards agriculture; in the last ten years with a right to work law, Arkansas has gained 85,084 new industrial jobs. If Maine could only do the same.

I think that these people who make these claims of weakening unions, weakening collective bargaining, I think it is an insult to your intelligence for them to make these baseless statements without some basis of fact behind them. And I challenge them not to insult the intelligence of this body by making such statements without some basis of fact. And I ask and

move that you accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Mars Hill, Mr. Tweedie, that the House accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report.

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

Mr. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have voluntarily served my country in two wars—World War I and II. At the time I served in World War II, I had two sons in the Pacific — one at Guadalcanal with the Marines and, the other with the Navy at Okinawa. I was stationed at Long Island at the time with the Marines on security duty when the news came to me that the Union had called a strike, paralyzing all shipping to the Pacific.

You can imagine how bitter I became. Our sons over there fighting, at that time against overwhelming odds, our darkest hour, and they were denied food to sustain their bodies and ammunition not only to protect their own lives, but to make it possible for us to be sitting here today in a democracy making laws for the safety and convenience of our peoples.

Years ago, when the unions were first conceived, they were good for the working man. But greedy fingers reached in and strangled all the goodness. And now this concentration of greed and power in the hands of a few has become a serious threat to our Nation's economy.

Why should a man be forced to join a union in order to work? He shouldn't. The right to work is freedom, democracy, America. And yet compulsory unionism is widespread in the ranks of organized labor.

The biggest gripe the unions have against the right to work bill is that a non-union employee gets the benefits of union activities without contributing to the cause. I can name two organizations off hand that do not demand contributions or enrollments. The Red Cross and mail service organizations.

I will admit there are always a

few who ride the trains and pay no freight. But should we deny freedom of choice because a few failed to contribute their share?

I do not think it is time to move for the abolishment of unions. They can still be beneficial to millions of laborers if we can slide them back through the years to the role intended at the time of their conception.

I do think there should be legislation to curb their political activities. Why should a democrat be forced to contribute to the campaign of a republican or vice versa? This is in direct violation to our democratic form of government.

In my opening remarks I said that I had volunteered my services in two wars. I would volunteer for a third war, if need be, to protect the right of men to join a Union if they wished, and by the same token, not to join.

I think the right to work bill is a good bill — that it will be good for the State of Maine. I do not believe it will cause dissension in the field of labor, but will bring about better relations by making union members realize they must curb the activities of the unscrupulous few who seek to dominate the organization by compulsory unionism.

It is alleged that His Excellency, Governor Reed, has said that he favors the right to work bill, but now is not the time. I have heard the same expression from leaders here in the House. I should hate to think that this is subordination of moral principle for the sale of political gain. There is no time limit on anything that is good. If it is good tomorrow, it is good today.

The goal of unions is to fill every seat in the House and Senate with a union member. When this takes place there never will be a right to work bill in the State of Maine.

I like to think that we are passing laws not only to further our own interests — laws applicable to the generation we live in, but to make the road smoother for future generations, lighten the load of posterity. This thought has brought to my mind my favorite poem,



## The Bridge Builder:

"An old man going a lone highway,  
 Came at the evening, cold and  
 gray,  
 To a chasm, vast and wide and  
 steep  
 With waters rolling cold and deep.  
 The old man crossed in the twilight  
 dim  
 The sullen stream had no fears for  
 him,  
 But he turned when safe on the  
 other side  
 And built a bridge to span the  
 tide.  
 Old man, said a fellow pilgrim  
 near,  
 You are wasting your strength with  
 building here,  
 Your journey will end with the  
 ending day,  
 You never again will pass this way,  
 You've crossed the chasm steep  
 and wide,  
 Why build you the bridge at even-  
 tide?  
 The builder lifted his old gray  
 head,  
 Good friend, in the path I have  
 come, he said,  
 There followeth after me today  
 A fair haired youth whose feet  
 must pass this way,  
 The chasm that was as not to me,  
 To this fair haired youth may a  
 pitfall be,  
 He, too, must cross in the twilight  
 dim,  
 Good friend I am building this  
 bridge for him."

I now urge the passage of this document, and I reiterate a vote for the right to work bill is a vote for Freedom, Democracy, Posterity, America.

Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my thanks for your kind indulgence.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would like to recognize two groups in the gallery. One is forty-two students from the St. John School in Rumford, from the eighth grade, accompanied by Mother Superior Anna Zoe and Sister Lucie Theresa.

Also in the gallery is a group from the East Stoneham School, the fifth to the eighth grades, approximately thirty-five pupils, accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Adrian Stearns.

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)

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

Mr. HARDY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We, as legislators, are sent down here to Augusta to represent the people of our districts, and I did want to relate to you something that has happened in my district and which influenced me tremendously in the signing of this bill the way I did.

I have had one member of my constituents appear before me and express his dislike to this bill. I have had hundreds appear and call and write that they were in favor of this bill. Many of the shops in my area have gotten in touch with me by letter and by telegram favoring this bill. And I think that in order to do a good job, I had to sign it as I did. I firmly believe in it.

I think back to our public hearing on this bill as many of you do, it was held here in this House, and I remember the parade of shop stewards, of union presidents, of legal minds that were opponents to this bill. I remember the John Q. Public that came here, they weren't sent here, they came here of their own free will and they spoke for it. For these reasons, I very strongly support this measure.

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

Mr. BAXTER: Mr. Speaker, before getting into this bill and the details and some of the reasons why I am opposed to it, I would just like to say a couple of words to set it in its context in labor management relations.

In the corridor discussions, the word closed shop and union shop is often used, and it's my experience that many people and particularly the people on the street are confused as to the difference between these two concepts and what the relationship of this bill has to them inasmuch as it's title is "An Act Providing that Employment

Shall not be Conditioned upon Membership or Nonmembership in a Labor Organization." Otherwise called of course for short and I think very confusing 'the right to work bill'.

Now primarily there are two forms of union representation in an organized plant. One of course is the so-called closed shop. Now the closed shop means that in order for a person to be hired, he must be a member of the union before he is hired. That particular type of shop has been outlawed by the Taft-Hartley Act on the federal level, and therefore that is not a matter of consideration here today. The other form of representation is what is called the union shop and that says that an employer may hire anyone he pleases regardless of union affiliation. However, after the person has been at the plant for a certain length of time, a length of time negotiated between labor and management and has seen what he thinks of, the plant and the work conditions and the union that is represented in the plant, and after the employer has had a chance to look the man over and decide whether or not he wishes to continue his employment, when all these things have been decided upon by the worker and by management, then as the condition of his remaining at the plant, he is requested to join the union that is representing the other employees in the plant by a majority vote. I think we should keep that in mind. That there is this period during which the worker has ample opportunity to decide whether or not he wishes to become a member of the union and to continue his work there as a result.

Now of course, the words right to work attached to this bill are misleading, and I think probably we all realize it at this time. You and I know that nobody is guaranteed a right to work. The right to hire is a management prerogative, and nobody can guarantee you or me or anybody else that a particular management will hire me for work. This is actually a condition of work, and we all know that there are many conditions of work in all of our plants through-

out the state and throughout the country. You must be on time, you must have certain skills, you must obey the rules of the plant. The conditions of work that management sets up are very great in number. One of the conditions of work in some plants, particularly those and obviously only those with union representation, is a condition of work which management has entered into an agreement with a union to specify to new employees coming to his plant, and that is the condition if they wish to work for him they shall respect his request that they join the union after a certain length of time.

Now this condition of work should be required by management, does not violate any American freedoms as defined by the Constitution of the United States and interpreted over the years by the Supreme Court. This question has been brought to the Supreme Court and it said in a unanimous decision that required a worker to join a union as a condition of work is definitely not unconstitutional and therefore does not violate any of the rights set forth in the Constitution of the United States, as subsequently interpreted by the Court.

This bill over a period of time has taken on the aspect of being a bill which has to do particularly with the unions. However, I submit to you that it also has to do with management, because when you prevent management from making this decision to require its employees to join the union, you are definitely removing from management one of its great prerogatives which is to set conditions of employment. And it's not unusual that managements when they are organized wish to have this particular privilege. There are substantial reasons why they should have it. And some of the largest industrialists in the state have said that they definitely want it, and they do not want it to be removed. Because after all when a management is organized, it enters into a contract with its labor union. Now no contract is any good unless both sides can carry out the conditions of the contract. In other words, we must have authority with the responsibility.

When a management is unionized, many times it wishes to focus responsibility at the particular point with which it is dealing and that is of course the union. If a shop has 2,000 workers and 1,001 are members of the union and the other 900 are not, then it is very difficult for management to realize whatever benefits it may have gained in long hours at the bargaining table, with regards to specific points in the contract which it wants. Because of course the union has no way of enforcing its agreement upon those who are not members of the union. This means that what management gets through the contract, it very likely will not get, and I think wildcat strikes are particularly a good case in point. If there's anything that is important to management, it is a no strike contract. Something it knows it can produce over a certain period of time and it frequently goes to great lengths to get such a contract. Now obviously if half of the people belong to the group who is going to enforce that no strike contract, and the other half don't, or 49 percent or 30 percent, then the other group can strike and those within cannot. And this disrupts to a great extent management productions plans and sales plans and everything else.

