

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 Hundred and First Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

VOLUME II

MAY 10 - JUNE 22, 1963

and

SPECIAL SESSION

JAN. 6 - JAN. 17, 1964

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Monday, June 3, 1963

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Arthur Christopher of Augusta.

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

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

Conference Committees Report

Report of the Committees of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on House Joint Order relating to Search and Seizure (H. P. 1081) reporting that the House recede, adopt Conference Committee Amendment "A" and pass the Order as amended by Conference Committee Amendment "A"; that the Senate recede, adopt Conference Committee Amendment "A" and pass the Order as amended by Conference Committee Amendment "A" in concurrence.

(Signed)

KNIGHT of Rockland

CHILDS of Portland

BERMAN of Houlton

— Committee on part of House.

FARRIS of Kennebec

BOARDMAN of Washington

CAMPBELL of Kennebec

— Committee on part of Senate.

In the House, the Report was read and accepted. The House receded from its action whereby the Order was passed.

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

CONFERENCE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to JOINT HOUSE ORDER (H. P. 1081) Relating to Search and Seizure.

Amend said Joint House Order by striking out all of the first paragraph.

Further amend said Joint House Order by striking out everything after the word and punctuation "concurring," in the first line of the 2nd paragraph and inserting in place thereof the following: "that there be created an Interim Joint

Commission to consist of 2 Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, 3 Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, 3 members, to be appointed by the Governor, and the Attorney General, or the Deputy or an Assistant Attorney General designated by him to serve during his pleasure and in his stead, to study and report to the 102nd Legislature on whether the present statutory provisions of the State governing the procedure on search and seizure comply with recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court upon said subject matter.'

Conference Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Order was passed as amended by Conference Committee Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

Papers from the Senate Tabled

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee is directed to study the welfare functions and activities of the State as relate to the Aid to Dependent Children Program; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Committee report the results of its study to the 102nd Legislature (S. P. 616)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

In the House, the Order was read.

(On motion of Mr. Wellman of Bangor, tabled pending passage in concurrence and unassigned.)

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 Bill "An Act Promoting Scenic Attractions and Vacation Facilities in Maine" (S. P. 134) (L. D. 496)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, the Report was read.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, my motion may appear a little bit un-

usual, but because of recent developments, I would hope that someone would table this item pending acceptance of the "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee.

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

Mr. TYNDALE: Mr. Speaker, I move that item two lie on the table until the next legislative day.

Mr. Littlefield of Hampden then requested a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested on the tabling motion. The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Kennebunkport, Mr. Tyndale, that item 2 be tabled until the next legislative day. All those in favor of tabling this matter until the next legislative day, will please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Fifty-seven having voted in the affirmative and sixteen having voted in the negative, the motion to table did prevail.

Thereupon, the Bill was tabled pending acceptance of the "Ought not to pass" Report and specially assigned for tomorrow.

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Appropriating Moneys to State Board of Education to Match Federal Funds under the Manpower Development and Training Act (S. P. 229) (L. D. 611)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

Ought Not to Pass Covered by Other Legislation

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Providing Funds to Aid Existing Maine Business to Find Foreign Markets (S. P. 136) (L. D. 413), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act to Provide Funds to Aid Completion of Lincoln County Economic Develop-

ment Plan" (S. P. 227) (L. D. 722), as it is covered by other legislation.

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, the Reports were read and accepted in concurrence.

Indefinitely Postponed

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Providing Funds for Economic Research Projects for Industrial Expansion" (S. P. 133) (L. D. 495)

Came from the Senate with the Report and Bill indefinitely postponed.

In the House, the Report was read and, on motion of Mr. Littlefield of Hampden, the Report and Bill were indefinitely postponed in concurrence.

Ought to Pass in New Draft Amended in Senate

Report of the Committee on Agriculture on Bill "An Act to Create Water Conservation Districts and to Expand Powers of Soil Conservation Districts" (S. P. 553) (L. D. 1490) reporting same in a second new draft (S. P. 603) (L. D. 1570) under title of "An Act to Expand Powers of Soil Conservation Districts" and that it "Ought to pass"

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the New Draft passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendments "A" and "B".