Now another point is the point that with a large uncommitted group, you have an obvious invitation to union rating. You have a hotbed of jurisdictional strikes. You have a point where other unions are working constantly to persuade the uncommitted group to go with them and then pick up a few from the committed group and change the representation of the shop. Now this matter of jurisdictional strikes is another problem which management has little or no control over when its union which is representing its workers has no representation for the uncommitted group. I think also that morale in the divided shop is an important thing to consider. We always have free loaders, we always have agitators, and it seems to me that it is quite obvious that if a group, a majority group has voted to be represented for the purposes of attaining better working conditions, better wages or

what have you, and another group—and pays dues for that purpose, and observes rules and regulations for that purpose and another group gets these benefits but does not pay or perhaps subscribe to the rules and regulations for these benefits, then obviously you have a divided shop and certainly morale is bound to suffer.

Now obviously besides the fact that this is an important matter to management as we have heard and as we know, it is an important subject for unions. Their principal problem is the matter of responsibility without authority. A divided group within the shop, a group over which they cannot exercise their control, obviously means that they have authority, responsibility to maintain certain things, and do not have the authority to carry it out. And then the other obvious point is the fact that the union is working for all of the people in the plant obviously as far as improving wages or working conditions are concerned; this does cost money, and yet they are being paid by only a part of the members in the plant. And therefore, they are working for many without pay.

Now in Maine, there's no question but we have very fine labor-management relations. We have had over a period of time and without doubt, we have some of the best labor-management relations in the United States. This particular bill, unreasonably I believe, affects the rights and prerogatives of both sides of our management group. Our labor-management relations that we have today are the results of a partnership, a working partnership willingness to get along, a statesmanship between Maine labor and Maine management. It does seem to me that this bill is an unwarranted disturbance of those labor-management relations.

Now I think the obvious feeling of this part comes from the fact that we know that this is not desired by the unions, we know that a great deal of management does not want this. I call your attention to the fact that the Associated Industries of Maine and the Maine State Chamber of Commerce, who certainly represent the largest seg-

ment of our manufacturing in the State of Maine, were so divided on this that they were not able to take a stand in favor of the bill. The Governor is against the bill, and I have the direct quote from him that he is against the bill in principle as well as practice, and the implication of timing on his part is incorrect. The Commissioner of Labor has spoken out against the bill, House leadership has spoken out against the bill, the Democratic Party is against the bill. It just seems to me that there is a terrific weight of evidence and feeling against this bill, and for that reason I now propose that the bill and all its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, that both Reports and the Bill be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. PIKE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I tried to keep my ears and eyes open, not always successfully, since the session started, and knowing that this thing was coming up, tried to get the feeling of my district. I have something of the same feeling that the gentleman from Hope has, I would like to know how my people feel.

Now we have two strongly unionized industries in Lubec. We have several other industries not unionized. We have a great many members; a great many non-members of unions. It seems very peculiar to me that during that period I received no pressure whatsoever from people in management, not even a suggestion that this was a good bill. I have only received two more or less formal letters from the secretaries of the two unions that they are against the bill. I find no interest in it, no positive interest in the bill whatsoever. And more frankly, to the point it seems to me, is that none of these people for whom the title says the bill is for, that is, the people who want a right to work, I haven't heard either in my area or anywhere else in the state of anybody who has been deprived of his right to work by this bill not being in or nobody

has told me he thinks he would have a better right to work if this bill did pass.

Now I deplore frankly, the presence in union-management of such people as Mr. Hoffa, that very arrogant man, that associate of criminals, to me, that symbol of evil. But I give to you that it has very little bearing, that one person in one particular job doesn't color all the people and all that sort of thing. He was up here for the weekend and went back as I catch it with his tail pretty well between his legs. We know a lot of labor people in this state. I see no horns and tails sprouting on them.

I am President of one company and Vice-President of another little one, they employ six or seven hundred people in the summer, and I have not heard from any of them, the people who actually do the management of those things. I think this is a bad bill, frankly, and I hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone does prevail.

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

Mr. BREWER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think the question each and every member here has to decide today is whether L. D. 1459 is good or bad legislation. Governor Reed and Labor Commissioner Marion Martin, as well as many, many others, have gone on record as being opposed to this L. D.

Lest we forget, let us go back a few years to the turn of the century and review the steady growth of the labor movement. There is no doubt that there are some members of this body who may well remember it and some of us who have read of it, for it is a matter of history.

In this period, the railroad, banking and industrial empires were being created. The leaders of these empires in particular, were bluntly unconcerned with the welfare of employees. As we know, the time arrived when such concentrated, abusive power became so unpopular that with the impetus of Teddy Roosevelt's big stick it was brought to an end. The utter disregard for the working man in that era must never happen again.

Today we find labor and management sitting across the table from each other, talking out their problems. I will agree that the pendulum has in the past swung a bit too far in the opposite direction and persons not familiar with labor-management relations are prone to blame unions entirely. This is not true as management and government must each take their equal responsibility for inflationary conditions along with the unions. I also believe that the pendulum will be brought back to the midway point by honorable and soundly conducted unions and honorable and soundly conducted business. We have in this country at the present time unethical unions and also unethical management, but these are in a small minority, and we should be thankful that in our state we have ethical union leadership and ethical management leadership.

I believe that compulsory union membership should neither be required nor forbidden by law, but should be left to management and labor to decide which is best for their mutual interests. We must remember that no union shop agreement can be signed unless both labor and management are in agreement. I would like to emphasize that under the Taft-Hartley law the bargaining agent elected to represent the employees by a majority vote must represent all employees, relative to wages, conditions of employment, grievances, and soon, when that plant has an open shop agreement. If L. D. 1459 were enacted, a union shop agreement would be unlawful, causing increased tensions and unrest among employees who want union security, and are willing to pay their dues and employees who also want union security but are not willing to pay their dues. Unrest and bickering and flare-ups among employees due to this type of legislation poses many additional problems for both labor and management.

This legislative document is a non-partisan issue, but I would like to read in part from the Republican Platform which was adopted at the National Convention in July of last year. America's growth can-

not be compartmentalized. Labor and Management cannot profit without each other, they cannot ignore their mutual public obligation. Industrial harmony, expressing these mutual interests, can best be achieved in a climate of free collective bargaining with minimal government intervention, except by mediation and conciliation. And this paragraph here is important, and I would assume that the Democratic platform is worded similar to this. Republican policy firmly supports the right of employers and unions freely to enter into agreements providing for the union shop and other forms of union security as authorized by the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. Now the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 is the Taft-Hartley Law. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Albion, Mr. Cooper.

Mr. COOPER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I didn't intend to get up here and say anything; it wouldn't make any difference whether I do or don't, but I feel just like saying a few words. I want to read a clipping that I took from the Wall Street Journal, it was published by Chairman McClellan of the Senate Investigating Sub-Committee denouncing what he called "Damnable" labor practices at missile plants. Commenting on two weeks of hearings on the subject, he said "wildcat strikes, work stoppages, slowdowns, featherbedding and a deliberate policy of low productivity on the part of some unions" has hurt the nation's space and missile efforts. Mr. McClellan also said some subcontractors tolerated slowdowns and profited by them.

Now if these men who are bosses of the unions can't control these wildcat strikes, and prevent this featherbedding, it seems to me that something ought to be done. I don't know that this bill will accomplish it, but I think it is a bill in the right direction. We have here in the State of Maine our railroads, no question about that because there has been featherbedding and we can't get rid of it. I may be narrow-minded, but I feel as if the bill ought to pass and see if we

can't, as I said, take a step in the right direction in curtailing some of the unions' practices.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Woodstock, Mr. Whitman.

Mr. WHITMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Much has been said in regard to this bill as to freedom of choice and the rights of the individual. I would submit to you that the unions as established in the State of Maine are a direct result of the freedom of choice. They exemplify true democratic process in action. Nowhere do we have a union except where a majority of those people involved have voted to accept a union, and they also maintain the right to reject a union at any time. Now this is the voice of the majority speaking.

Now I would hate to see the Legislature entertain a bill which would circumvent the true democratic process. Are we to exempt the minority from accepting the rule of the majority? We might just as well entertain a bill to exempt those in the minority in our town meetings from accepting the provisions provided by the majority. If I was not in favor of building a new school, perhaps I should be exempt from taxation because I did not favor such a thing. Should I have that freedom of choice?

These people who would be in the minority still have the freedom of choice if they cannot subscribe to the rule of the majority; then they can find employment elsewhere. If the union is obnoxious to them, that should be their position. It might not be the union, it might be some other condition of employment. However, they do not have to accept the employment. By the same token, if I am not in favor of the ruling of my town meeting then I must be obliged to find a more suitable location to reside. I think the basic issues involved here is the democratic process and the majority shall rule.

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

Mr. MORRILL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: It seems

that different areas vary on their wants on this bill. From the area that I come from I think that practically all are interested in this bill, and I will give you the reasons why they are interested.

We have a shop in our area that employs ninety people. It has been in operation many years. Help has been satisfied and the management has been satisfied. Last fall, I believe it was October, some union representatives came into this shop, told the management, "You are going to join the union, your help is going to join the union." He said, "Oh, no." They came back with a statement, "You ship all of your merchandise into a big city market." He said, "That's right." And they came back and said, "If you don't join the union, your merchandise will no longer be accepted."

Now, it was just stated there were no shops in this state that were organized without a vote of the people. This shop was unionized. The ladies and gentlemen working there had no choice. Now today the shop is unionized, there is unrest, and we are told that very shortly this shop will be closed; and in our area ninety people out of work — I don't know where they are going. It was just stated here that there are other jobs elsewhere. In our area, there are not. These people had jobs; and they are going to be out, they are not going to have a right to work. The people in my area are very much in favor of this bill.

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

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker, I move when the vote is taken, it be taken by division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Westerfield.

Mr. WESTERFIELD: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We have before us a piece of legislation which deals with the basic human rights. We have heard this legislation described as anti-labor, and we have even heard it described as anti-management. I submit to you that we have permitted the working man

to be a pawn between management and labor long enough. It is high time that we quit kicking the working man around and give to him a voice in his own destiny.

I point momentarily to you the Bill of Rights and I suggest that each right within the Bill of Rights represents a two-sided coin. Unionism is authorized and legal because of two basic rights guaranteed under the Bill of Rights, these being the right of freedom of speech and freedom of assembly. I submit to you that these rights work both ways. Just as we have the right and freedom of speech, we have the right and the freedom not to speak. Just as we have the right and the freedom of assembly, we have the right and the freedom not to assemble. By the same token, we have the rights under these two freedoms mentioned in the Bill of Rights, we have the right to form unions and to hold union membership. By the same right, we have the right not to organize and not to hold union membership.

We have recently seen many instances of how democratically many of these meetings are conducted. We have also had the ample opportunity to see how greedy wildcatting can destroy the efficiency of any organization. Recently we have heard mentioned of giving the President of the United States more power to deal with these problems. I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, it is not the President nor the Governor that needs to be given power to take hold of these situations and correct them. It is high time that we placed the unions back in the hands of the working man so that he, through his capable hands, may control any undesirable elements which creep into his union, that he himself may be represented at the bargaining table.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would like to recognize the presence in the gallery of a hundred and twenty pupils from the eighth grade Purchase Street School in Rockland, accompanied by Mrs. Helen Young, Principal; and teachers, Marshall Burk, Mrs. Lincoln Johnson and Mr. Joel Fisk.

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)

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, that both Reports and the Bill be indefinitely postponed, and a division has been requested.

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

Mr. FOGG: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a rule any major piece of legislation is prompted by some major crisis; that is, it receives its impetus from some major development. Now ordinarily a piece of legislation like this would receive its impetus from a large number of labor strikes and different kinds of trouble which would get the public in general on edge.

It hasn't been so in this particular piece of legislation. Maine for years has had what one might almost call an ideal labor situation. I think that we could point to it with pride. And before this piece of legislation was introduced, none of the downtrodden working men in the State of Maine made any major demand for a piece of right to work legislation. There were none of the abused manufacturers—you might say—that demanded that we have a piece of legislation like this. All of a sudden right out of the clear blue the impetus for this piece of legislation, as far as I can see, came mostly from out of state. For some reason or other somebody out of the State of Maine seemed to want to have a right to work bill put through this Legislature and they seemed to have plenty of money to put behind it too.

Now I believe that until we do have the major crises which will give any kind of piece of legislation such as this the necessary impetus to put it through, till we do have some sort of a major conflict between labor and management, I believe that we should not have anything like this pass through this Legislature. And as the leader of the Minority Party in this Legislature I want to state that I am ab-

solutely opposed to it and I hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone does prevail.

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I didn't intend to get involved in this matter this morning, but I have been intrigued by some of the comments made by the proponents of this bill. And I would like to remind the members of this House of something that a very great American wrote so many years ago. He was Luther Burbank and he said, "Men should stop fighting among themselves and start fighting insects." I hope you will go along with the motion of the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, to indefinitely postpone.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque.

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: You have heard this bill this morning very well discussed through all the aspects that should have been brought up, although I feel that there are many, many other things that would enter the picture as far as this bill is concerned for the people of the State of Maine. You have heard the proponents of this bill saying that these states that have now got right to work bills in their own states, have increased their membership and increased their productivity and all the other things going along with it. I sort of kind of disagree with that, because it is not a true picture of what the whole thing is all about.

The thing that amazes me is, the proponents would say that these right to work states have increased their membership by 150 percent or 250 percent where other states have increased by five or six percent. I can very well see in a state where there has been no industry at all for the last fifty years that it would increase by one or two industries in their own state if they would have a hundred per cent increase in their membership. But a state that has been heavily industrialized for the last fifty years would increase by one

industry, would hardly show on the books at all. So these one hundred percentage and six percent comparisons to me do not work at all.

Also the proponents said that the Governor of the state was for the bill. It seems to me I have read in the paper a few times where the Governor has more or less stated that he was not for the bill because he did not think it was a good bill for the State of Maine. And then we have the labor and management contracts that have now been written for the period of twenty-five to thirty or fifty years. These contracts between labor and management provide for a reasonable check off of dues by the management if they so choose, and what would happen to these check off dues if this bill would come into effect?

Also the provisions for seniority on layoff? Would you want a senior man of twenty, twenty-five years of service to be laid off in preference to a non-union man in the same class? To be at work while the other older gentleman would still be out in the street? Certainly I don't think too many of you people here would like to see that. The question of the people have more or less voiced their opinions in 1947 and 1948 on a referendum vote on such a measure as the Taft-Hartley bill, which the people of the State of Maine have voted on a majority of three to one against it.

So I think that the State of Maine as a whole have voiced their opinion that they don't think and they know it is not right for the people, especially for the working people. And ladies and gentlemen, there are so many things that come into the picture here but I certainly don't want to keep you up all this time to go into the aspects of the labor-management relations in the State of Maine or how good or bad this right to work is. I hope that you ladies and gentlemen have made up your minds and go along with the motion to indefinitely postpone the bill and all its accompanying papers. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair rec-



ognizes the gentleman from Norway, Mr. Chapman.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to request a roll call vote.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The legislation we are considering today has taken a great deal of your thoughts and has been one of the prime topics of your discussions with your colleagues and others over the past weeks. I am sure you will recognize both sides of the issue have been presented to you with the emphasis on the side of the issue to which the addressee of course represents. You, of course, recognize that this document is far from being an innocent piece of legislation, as some would like you to believe. It, as I am sure you recognize, strikes at the basic principle of the labor movement and if passed, would in the State of Maine set management and labor relations back many years. Not just organized labor, but every laboring man and woman in the State of Maine. This, just at a time when we are making great strides in solving some of the problems of retaining instead of shipping to other states of this Union our men and women of great attributes associated to Maine people all over the United States.

I feel that the pros and cons of this issue have been well discussed and that you, here in this House of Representatives, had basic enough arguments on both sides to decide the issue. If either side does not like our decision and feel that they would like to take it to the voters of this State of Maine knowing full well the significance of the move as to cost and so forth, there are ample provisions to do so.

I close with these thoughts to you who must decide this issue. If you truly believe the proponents, you should vote for this legislation. On the other hand, if you recognize the great harm this legislation can do to management-labor relations in the State of Maine, you will vote in favor of ninety per-

cent of the working men and women of this State. I say ninety percent, for nothing can be perfect. Just almost; when dealing with the minds of mankind.

I sincerely hope this legislation does not pass.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mars Hill, Mr. Tweedie.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: You have heard some flowery smoke-screen activity talk. You even heard reference made to the hearing held here on March 28, by the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter. I would like to point out to you people and to him, that that day there were twenty-two rank and file union members here. They said what we say, we like our unions, we want them, but give them back to us. He also said the right to work bill is a misnomer; well, I don't see anywhere in the bill where it says right to work, but that's a point of interest also. In the Communistic sense, the right to work does guarantee you an occupation. This must come from the fraternalistic government which owns and controls all form of income and wealth. I don't think we have that here or want it.

Also I would point out to you that when his saying that fifty-one percent of the employees vote for a union shop or for any union, that that union is the sole and exclusive bargaining agent and representative of all employees. They must work under the same conditions for the same rate of pay. The gentleman from Woodstock, Mr. Whitman, has said that majority rules. It does, but only in a voluntary organization. Do not confuse labor unions with the forces of government. When you voluntarily enter into an association and voluntarily agree to give up your rights if you are in the minority, yes, then the majority rule does prevail, but only then. Mr. Fogg, the gentleman from Madison, has said, that there's no major crisis in this state which would cause this bill to pass. Must we come face to face with tyranny before we'll ask to protect the Maine workmen? Must we wait until the horse has been stolen and that

some crisis is prevailing in Maine before we will take any steps to let the workingman have his unions back?