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

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 603, L. D. 1570, Bill, "An Act to Expand Powers of Soil Conservation Districts."

Amend said Bill in the 6th line of section 2 by adding after the underlined word "upon" the underlined punctuation and words ', or any rights heretofore or hereafter granted by the Legislature to any person, firm, corporation, association, public or quasi-public body to use or take the water in or from,'

Senate Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence.

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "B" to S. P. 603, L. D. 1570, Bill, "An Act to Expand Powers of Soil Conservation Districts."

Amend said Bill in that part designated "Sec. 3." of section 4 by striking out all of the last underlined sentence of paragraph J of subsection IV and inserting in place thereof the following underlined sentence:

'Any balance in this fund, except moneys appropriated by the State, shall not lapse but shall be carried forward from year to year to be expended for the purposes set forth in this section;'

Senate Amendment "B" was adopted in concurrence and the Bill assigned for third reading tomorrow.

Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment Amended in Senate

Report of the Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act Providing for a Full-time Chairman of the Liquor Commission and Increasing the Compensation" (S. P. 157) (L. D. 433) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" as amended by Senate Amendment "A" thereto.

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

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 157, L. D. 433, Bill, "An Act Providing for a Full-time Chairman of the Liquor Commission and Increasing the Compensation."

Amend said Bill in the 5th line of section 2 by striking out the underlined figure "\$10,000" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure '\$8,500'.

Further amend said Bill in the 2nd line of section 3 by striking out the figure "\$1,600" and inserting in place thereof the figure

'\$521'; and by striking out in the 3rd line of section 3 the figure "\$2,125" and inserting in place thereof the figure '\$625'.

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 157, L. D. 433, Bill, "An Act Providing for a Full-time Chairman of the Liquor Commission and Increasing the Compensation."

Amend said Amendment by striking out all of the 2nd paragraph and inserting in place thereof the following:

'Further amend said Bill by striking out all of section 3.'

Senate Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence. Committee Amendment "A" as amended by Senate Amendment "A" thereto was adopted in concurrence, and the Bill assigned for third reading tomorrow.

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

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Election Laws reporting "Ought to be Adopted" on Joint Resolution Ratifying the Proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the United States Relating to the Qualification of Electors (S. P. 381)

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. BROOKS of Cumberland
— of the Senate.

Messrs. BROWN of Fairfield
CROCKETT of Freeport
VILES of Anson
BINNETTE of Old Town
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought not to be Adopted" on same Joint Resolution.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. STITHAM of Somerset
FARRIS of Kennebec
— of the Senate.

Messrs. MATHIESON of Montville
HARRINGTON of Dexter
— of the House.

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted and the Resolution adopted.

In the House: Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett.

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in opposition to the adoption of this Resolution to the Constitution of the United States. I think, as many of you might remember, several months ago this Resolution came into this body and was about to go under the hammer: It afforded no consideration to be given to this bill whatsoever. As a result, I think the thing you might say was caught in time, and it was sent to the Committee on Election Laws.

Now what transpired in that committee? Little or nothing. There was one proponent to the bill who frankly I don't think understood but very little about it, and I think that I appeared at the time as an opponent. I think at the time my knowledge of this Resolution was about as meager as that of the proponent. As a net result, I attempted somewhat to delve into this proposed Constitutional Amendment and see what it was all about. I waited a long while for this document to make its appearance in this body, and finally of course, it is with us today. Now what does it propose, and what is its intent? It proposes to amend the Constitution of the United States so that no state can make a prerequisite of the payment of a poll tax on voting. Now that in itself is perfectly all right, except for the fact this same thing could be accomplished by statute under our federal law. It seems as though there is absolutely no need whatsoever of cluttering up the Constitution of the United States with an amendment such as this.

Now further who does it affect? It affects only those who might vote for President, Vice-President, Senators and Congressmen; it has nothing to do with voting on any state level or any local level whatsoever.

Now apparently at this time, there is a sort of a mass hysteria sweeping over this country; this, we will admit. The newspaper columns ev-

ery day are filled with happenings in other parts of the country, according to race difficulties. Now the first thing that anyone would be apt to say is, that this is a thing that is helpful — an attempt to clarify this situation. This is helpful to those people who perhaps have been deprived of their vote by some state legislation. This is not true.

I have an article here. I very seldom read; as a matter of fact, I hate to read, but I want to be clear and concise on this particular point. The point is that the very people who supposedly — this is to help with the people who opposed it at the hearings in Washington. The Attorney General of the United States admitted at the time that this same thing could be accomplished by statute, and this article is from what I consider and I think we all consider a very reputable newspaper, 'The Christian Science Monitor,' and it is certainly not deemed a scandal sheet in this country from coast to coast. It has an excellent reputation.

It goes on to say: "The historical significance of the Twenty-fourth Amendment, if adopted, probably lies elsewhere. It offers a precedent for Congress to shunt aside other uncomfortable civil rights issues to constitutional amendment rather than dealing with them by simple statute. In the long run the amendment may be a defeat for civil rights' hopes rather than a victory.

"This paradox was noted at the time. Seven civil rights groups, including the NAACP, the ADA, the American Jewish Congress, the United Auto Workers and the like, urged Congress last year not to pass the amendment declaring it would 'provide an immutable precedent for shunting all further civil rights legislation to the amendment procedure.'

"Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy testified for the amendment but said that Congress could achieve the same thing by simple statute."

Now it appears to me and I think it would appear to anyone who delved into this proposed amendment, that the State of Maine, for once, should stand and stand in the way that it always has stood, for simple procedure and for civil rights

and for the Constitution of the United States in its pure and simple form, and I move the indefinite postponement of this Resolution, and when the vote is taken, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, moves the indefinite postponement of both Reports and the Resolution.

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

Mr. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I had prepared a talk on this Resolution, but after hearing the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, I don't believe I could add a thing to it. I most heartily concur with that gentleman.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. WELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have not prepared a talk on this particular Resolve that we have before us; however, I think it is important that we should consider two or three points before we take a vote on the motion made by the gentleman from Kittery.

I think first of all that we must recognize that this is—and should not be considered, in the ensuing debate, a partisan matter. I am rising as an individual; not as a Floor Leader at this particular moment. The gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, has noted that it is a simple matter of federal statute. I would like to point out, I believe I am correct in my figures, that this item has passed the National House three times and has failed of passage due to filibustering in the National Senate. I think that the real point that we should be considering today is the principle that all persons should have the right to vote and should in no way be hindered by the imposition of a poll tax, which as we know, has been used in some circumstances to prevent people from voting. I think you should be very careful before you make any final decision as to whether this is cluttering up the Constitution. I, for one, do not feel

that this is cluttering up the Constitution. Thank you.

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

Mr. EWER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: I find myself in complete agreement with the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, on this matter. I also agree to a very considerable extent with my colleague from Bangor, Mr. Wellman. But I do think that there is one point that has not been mentioned yet in connection with this Resolution, and that is the characteristics of the states which have so far approved the Resolution. The last figures that I saw showed that practically all of the approvals had come from the so-called southern tier of states, the very ones which apparently on the face of it would be affected by this Resolution and the Constitutional Amendment if it became ratified. I am a little upset by this fact, because it seems to me if these states which so far have used the poll tax amendment to keep certain classes of citizens from voting, are ratifying this; and the number that they apparently are, there must be something about it that we haven't seen yet. I do think that a great deal of thought should go into this matter. My own feeling — I am not a lawyer, but my own feeling is that this is an unnecessary amendment. The Constitution already provides for a necessary effort in regard to the poll tax setup. This would not confer the right to vote by poll tax exemption in any state election, and after all, in the southern states where the troubles are occurring today, the troubles are coming in the state elections and not in the federal ones. For that reason, I hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone does prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease.