It has been mentioned time and again by the opponents of this bill that this will cause great unrest between labor and management. I submit to you that it never has happened in any of the nineteen states. It is an insult to your intelligence to keep promoting this over and over without some basis of fact. It has been said also that there will be free riders. There's nothing in this bill which prohibits 100 percent union membership. As a matter of fact, the Portland Press Herald a paper which hasn't been particularly in favor of this bill, has four unions in it, all voluntary membership. Three of them, 100 percent, the other 94 percent. And yet, they think this is a terrific situation, and yet they turn lukewarm at best towards this bill.

Mr. Levesque has said that none of these states have any industry. I submit to you that in four years since passage of the right to work bill, the State of Indiana has gone from twenty-second to third in industrial expansion in this country. This didn't come by accident or automatically. The basic issue still is freedom of choice for the individual. We will never be able to clean up labor unions if they are corrupt. That task has to be done by the union member. This is the only tool he has to do it with. He is the only man who can clean up corruption in a labor union, the rest of us can't do it for him. We have no right to deny him that tool with which to work. He is the man who has to do the job.

We are asking here today that you let the people of the State of Maine decide this. Now if you're afraid that they might vote against you and that they want this bill in the State of Maine, then hide behind your little cover; if you're not, pass this on to the people of Maine, let them decide. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, that the Reports and Bill, "An Act Providing that Employment Shall not be Condi-

tioned upon Membership or Non-membership in a Labor Organization," House Paper 999, Legislative Document 1459, be indefinitely postponed. And a roll call has been requested.

For the Chair to order a roll call, it must have the expression of a desire for a roll call by at least one-fifth the members present. Will those who desire a roll call, please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned their count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously, more than one-fifth having arisen, a roll call is ordered.

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

Mr. BERRY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I feel, before I cast my vote on the issue before the House, it is important that I explain why I am voting in the affirmative. I have carefully studied this bill before the House and given it serious consideration, and I am voting in favor of the bill for the following reasons: I am completely in favor of the labor union movement in the United States as it has done a great deal for the working man and, for that matter, for the economy of the State of Maine. It has revised the living standards of the worker by increasing his wages, providing him with fringe benefits such as health and pension programs and improved his working conditions. These are laudable achievements of the labor movement. However, I am violently opposed to dictatorial labor leaders completely taking over control of the labor movement. I feel there is a deep need for the right to work bill in that it protects the rights of the individual workman-citizen. It gives him an opportunity to cope with unscrupulous labor leaders who have given them no opportunity to express their free will within their own union. This bill merely does that. It does not deprive the labor unions of any of their rights; it merely insures the individual worker of his rights.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure I did not want to get into this argument but the reasons the gentleman put forth are so unreasonable and so untrue to the facts. Now I started working for a large corporation when the gentleman was in three cornered pants, and I also was working when that place was organized, and when we say that this bill would return to the worker anything whatsoever except hard luck and no rights whatsoever, then he should have been back in those days when we didn't have any labor union whatsoever. And I just like to draw his and your attention to that fact to what has happened since labor unions became effective in this state and the country and our own municipalities. We have much better roads, we have much better schools, we have much better homes, we have much better of all the things that make life better and more abundant. I surely hope that this bill will be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair will restate the question. The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, that the Reports and Bill be indefinitely postponed.

If you are in favor of indefinite postponement, you will answer "yes" when your name is called. If you are opposed to indefinite postponement, you will answer "no" when your name is called.

The Clerk will call the roll.

### Roll Call

YEA — Albair, Anderson, Greenville; Baxter, Beane, Augusta; Beane, Moscow; Bearce, Bedard, Berman, Auburn; Berman, Houlton; Bernard, Berry, Cape Elizabeth; Binnette, Boissonneau, Boothby, Bradeen, Brewer, Briggs, Brown, South Portland; Buckley, Burns, Bussiere, Chapman, Gardiner; Choate, Crockett, Curtis, Cyr, Dennison, Dostie, Lewiston; Dostie, Winslow; Edgerly, Estey, Fogg, Gallant, Gardner, Gill, Hague, Ham, Hancock, Harrington, Hendricks, Hichborn, Hinds, Hopkinson, Humphrey, Jalbert, Jameson, Johnson, Stockholm; Karkos, Kellam, Kilroy, Knight, Lacharite,

Lane, Lantagne, Letourneau, Levesque, Littlefield, Lowery, MacGregor, Maddox, Matheson, Mathews, Maxwell, Moore, Morse, Nadeau, Biddeford; Nadeau, Lewiston; Noel, Philbrick, Augusta, Pike, Plante, Poirier, Prue, Roberts, Rust, Schulten, Sevigny, Shepard, Sirois, Smith, Strong; Sproul, Stevens, Stewart, Storm, Swett, Tardiff, Thaunum, Turner, Tynedale, Vaughn, Wade, Walls, Waterman, Wheaton, Whitman, Whitney, Winchenpaw, Young.

NAY — Anderson, Ellsworth; Baker, Berry, Portland; Brown, Vassalboro; Chapman, Norway; Cooper, Coulthard, Danes, Davis, Dodge, Drake, Dunn, Durgin, Edwards, Finley, Hanson, Bradford; Hanson, Lebanon; Hardy, Hartshorn, Haughn, Hughes, Hutchins, Johnson, Smithfield; Jones, Kennedy, Kimball, Knapp, Lincoln, Linnekin, Merrill, Morrill, Perry, Philbrick, Bangor; Prince, Shaw, Smith, Bar Harbor; Smith, Falmouth; Thornton, Tweedie, Walker, Waltz, Wellman, Westerfield, Williams, Wood.

ABSENT — Bragdon, Brown, Fairfield; Carter, Dennett, Jobin, Malenfant, Minsky.

Yes, 98; No, 45; Absent 7.

The SPEAKER: Ninety-eight having voted in the affirmative and forty-five having voted in the negative, with seven absent, the motion to indefinitely postpone does prevail.

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

### Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act relating to Zoning in the City of Lewiston" (S. P. 295) (L. D. 906)

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

Bill "An Act Repealing Certain Limitations on Elliottsville Plantation" (S. P. 532) (L. D. 1573)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading and read the third time.

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

Mr. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, on item number 2, L. D. 1573, I would like to table that until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Stewart, in reference to item 2 L. D. 1573, moves that it be tabled until tomorrow, pending passage to be engrossed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

Mr. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division on the tabling motion.

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.

Twenty-nine having voted in the affirmative and eighty-one having voted in the negative, the tabling motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

### Third Reader Amended

Bill "An Act to Clarify State Boating Law" (S. P. 547) (L. D. 1591)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading and read the third time.

Mr. Moore of Casco offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 547, L. D. 1591, Bill, "An Act to Clarify State Boating Law."

Amend said Bill in section 6 by striking out all of that part designated "Sec. 7." and inserting in place thereof the following:

"Sec. 7. Motorboats for hire. The owner of every motorboat maintained for hire upon any inland body of water to which the public has access, including all vessels propelled by outboard motor but excluding vessels under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission as set forth in chapter 49, before renting or offering for hire such vessel, shall apply to and

obtain from the commissioner a certificate authorizing its use for such purpose. The owners of all motorboats required to be registered under this section shall further comply with all the provisions contained in sections 3 and 4, regardless of the fact that the vessel in question is propelled by machinery of less than 10 horsepower.

Every operator of a motorboat propelled by outboard motor and carrying passengers for hire shall be examined by the commissioner, through the warden service as to his qualifications, and if satisfied therewith, the commissioner shall grant him a license for such operation, which license shall expire on the last day of the calendar year in which it is issued unless sooner revoked by the commissioner for intemperance, incompetency or willful violation of duty. The commissioner may grant a renewal of such license upon written application and without further examination. Said license shall be in the possession of the operator at all times when he is carrying passengers for hire in such motorboat."

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

### Third Reader Amended

Bill "An Act relating to Work on Shade and Ornamental Trees" (S. P. 548) (L. D. 1592)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading and read the third time.

Mr. Wellman of Bangor offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 548, L. D. 1592, Bill, "An Act relating to Work on Shade and Ornamental Trees."

Amend said Bill, in section 2, by striking out in the 3rd line from the end the underlined words "appropriation for entomology" and inserting in place thereof the underlined word 'board'

House Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill passed to be

engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

Bill "An Act Regulating the Operation of Motor Vessels" (S. P. 549) (L. D. 1595)

Bill "An Act Authorizing Lucerne-in-Maine Village Corporation to Construct Dams and Fishway on Phillips Lake" (H. P. 1161) (L. D. 1601)

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

#### Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act Authorizing Funds for Construction of Machias Landing Field" (H. P. 1162) (L. D. 1602)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading and read the third time.

Mr. MacGregor of Eastport offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1162, L. D. 1602, Bill, "An Act Authorizing Funds for Construction of Machias Landing Field."

Amend said Bill in the title by inserting before the period at the end the following words: 'and Expansion of Eastport Airport'

Further amend said Bill by inserting before the emergency clause a new section 3 to read as follows:

**'Sec. 3. County funds authorized.** The treasurer of Washington County is authorized to pay over to the Aeronautics Commission a sum of money not exceeding \$50,000 to finance expansion of Eastport airport.

The treasurer of Washington County is authorized to issue a board of said county therefor, with interest coupons attached, for an amount not exceeding \$50,000, said bond to bear interest payable semiannually, at a rate not exceeding 5 percent per year; the principal to be paid at the rate of \$10,000 annually until maturity which shall not exceed 5 years from the date thereof, as the county commissioners may fix; said bond to be signed by the treasurer and countersigned by the county commissioners of said county, and the coupons to bear

the facsimile signature of said county treasurer.'

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. MacGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It is a very awkward position that I find myself in this morning. I, serving on the committee of Towns and Counties heard this bill. It was introduced by my good friend and colleague from East Machias, Mr. Dennison. And as an individual I was very happy to concur with his thoughts in the desirability of his airfield at Machias, and as an individual I did sign the committee report as "Ought to pass." However, over the weekend, while at home, and being exposed if you like to my constituents, I was brought to bear but fast, and they so advised me that they were most unhappy and the fact that county funds were going to be used to the extent of the expansion of a facility at Machias, and if this precedent was to be established within the county, then they certainly and sincerely felt that Eastport in turn would be in a position to receive the same considerations, and as a consequence I have found myself in this position this morning in which I am introducing this amendment, and requesting that it be adopted with L. D. 1602. Thank you.

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

This bill having had its three several readings and the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading having reported no further verbal amendments necessary, is it now the pleasure of the House that this bill shall be passed to be engrossed?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Princeton, Mr. Wheaton.

Mr. WHEATON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I find myself in the same predicament — in nearly the same predicament as the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. MacGregor. In my town we have an airport with two runways, 4,400 feet long, paved with safety bands 300 feet wide, and we have spent \$25,000 of private funds sealing up the cracks in this hot top airport. I would like to pre-

sent House Amendment "B" to H. P. 1162, L. D. 1632, and move its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "B" to H. P. 1162, L. D. 1602, Bill "An Act Authorizing Funds for Construction of Machias Landing Field."

Amend said Bill in the title by inserting before the period at the end the following words: 'and Expansion of Princeton Airport'

Further amend said Bill by inserting before the emergency clause a new section 3 to read as follows:

**'Sec. 3. County funds authorized.** The treasurer of Washington County is authorized to pay over to the Aeronautics Commission a sum of money not exceeding \$25,000 to finance expansion of Princeton Airport.

The treasurer of Washington County is authorized to issue a bond of said county therefor, with interest coupons attached, for an amount not exceeding \$25,000, said bond to bear interest payable semi-annually, at a rate not exceeding 5 per cent per year; the principal to be paid at the rate of \$5,000 annually until maturity which shall not exceed 5 years from the date thereof, as the county commissioners may fix; said bond to be signed by the treasurer and countersigned by the county commissioners of said county, and the coupons to bear the facsimile signature of said county treasurer.'

House Amendment "B" was adopted.

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

Mr. PIKE: Mr. Speaker, I also was approached by constituents over the weekend who'd like some money for Lubec, but I didn't have time to draw up an amendment. Now they have an airport there, and they think if the county is going to support airports, it ought to support all the airports in the county. On the other hand, they don't think the county ought to be supporting local airports. We now are in a fix in Washington County that the county commissioners are unable to send out their tax bills which will notify the various towns

of how much they've got to phony up to support various local airports. This is very embarrassing. And I being embarrassed, do now feel that I should move that this bill and all its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Pike, that the Bill, "An Act Authorizing Funds for Construction of Machias Landing Field," House Paper 1162, Legislative Document 1602, be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from East Machias, Mr. Dennison.

Mr. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, it is very evident to see what has transpired over the weekend. Now in the first place, this Machias airstrip which was under the aeronautics control amount of money that they had, and was distributed into the different counties. Now neither—and Machias was one of them, and the appropriation was \$11,858. Now last Friday, you heard the opposition that has just spoken in back of me again trying to kill my bill. Now this is the way they have gone about it. There was no reason for these others, these county commissioners we'll say, cooked the whole thing up to try to kill the bill, which the man behind me has already suggested. I hope you don't go by his thirteen that voted for him last Friday, and indefinitely postponed this bill. I hope you do not indefinitely postpone this bill, leave us a time to work over it over the weekend, and I propose this bill be tabled until next Thursday.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from East Machias, Mr. Dennison, that the bill be tabled until next Thursday pending the motion of the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Pike, that the bill be indefinitely postponed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

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

Sixty-three having voted in the affirmative and forty-four having

voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

Thereupon, the Bill was tabled pending the motion of Mr. Pike of Lubec that the Bill be indefinitely postponed, and specially assigned for Thursday, May 18.

### Amended Bills Indefinitely Postponed

Bill "An Act relating to State Valuation of Town of Bristol for School Subsidies" (H. P. 691) (L. D. 969)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading and read the third time.

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

Mr. DURGIN: Reference to item 8, if we pass this bill, and certainly we should amend it to include every town that has lost subsidy due to the increased state valuations in 1958 to 1960. This is a very unfair bill for every town that has lost subsidy through this increase in valuation with the exception of course of Bristol. I would now move the indefinite postponement of this bill and all its accompanying papers.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House in reference to item 8, L. D. 969, is the motion of the gentleman from Raymond, Mr. Durgin, that the Bill be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bristol, Mrs. Sproul.

Mrs. SPROUL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As I explained last Friday, we had the town revalued at an expense of \$20,000. I do not want to go into all that again, but I will say that the valuation was taken in the summertime when we have our summer visitors and things look prosperous. They were not down in the winter when I've seen men go into the clam flats frozen, I mean the flats, and they are too afterwards, and horses going into the woods and lumber pretty well cut off. The property that is selling in the Town of Bristol is the property around the shore, that I think—and that is what the state is basing their valuation on. That I think I am qualified to talk on as I have done every single trans-

fer for two years in the Town of Bristol. I know exactly what is selling and what is not.

And now as far as the education committee goes, they object to this on the ground that every other town will also object. Why shouldn't they object? You heard here in this House of how the \$500,000 had been found. You know as well as I do that amount that was found was taken from the smaller towns. Now people from very interested—and I can name them—say, well we can fix this all right. We will pass this other subsidy which will give the money back to the smaller towns. It will not only give it back to the smaller towns, it will also give it back to the larger towns, and we will be paying the tax to support both the larger and the smaller towns. I need not say again that we've been hurt bad, this is a loss of \$14,000 in two years, \$7,000 each year. Our county tax has gone up \$4,000 this year, we will have payments to make on the beach. This is the first year that they will become due. We have asked for no help from the state in establishing this Pemaquid Beach Park. I do not think that we are asking for any more than we should. I certainly hope that you will favor this bill.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: I did not intend to inject myself in this, but I am concerned with the bill that will be coming before you for consideration very shortly in regards to subsidies. Now I will have to concur with the remarks made by the gentleman from Raymond, Mr. Durgin, that if we upset the entire state's structure on subsidies based upon the facts presented to you, we all have the same problem before us. And this new bill coming before you does equalize on a percentage basis, the valuation of your town as far as the work conditions problem and financial conditions. We all have them in our own areas, and if you set up and break open the door for one particular area and not the entire state, it will not be healthy for your subsidies in the future. So I will have to con-

cur with the remarks of the gentleman from Raymond, Mr. Durgin.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Bristol, Mrs. Sproul.

Mrs. SPROUL: I would again state that we were influenced to build a new schoolhouse in Bristol at a cost of over \$50,000. While we were about it, we thought we might just as well build a gym, which cost \$59,000. We are paying each year to the Maine School Building Authority \$9,000; that payment never goes down. When I asked why it doesn't go down, why the insurance is included. Certainly if we had favored the Sinclair bill and that is what is influencing the thought of everyone—I won't say everyone—some in the House, why did the Education Department come down and tell us to build what we have now? If what we have now is right, we should not have the Sinclair Act. If the Sinclair Act is the thing that is right now, why were we told to build what we have?

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

Mr. STEWART: I move for a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Chelsea, Mrs. Shaw.

Mrs. SHAW: Mr. Speaker, I concur in part with the gentlewoman from Bristol, as one of my towns which I represent also had its valuation increased by a quarter of a million dollars. But in checking with the Taxation Department, I found that sixteen towns were increased by over twenty percent, and if you are interested in these, they are Glenwood Plantation and Nashville Plantation of Aroostook County, Raymond and Standish of Cumberland, Dedham, Orland and Surry of Hancock County, Pittston in my own Kennebec County, Bristol and Waldoboro of Lincoln County, Corinna, Detroit and Highland Plantation of Penobscot County, Beddington of Washington County, and Acton and Arundel of York County. Now these towns all of their valuation were increased by over twenty percent up to forty-two percent. Now all of these towns have lost substantially in their sub-

sidy payment. My town of Farmingdale was less than twenty percent and thus I did not put an amendment onto this bill because I did think it was discriminatory legislation.

These towns are in your jurisdiction, and it is up to you how you vote on this.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Raymond, Mr. Durgin, that the Bill, "An Act relating to State Valuation of Town of Bristol for School Subsidies," House Paper 691, Legislative Document 969, be indefinitely postponed, and a division has been requested.

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

A division of the House was had.