Mr. PEASE: I, Mr. Speaker, will voice my support of the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, on the simple grounds that it appears to me after reading this proposed Joint Resolution, that it is merely an attempt to get around the rules of the

Senate of the United States as pointed out by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Wellman. I think this is a problem which should be handled by the Senate; if they have a filibuster rule, they should take care of it. We should not tamper with the Federal Constitution on a matter which can, by enactment of our Federal Congress, be taken care of in a very simple fashion. It seems to me like we are attempting to go in the back door, where our own Representatives and Senators in Washington together with other Representatives and Senators have not seen fit to go in the front door.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, that both Reports and the Resolution Ratifying the Proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the United States Relating to the Qualifications of Electors, Senate Paper 381, be indefinitely postponed. A division has been requested. All those in favor of indefinite postponement, will please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Eighty having voted in the affirmative and eleven having voted in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone did prevail.

Thereupon, the Reports and Resolution were indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Weight of Commercial Vehicles" (H. P. 866) (L. D. 1253) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in the House on May 23.

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

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Increase the Salaries of Certain Department Heads Elected by the Legislature" (S. P. 548) (L. D. 1480) which was

passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "B" in non-concurrence in the House on May 28.

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

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve in favor of Town of Woolwich for Rent of Certain Property Owned by State (H. P. 1026) (L. D. 1487) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on April 2.

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

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Apportionment to Municipalities of Tax on Telephone and Telegraph Companies" (H. P. 1077) (L. D. 1544) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on May 3.

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

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act relating to County Taxes (H. P. 689) (L. D. 945) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 22 and passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" on May 17.

Came from the Senate with Senate Amendment "A" indefinitely postponed and the Bill passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to the Educational Foundation Program Al-

lowances" (H. P. 862) (L. D. 1249) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" in the House on April 16.

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

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

Orders

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I would inquire if Legislative Document 493, "An Act relating to Expending Aroostook County Funds for Renovating the Terminal at Presque Isle Municipal Airport," is in possession of the House.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would inform the gentleman that it is in the possession of the House.

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I would also inquire what the pending action is on this bill.

The SPEAKER: On May 29, the last legislative day, pending enactment it was indefinitely postponed.

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move that we reconsider our action whereby this Bill was indefinitely postponed, and if you go along with me, I would later move that it be tabled until Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, moves that the House reconsider its action whereby this Bill was indefinitely postponed; and also that it be tabled until Wednesday next. Is that the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The Bill was tabled pending reconsideration and specially assigned for Wednesday, June 5.

On motion of Mr. Crockett of Freeport, it was

ORDERED, that Cathy Carswell, niece of Representative Catherine Hendricks, be appointed to serve as Honorary Page for today.

The SPEAKER: The Sergeant-at-Arms will please retire to the rear of the Hall of the House and es-

cort the Honorary Page to her position. (Applause)

Thereupon, Miss Cathy Carswell was escorted to the well of the Hall of the House by the Sergeant-at-Arms to serve as Honorary Page for the day.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith.

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I move that the gentlemen be allowed to remove their coats.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith, moves that the gentlemen be allowed to remove their coats. Is that the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I would inquire if the House is in possession of Senate Paper 384, L. D. 1087, An Act Continuing the Committee on Aging.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would inform the gentleman that the paper is in the possession of the House.

Mr. JALBERT: I would ask that we reconsider our action of Wednesday, May 29, wherein we moved that this item be indefinitely postponed; and move that the item be tabled.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, moves that the House reconsider its action whereby this matter was indefinitely postponed on the last legislative day.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hodgdon, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We debated this matter at quite a length the other day and killed it by a good margin. Now we are being asked to reverse our action of the last legislative day. It looks to me as if we ought to find a little bit of economy around here somewhere, and I would ask for a division.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I didn't know that this thing had been debated at such a length. I debated it for about twenty-three seconds. I certainly didn't know that there was a law that said we couldn't reconsider; we just did a moment ago. I will withdraw any thinking of tabling. I will move that we just reconsider, period.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. WELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out one fact in the process of making up your minds about reconsidering this particular bill. Wednesday, I believe it was, we passed — I believe we enacted, the Committee on Children and Youth. Now those of you who were from the 100th Legislature will remember, and I will remind the rest of you, that that Legislature combined the Maine Committee on Children and Youth and the Maine Committee on Aging together in employing and sharing the office staff. Now during the interim, the difference in the appropriation between the two committees put the bulk of the office and the necessary staff overhead on the Committee on Aging. I personally feel that the Committee on Aging has done a good job. It has a real role to contribute in the state, but are you going to kill — or strangle in effect, another committee which you already passed on Wednesday?

I urge you to reconsider your action and eventually pass the Committee on Aging to be enacted. Thank you.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There were several bills similar to this bill reactivating the Committee on Aging which came before the Appropriations Committee and while that Committee felt that — the Appropriations Committee in considering these similar bills, felt that a time should come soon when these study committees should begin to taper off their activities. However, rather than cut those bills off completely, you

will find that the Appropriations Committee did consider reduced appropriations with a feeling a warning should be given to those committees that they should do their studying shortly and perhaps face in a future legislature the matter of being cut off. I feel that this would be a good method of handling this particular committee as it is in line with what has been done with many other bills of a similar nature. I would hope that you would go along with the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hodgdon, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out to the House — now I'm not arguing for the Committee on Aging or against it too much, or the Committee on Youth. What I am arguing for is just a little bit of economy. I would point out that these two committees were combined. All right. For first year of their operation they spend a total of \$91.50 for stenographic work. This lady apparently wrote all the necessary letters for a year. All right. When they started in again, they are spending — I don't know if I've got the exact amount, but up around seven or eight thousand dollars for the same work that the one lady did before. So I think that the Committee on Youth, if you want to continue that, have plenty of money. The year before they got by for a half of ninety dollars and I can't for the life of me see why they need six or seven thousand dollars to do the same work this time.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that the House reconsider its action whereby this Bill "An Act Continuing the Committee on Aging," L. D. 1087, was indefinitely postponed on May 29. A division has been requested. All those in favor of reconsideration, will please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Fifty-four having voted in the affirmative and thirty-three having voted in the negative, the motion to reconsider did prevail.

Mr. JALBERT: I now move the pending question.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the indefinite postponement of the bill. Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I hope we vote against the indefinite postponement — a long weekend.

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

Mr. JONES: Mr. Speaker, if it would be in order, I would move that we table the measure now until next Wednesday.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Jones, moves that this matter be tabled until Wednesday next.

Mr. Littlefield of Hampden requested a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested on the tabling motion. All those in favor of tabling this matter until Wednesday next, please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Twenty-three having voted in the affirmative and sixty-one having voted in the negative, the motion to table did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the indefinite postponement of this bill. Is the House ready for the question? The Chair will order a division. All those in favor of indefinite postponement, will please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Forty-two having voted in the affirmative and forty-three having voted in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone did not prevail.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I now move the pending question.

The SPEAKER: All those in favor of the passage of this bill will say yes — the Chair will order a division.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, may I request information. Does this matter have an emergency preamble to it?

The SPEAKER: It has.

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, I move that this matter lie upon the table assigned for tomorrow.

Mr. Littlefield of Hampden then requested a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested. All those in favor of tabling this matter, Bill "An Act Continuing the Committee on Aging," L. D. 1087, until tomorrow will please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Sixty-six having voted in the affirmative and twenty having voted in the negative, the Bill was tabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for tomorrow.

On motion of Mrs. Lincoln of Bethel, it was

ORDERED, that the Sergeant-at-Arms, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms, Pages and Doorkeeper be permitted to appear on the floor of the House with their coats removed.

Mr. Wellman of Bangor presented the following Order and moved its passage:

WHEREAS, the members of the 101st Legislature and other guests thank Representative Sahagian of Belgrade for the Legislative Cook-out held at his home in Belgrade last Tuesday afternoon and evening; and

WHEREAS, the fine hospitality of the host and Mrs. Sahagian cannot be excelled; and

WHEREAS, the weather was fine, the setting fine and the food wonderful; and

WHEREAS, it came at just the right time to relieve a little bit the tensions and monotony of a long and arduous session; now, therefore, be it

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that Representative Sahagian be commended for his thoughtfulness and hospitality. (H. P. 1100) (Applause)

The Order received passage and was sent up for concurrence.