Ninety-five have voted in the affirmative and twenty-four having voted in the negative, the Bill was indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

---

Bill "An Act relating to Outdoor Advertising on the Interstate System" (S. P. 417) (L. D. 1356)

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

---

### Finally Passed Emergency Measure

Resolve Authorizing the State of Maine to Convey Certain Land in the City of Saco (S. P. 523) (L. D. 1550)

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. 132 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Resolve was finally passed, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

---

### Passed to Be Enacted

An Act relating to Burden of Proof on Questions of Fact in In-



dustrial Accident Commission Decisions (S. P. 535) (L. D. 1583)

Was 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 Apportionment to Municipalities of Tax on Telephone and Telegraph Companies (H. P. 358) (L. D. 510)

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

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

An Act to Include the Town of Winslow in the Kennebec Water District (H. P. 416) (L. D. 591)

Was 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 Reactivating the State Committee on Children and Youth (H. P. 452) (L. D. 652)

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)

An Act relating to Preservation of Essential Records Against Destruction in Event of a Disaster (H. P. 989) (L. D. 1376)

Resolve Appropriating Moneys to Match Federal Funds Provided under Title X of the National Defense Education Act (H. P. 724) (L. D. 1012)

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.)

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read a paper.

The CLERK: "May 12, 1961 — Please accept my resignation as a member of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on House Paper 648, Legislative Document 926, Resolve

Appropriating Funds for Capital Improvements at East Corinth Academy. Signed Kenneth A. Hughes, St. Albans Representative."

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that this resignation shall be accepted?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: In place of the gentleman from St. Albans, Mr. Hughes, the Chair will appoint the gentleman from Bradford, Mr. Hanson.

The SPEAKER: Also, the Chair wishes to announce at this time in reference to the action of the House on May 12, whereby it insisted and asked for a Committee of Conference, in relationship to Bill "An Act relating to Compensation for Injuries under Workmen's Compensation Law," House Paper 937, Legislative Document 1285, the Chair appoints the following Conferees:

Messrs. LITTLEFIELD

of Hampden

BREWER of Bath

THAANUM of Winthrop

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Baxter of Pittsfield,

Recessed until two o'clock in the afternoon.

#### **After Recess**

2:00 P.M.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

#### **Order Out of Order**

Mr. Johnson of Smithfield presented the following Order out of order and moved its passage:

WHEREAS, the members of the House have learned that today is the 70th birthday of Mr. Poirier of Van Buren,

BE IT ORDERED, that the members extend to Mr. Poirier their best wishes and congratulations not only for today but for the entire year.

The Order received unanimous passage. (Applause)

Mr. Thornton of Belfast was granted unanimous consent to address the House briefly.

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

I want to express my appreciation and thanks for the action of this Legislature in passing an order during my illness; also for the very beautiful bouquet that graced my bedside in the hospital. I want to include in my thanks the Speaker of the House and Clerk of the House for their personal encouragement. I thank you one and all. Thank you. (Applause)

#### Order Out of Order

Mr. Stevens of Portland presented the following Order out of order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that a message be sent to His Excellency, the Governor inviting him and his guest National Commander Erickson of World War I Veterans to visit the House of Representatives and make such communication thereto as they may desire.

The Order received passage.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will appoint the following Committee on the part of the House to invite the Governor and his guest, National Commander Erickson of World War I Veterans to visit the House of Representatives and make such communications thereto as they may desire.

Thereupon, the Chair appointed the following Committee:

STEVENS of Portland  
MacGREGOR of Eastport  
WHEATON of Princeton  
THAANUM of Winthrop  
ANDERSON of Ellsworth  
WALTZ of Waldoboro  
KELLAM of Portland

Mr. Stevens for the Committee subsequently reported that the Committee had discharged the duties assigned it, and that His Excellency, Governor John H. Reed and his distinguished guest, John E. Erickson, National Commander of World War I Veterans, would be pleased to attend forthwith and address the House of Representatives.

Whereupon, His Excellency, Governor John H. Reed, and his distinguished guest, announced by Robert L. Travis, Chairman of the Governor's Council, entered the Hall of the House amid applause, the members rising.

The Speaker then presented Gov-

ernor Reed to the House of Representatives.

GOVERNOR REED: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House of Representatives and Guests: It is indeed an honor to be invited in this afternoon accompanied by the distinguished guest that we have with us in the State House here this Tuesday afternoon.

It is always a pleasure I know for any of us from Maine to welcome to our boundaries in the great Pine Tree State distinguished visitors from outside the state, and we are especially honored today by the presence of one of our distinguished members of Veterans of World War I, the National Commander of that organization.

During 1960 I had the pleasure of addressing our Maine Department of Veterans of World War I. I was very impressed by the interest and the enthusiasm that these men who served our country in World War I, have towards this individual organization, and I am sure that we are very proud today to have their distinguished Commander here in person, and available to say a few words to us, and I know that we all look forward to his message this afternoon, and at this time, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to present to the Members of the 100th Maine House of Representatives, Commander John Erickson, who is a native of the State of Minnesota. This is the first time that Commander and Mrs. Erickson have been in the State of Maine. He tells me that he is enjoying the traditional Maine hospitality; and so to voice this in his own words, it is a pleasure for me to present Commander John E. Erickson, Veterans of World War I. Commander Erickson. (Applause, audience rising)

COMMANDER ERICKSON: Excellency Governor Reed, Mr. Speaker, distinguished Members of the House of Representatives of the State of Maine: As I told the Governor just a little bit ago, this happens to be my first visit. This happens to be the last state in the Union that I have had the opportunity to visit during the past years. Driving up from New Hampshire this morning, the scenery and the things that I saw along the

road are reminiscent of the scenery and the things that we have in the northern part of my own State of Minnesota, so it made me feel quite at home. And the hospitality that has been extended to me by the members of the Veterans of World War I and the hospitality that you, the distinguished Members of this Legislature have accorded me, is most heartwarming, and I am happy to accept that in behalf of and in the name of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A.

Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A is a distinctive organization whose membership is composed only of those who served between the 6th of April, 1917 and November 11, 1918. They are the remnants of that great army that went overseas and for the first time in large numbers fought a war to defend democracy to make our way of life permanent and to guarantee the future of this nation. We are also perhaps one of those groups of men who have raised sons who in turn had to go to the second World War to maintain the things that had been won in the first World War.

Our purpose, of course, is both fraternal and historical, and also to do what we can and what must be done to advance and to try to take care of the problems that now are afflicting so many of our aging veterans in this country. We have economic problems among hundreds of thousands of the veterans of World War I who haven't been able during the years to establish sufficient income for themselves in their retired years to keep them in respect and in comfort. One must remember that the average veteran of World War I was forty-two years or more before he was able to establish himself economically after the depressing years of the '30's, and so he has only been able to work at a gainful occupation for a short time in comparison to many other people. Because of that, being retired at the age of sixty-five for age and disabilities, his economic condition is not as good as many other people. We are hopeful that a grateful nation will see to it that the Veterans of World War I will get the same

consideration that has been extended to the veterans of other wars, both previous to World War I and following World War I.

On the 19th of this week, I am going to go to Ireland for the purpose of instituting a Department of the Veterans of World War I in Ireland. And I am sure that you may say, how come that there are so many American veterans living in Ireland? And I can tell you that the basic or the main reason rather for their sojourn over in Ireland or going there are economic more than anything else. Because of economic conditions they have been forced to go some place where their dollar will stretch out a little farther getting the needs and necessities of life than they have at home. We find that in Mexico there are 25,000 veterans of World War I living in that country because of economic reasons. There is a great migration of World War I veterans after they retire from Maine, from Minnesota and from all these northern states to Florida and California and the southern states where they find that they might be able to get just a little bit more out of the meager income that they have. And so I believe, and I am sure you will agree with me, that it is high time that we do something to keep these people or give them the opportunity to remain here at home where they have their roots in the ground, where they have lived and where they have worked all their lives, where their friends are, so they don't have to migrate to some strange place and to try to make new friends again.

Distinguished members, I know that you have a busy schedule, and I am not going to take any more of your time, only to express to you my deep and sincere appreciation for this opportunity to say a few words to you, and for the wonderful hospitality and the marked show of respect that you have shown, not to me as National Commander, but to the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. Thank you so very much. (Prolonged applause, the audience rising)

The SPEAKER: Thank you, Commander Erickson, for your timely remarks. We note that the Com-

mander saved as his dessert his final visit to the State of Maine, and on behalf of the House, the Chair extends to all the veterans who have left the State of Maine an invitation to return. We have opportunities for them in the State of Maine.

Thereupon, the Governor and his distinguished guest and suite withdrew from the Hall of the House amid applause, the audience rising.

### Orders of the Day

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

HOUSE REPORT—Ought to Pass in New Draft (H. P. 1157) (L. D. 1594)—Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Creating a District Court to Integrate Activities of Municipal Courts and Trial Justices" (H. P. 397) (L. D. 572)

Tabled—May 10, by Mr. Knight of Rockland.

Pending—Acceptance of Report.

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

Mr. BAXTER: Mr. Speaker, due to the absence of several members of the Appropriations Committee on legislative work, members who are very much interested in this bill, I would request that this be tabled until tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Report and Bill were tabled pending acceptance of the Committee Report and specially assigned for tomorrow.

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

SENATE REPORT — Ought to Pass As Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (Filing S-55) Committee on Business Legislation on Bill "An Act relating to Interest Rate for Licensed Small Loan Agencies." (S. P. 392) (L. D. 1258) In Senate Indefinitely Postponed.

Tabled — May 11, by Mr. Lane of Waterville.

Pending — Acceptance of Report.

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

Mr. LANE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I

now move we recede and concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Lane, now moves the House indefinitely postpone the Report and Bill.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Jones.

Mr. JONES: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill had its hearing before the Committee and I believe it came out ought to pass, and therefore, I move we support the ought to pass report with the amendment attached to the bill.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Lane, that the Report and Bill be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nobleboro, Mr. Hancock.

Mr. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have been very much interested in this bill ever since it came out of Sam Slosberg's office. I think it is a good bill and I think the unfortunate people in the State of Maine who have to have a small loan on short notice are being charged far too much for interest rates.

The bill originally called for a one percent reduction in rates which would make it two percent a month; that's twenty-four percent a year. They have been charging three percent a month which to me is awful high. Now this bill with the amendment would call for a reduction of one-half of one percent which seems to me that anyone lending money ought to get along on thirty percent interest a year. I think it is time that someone tried to help the poor people and the unfortunate ones that have to have money. Certainly at the hearing there was no one interested in them, and I think it is up to this body to do it, and I hope that the unanimous report of the committee passes.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Guilford, Mr. Dodge.

Mr. DODGE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It might be of some interest to the House to

know what other states are letting their small loan organizations do. Now the State of Maryland lets them charge three percent up to three hundred dollars, but they aren't allowed to advertise that, they aren't allowed to do any advertising. The State of Massachusetts is two and one-half percent up to two hundred dollars, two percent from two hundred to six hundred and beyond that there is six hundred to a thousand is one and three-quarters. Connecticut, the first one hundred dollars is three percent; up to three hundred dollars is two percent, and three-quarters percent up to six hundred. New Hampshire is two percent up to three hundred. Vermont, two and one-half up to one hundred twenty-five and two and a quarter up to three hundred and one percent up to six hundred.

Now I think in view of the fact of what these other states are doing, that our three percent a month is too high, and I am very much in favor of cutting that to two and one-half percent. I think we are imposing on many of our people. They don't realize what they are paying. I have talked with people who thought that three percent a month was less than the six percent that the banks might cost for a year.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunkport, Mr. Tyndale.

Mr. TYNDALE: Mr. Speaker, I heartily concur with my good friend and colleague, Mr. Hancock, and also Mr. Dodge. I think one thing that we overlooked here is the absolute ignorance of the people who borrow money under these circumstances. In the first place, they are desperate or they wouldn't go there, and in the second place, in order to get the money, they would sign anything, and I do think that it is up to the Legislature to protect these people, and that is exactly what we are doing. I don't think that there is going to be any crying need on the part of these loan companies with the extent of the interest that they are allowed under this bill, and I sincerely trust that the ought to pass report of the committee, and they gave it a great deal of thought and con-

sideration, will be accepted in this House.

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

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I heartily agree with the previous speaker from Kennebunkport, that we must have a place where people that are unfortunate, not quite as fortunate as you and I that we can go to a bank and get three hundred or four hundred or five hundred dollars at a time, we must have a place for them to go in case of emergency, and I hope the bill passes.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hal-lowell, Mr. Choate.

Mr. CHOATE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In regard to the committee's action, I am a member of the Business Legislation Committee, and this bill had a very thorough hearing. It was presented by Senator Chase who presented it in all sincerity. It was supported by many, many people from all parts of the state in different walks of life, and we sent out an ought to pass report as amended by the committee amendment. I feel that it is a good bill and we should go along and accept the ought to pass report, and I hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

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

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I was also a member of the Business Legislation Committee the day this was heard, but unfortunately I was pleading my case before another committee and the part that I had to do with it was in executive session, and we went over very thoroughly the rates of other states. The bill originally called for two percent and down to \$1500. It would seem to me from my study further, that California and New York was the basis for our reasoning for the majority of the committee to report this ought to pass. However, there is one thing that a lot of people overlooked, that this state does not have the population of California and New

York. If trees in this state were people I think their rate could be cut to two percent, but I would doubt very much that the poor people that we are talking about when they need money, they cannot go to a bank and get it. It is just not there for them.

Now what will happen if the rate is reduced is very simple, these loan companies will have to be more selective in the people they lend the money to. On top of that they will probably reduce their help because they will not do as much business, but it would seem to me that if I am in a position where my creditors are all after me for money, and I have nowhere to go, no relatives to go to, I have got to find some place to go to, perhaps the state, but they won't pay my bills, so I have got to go to these loan companies. They get a rate in proportion to the risk that they take, and it would seem to me in fairness in some respects to poor people who can't get money any other way, and so that these small companies will be agreeable to lending this money when there is really no basis or a guarantee of a return of the money, and are willing to take the risk, I feel that regardless of signing the report, I feel that the bill should be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunkport, Mr. Tyndale.

Mr. TYNDALE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It seems to me that this is a matter of computation. Now this interest compounds itself every month. It is turned over in the space of six months, but what about the fellow that gets involved in one of these companies for say five hundred dollars and he gets two hundred fifty of it paid up and he is still in the same dilemma he was before, and they urge him to take back that money, the two hundred and fifty which he has paid back, at the same interest rate. By the time he gets finished with that loan, if he ever does, he will have paid ten times the amount that he has borrowed.

Now in natural business economics, it seems to me that if a fellow gets in the desperate position

that he is in, these loan companies are not very anxious to throw their money in the streets, and they are going to examine him very carefully. He either has to have a job; he must have some security, perhaps his automobile, and I think it is just simply a basic fact of being a very profitable business for people who like to deal in this kind of money, and I sincerely hope that this bill passes.

Mr. Hancock of Nobleboro then requested a division.

Mr. SPEAKER: A division has been requested.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hallowell, Mr. Choate.

Mr. CHOATE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: I would like to differ slightly with Mr. Johnson of Smithfield, that the figures we based our amendment on were more than just two states. We had charts showing every state in the nation, and this amendment that we brought out to the bill was an adjustment which we felt was in fairness to the adjusted rate which we should have. We felt that the rate in Maine is presently too high; that the bill had cut it too low, and this amendment is a compromise which we think is fair to all concerned.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Stonington, Mrs. Shepard.

Mrs. SHEPARD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I too signed this ought to pass report and I concur with what my colleagues Mr. Tyndale and Mr. Choate have said, and I hope this bill will be accepted.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Lane, that Bill "An Act relating to Interest Rate for Licensed Small Loan Agencies," L. D. 1258 and the Report be indefinitely postponed. A division has been requested. All those in favor of 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.

Eight having voted in the affirmative and one hundred and three

having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the "Ought to pass" Report was accepted in non-concurrence and the Bill read twice.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT  
"A" to S. P. 392, L. D. 1258, Bill,  
"An Act relating to Interest Rate for Licensed Small Loan Agencies."

Amend said Bill in the 5th line by striking out the figures "\$2,500" and inserting in place thereof the figures "\$1,500."

Further amend said Bill in the 7th line by striking out the underlined figures "2 percent" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figures "2½ percent."

Further amend said Bill in the 9th line by striking out the underlined figures "1½ percent" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figures "2 percent."

Further amend said Bill in the 10th line by striking out the stricken out figures and the underlined figures "1 percent" and inserting in place thereof the figures "1½ percent."

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

The Chair laid before the House the third 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) — In Senate Indefinitely Postponed.

Tabled — May 12, by Mr. Morse of Oakland.

Pending — Further Consideration.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Jones.

Mr. JONES: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is a very good bill. It came out of the committee unanimously ought to pass. There has been some discussion as to its benefits as to whether or not it was good by the several banking institutions, finance companies and automobile dealers associations. Now we compromised with the banking institu-

tions changing the wording so that it reads in part the amount included for insurance or other benefits specifying the types of coverage and benefits and the premiums or the fee for each type, and then it is amended, unless it is included in the finance charge. Now that last portion is the actual wording which we have accepted given by Mr. Sanborn who represents the banking institutions. Now I feel that this is a good bill. We accepted it before, and I would like to see if we can't hold it in line, and therefore, I move that we insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Jones, that the House insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

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

Mr. LANE: Mr. Speaker, this is a different bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have talked to our bankers in the City of Waterville and I have talked to quite a few bankers all over the State. The legitimate business people are against this bill, and now I move that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Lane, that the House recede and concur.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Jones.

Mr. JONES: Mr. Speaker, I dislike to take a difference with my good friend from Waterville, Mr. Lane, on this issue. However, there seems to be some misunderstanding somewhere where he states that the banks are still opposed to the bill. If they are still opposed to the bill, I don't see why they did not contact their representative who is representing them here at the Legislature, Mr. Sanborn, because with the terminology that we have used here in this bill as I state, was that of his own words and choosing. When the vote is taken, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Lane, that the House recede and

concur, and a division has been requested.

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

A division of the House was had. Fifteen having voted in the affirmative and eighty-five having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is it now the pleasure of the House to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference?

The motion prevailed.

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

HOUSE REPORT—Ought to Pass in Second New Draft under New Title "An Act Creating the Fort Kent Utilities District." (H. P. 1155) (L. D. 1593)—Committee on Public Utilities on Bill "An Act to Create the Fort Kent Sewerage District." (H. P. 528) (L. D. 726)

Tabled—May 12, by Mr. Berry of Cape Elizabeth.

Pending—Acceptance of Report.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, as House Chairman of the Utilities Committee, it has been a sad thing to have this bill bounced around so much so frequent and so many times, but I think it is pretty well clarified now and rather than recommit it back to the committee, there is an amendment being drafted which will be available and cleared by Mr. Sanborn by Tuesday next, and I would ask the indulgence of the House to place this upon the table and specially assign it for Tuesday next.

Thereupon, the Report and Bill were retabled pending acceptance of the Committee Report and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 23.

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

Bill "An Act relating to Chiropractic Treatment Under Workmen's Compensation Law." (S. P. 325)

(L. D. 1000)—In Senate Indefinitely Postponed.

Tabled—May 12, by Mrs. Hendricks of Portland.

Pending—Motion of Mr. Estey of Portland to Recede and Concur.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This issue has been thoroughly debated on the floor of the House, and as you know the House saw fit to pass this bill, and I don't want to stretch the thing out any further, so I would just hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Estey, did not prevail.

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

Mr. ESTEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As Mr. Hinds has indicated, this bill has had debate. The House, I believe, accepted the eight to two "Ought not to pass" Report because it was amended leaving the selection of chiropractic treatment subject to the approval of the employer which fundamentally killed the bill. I am not going to take time for extensive debate, but I would like to read a definition of 'chiropractic.' The practice of Chiropractics is defined to be the science of palpating and adjusting the segments and articulations of the human spinal column by hand and correcting interference with nerve transmission and expression by hand, electrical treatment, hydrotherapy and diet without the use of drugs or surgery, and any and all other methods are declared not to be chiropractic and chiropractics is declared not to be the practice of medicine, surgery, dentist, or osteopathy. Therefore, you see that chiropractors are not permitted to stop bleeding, to use antiseptics, to use hypodermics, anesthetics, to take stitches, to repair fractures, lacerations or apply bandages or splints. Neither hospitals nor operating rooms are available in which they can care for their patients. They are limited by law to the use of the hands on the spinal column and in such accident cases, hence they should not



seek to take over the treatment of industrial accident cases which are almost always traumatic experiences.

The number of states which license chiropractors is rather larger than those states that license such type of treatment under Workmen's Compensation. Only six states expressly permit chiropractic treatment under Workmen's Compensation acts: California, Colorado, Connecticut, Iowa, New Mexico, and Texas. There are a few states that explicitly exclude chiropractics in addition to these; thirty-six states, however, have no statutory provisions covering the matter either directly or under general headings in non-medical services. While it is possible by interpretation that some of these under some of the circumstances might authorize chiropractic treatment, most of the states presumably are in the same position as Maine, where a failure to specifically include chiropractic treatment has the effect of not permitting it. When the vote is taken, Mr. Speaker, I request a division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Jobin.

Mr. JOBIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As a member of the Committee on Labor who signed the "Ought to pass" Report on this bill, I should like to mention the reasons that I believe it should receive passage, I believe that to refuse passage of this bill would be gross discrimination. My reason for this stand was prompted by those who opposed the bill at the hearing. The main subject of their testimony was the qualification of the chiropractor to practice medicine, as against the qualifications of the physician. If there is a professional battle going on between the two professions, I certainly do not feel that it should be here on the floor of this House. The question is whether to allow the Workmen's Compensation to pay for treatment of an injured worker who seeks chiropractic treatment. I call your attention to the fact that the injured employee is the only one who decides as to whether he wishes this sort of treatment, and it is

by no means forced on him. As it stands today when an injured employee seeks the treatment of the chiropractor, he must pay the bills out of his own pocket, while other medical men are paid through the Workman's Compensation Act. This is the only question that is before the House at this time. As far as the type of treatment goes, it has been definitely known that in its place, and I repeat, in its place, in its own field, can be a tremendous benefit to a patient. If this were not so, I believe that the State authority would long ago have abolished the chiropractors. Instead of this the chiropractors have their state board, they must attend specialized schools, they must pass state board examinations, and be issued a license to practice in this state. I must admit that it is possible for a person to abuse the privilege of practice and to administer beyond his field, but that is also true in any other profession. There is always a minority in any field that is unscrupulous whether it be a chiropractor, physicians, nurses or anyone else. We have all seen at one time or another where someone abuses the privileges, but we should be thankful that this happens only very rarely. And when it does, we have laws that take care of this matter.

We probably can recall only a few years ago how the osteopath was discriminated against and the various things and accusations that were made about him, forcing him to practice under duress. But after having had the opportunity to prove himself, he has become one of the most respected of medical men and has benefited millions of people and is accepted on an equal plane with other professions. Let us give the chiropractor an opportunity to come into its own, and let's give him a chance to practice the profession that he is licensed for. I say again, that not to let these chiropractors receive remuneration from the Workmen's Compensation Act just as we do for physicians, osteopaths, and others is pure and simple discrimination, an act for which I feel no member of this House should be guilty of. Therefore, I certainly

hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair will ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to escort the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, to the rostrum to act as Speaker pro tem.

Thereupon, Mr. Baxter assumed the Chair as Speaker pro tem and Speaker Good retired from the Hall.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Estey, that the House recede and concur.

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

Mr. JAMESON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This is a good bill and I don't like to repeat myself by explaining my experience and the experience of my nephew. Now in the past three or four weeks I have talked to quite a number of employers. I haven't met one that objected to this bill in any way, shape or manner, particularly if it is a back injury or a muscular injury. Now the gentleman from Portland said they had no facilities or hospital. But if you will ask me they don't need any, they put you back to work so quick. They put me back to work, as I told you, five different times within forty-eight hours. They put my nephew on the street in two treatments, when he laid in the hospital for over seven months. I hope ladies and gentlemen, you will go right along with the agreement you made a short time ago and pass this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Milbridge, Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. KENNEDY: Mr. Speaker, a bill of this nature has been before several legislatures previous to the 100th and I sincerely hope that it will receive the same treatment as it has in the past. I won't attempt to review the various debates opposing the bill in the past, but they have been very effective by qualified speakers.

It has been mentioned on the floor here today that the osteopath now has equal status with the medical practitioners in the State of Maine, but they have done

so by prerequisite training. It is new to me that a chiropractor is a profession. It is legalized, it is true. As to the benefits of chiropractic treatment, I don't take any issue with that. Neither do I take issue with the benefits of a public masseur. Neither do I take issue with the benefits of a naturopath. They all produce great benefits to the human anatomy.

But I think this is a bad bill and I hope that the members of the House will take the same action that they have in previous legislatures and indefinitely postpone this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque.

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I do not wish to take too much of your time this afternoon although I feel it is my duty as a Representative in this House to see if there is any way possible that we can help an injured worker to go back to work as soon as possible; and if there is any justification between the medical profession as far as their ethics are concerned in barring one class of people or another from belonging to their organization, it is not up to this Legislature to tell the medical profession or association that they should or should not have these people under their own group.

If a chiropractor is a member that has been accepted by the State of Maine for practicing, then I think that if any worker can be helped by this practice that he should be given that privilege. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Jobin.

Mr. JOBIN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask a question through the Chair to anyone who may answer, to clarify a matter in my own mind.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. JOBIN: I would like to ask any member of the House who could do so, to give me a definition of a profession.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Jobin, has asked a question through

the Chair to anyone who may answer if he pleases.

Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Estey, that the House recede and concur with the Senate in which that body indefinitely postponed Bill "An Act relating to Chiropractic Treatment Under Workmen's Compensation Law," Senate Paper 325, Legislative Document 1000. A division has been requested.

Will all those in favor of the motion to recede and concur, please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned their count.

A division of the House was had.

Forty-five having voted in the affirmative and seventy-three having voted in the negative, the motion to recede and concur did not prevail.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I would move that we insist on our former action and that a Committee of Conference be appointed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hinds, that the House insist upon its former action whereby this bill was passed and ask for a Committee of Conference. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

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

An Act Regulating the Taking of Alewives in East Machias. (H. P. 1130) (L. D. 1557)

Tabled — May 12, by Mr. Whitman of Woodstock.

Pending — Passage to be Enacted. (Emergency)

Having been reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed and this being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a division was had. 111 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.

---

At this point, Speaker Good returned to the rostrum.

SPEAKER GOOD: The Chair wishes to thank the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, for acting as Speaker pro tem and to compliment him upon the excellence of the performance of the duties of that office.

---

The SPEAKER: The Mock Session has been postponed until the evening of Wednesday, May 24.

---

On motion of Mr. Whitman of Woodstock,

Adjourned until nine o'clock tomorrow morning.