On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act Amending Certain Provisions of the Employment Security Law" (S. P. 453) (L. D. 1345) the Speaker appointed the following Conferees on the part of the House:

Messrs. GIFFORD of Manchester
BROWN of South Portland
EWER of Bangor

On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act to Revise the Boating Law and Extend Boat Registration and Safety Law to Cover Coastal Waters" (S. P. 585) (L. D. 1542) the Speaker appointed the following Conferees on the part of the House:

Messrs. LOWERY of Brunswick
PRINCE of Harpswell
CROCKETT of Freeport

House Reports of Committees Leave to Withdraw Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Smith from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Designating Saco as the Seat of the District Court for Eastern York" (H. P. 51) (L. D. 74) reported Leave to Withdraw.

Report was read.

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

Mr. BEDARD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to substitute the bill for the report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Saco, Mr. Bedard, moves that the House substitute the bill for the report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Cartier.

Mr. CARTIER: Mr. Speaker, I move that this item be tabled until the next legislative day.

Thereupon, the Report and Bill were tabled pending the motion of Mr. Bedard of Saco to substitute the Bill for the Report and specially assigned for tomorrow.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act Increasing Working Capital of Liquor Commission" (H. P. 262) (L. D. 356)

Bill "An Act relating to Deficiency Appropriation for Division of Veterans Affairs" (H. P. 407) (L. D. 560)

Bill "An Act relating to Establishment of a Personnel Law for Certain Employees of the City of Lewiston" (H. P. 544) (L. D. 801)

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

Third Reader Amended

Bill "An Act to Reorganize the Department of Economic Development" (H. P. 1089) (L. D. 1561)

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

Mr. Sahagian of Belgrade offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1089, L. D. 1561, Bill, "An Act to Reorganize the Department of Economic Development."

Amend said Bill in that part designated "Sec. 2." of section 2 by striking out in the 3rd line the underlined word "not"; and by striking out in the 5th line the words "with the approval of the Governor and Council" and inserting in place thereof the following: "with the approval of the Governor and Council subject to the Personnel Law"

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eddington, Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. GILBERT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose through the Chair a question of the gentleman from Belgrade, as to what the purpose is of the amendment. What is the purpose of the amendment?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Eddington, Mr. Gilbert, poses a question through the Chair of the gentleman from Belgrade, Mr. Sahagian, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. SAHAGIAN: In answer to my colleague, the gentleman from Eddington, Mr. Gilbert, is I object to this original bill because I still remember the days when the department heads were hiring their

help before the establishment of the Personnel Laws, the State House was full of political hacks as a result of political pressure. I would like to take this out from the hands of the Governor and the Council and the department heads and put it into the Personnel rules and regulations.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eddington, Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. GILBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The part of the bill—first let me say this, this bill was developed originally by a special group, a special joint group of the House and Senate and it came from them to the Committee on Industrial and Recreational Development.

Now the first part of the bill pertaining to directors, deputies, assistants and industrial development specialists were made not subject to the personnel law, and there was a reason for this. Unlike the other agencies of state government, the D. E. D. is not only a service organization, it is a sales organization, and traditionally throughout America in business selling is done on a commission setup, and where results count, and if you don't get results, then they want to be able to remove the salesman. Now this is precisely what was done here. These people are going to have to produce under the original bill; otherwise, if they don't produce, they will be out. I think it is completely unfair to put somebody who is primarily a salesman under the Personnel law, where one guy goes out and does a good job and gets industry and business to come in here, and he doesn't get any more help or hindrance than the other guy who just sits around and does nothing. The precise point of the original bill was to make these salesmen produce and if they didn't produce, no soap. I hope Committee Amendment — I move — I hope it is not adopted.

Mr. SAHAGIAN: Mr. Speaker, I request a division.

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

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

I was a member of the interim committee, I wasn't able to attend a few of the last meetings when they decided to do this, and I agree with the point brought out by my esteemed colleague, Mr. Gilbert from Eddington.

The purpose of this organization was to hire proficient men who would go out and secure industry. Now if these men did not produce after the period of the year there was no sense of keeping them on the payroll. If you had them under the Personnel law, you might run into a problem there. That is exactly why that part was injected into the committee. Now this committee worked very hard and long on this problem. I think that they came up with a very good idea and for that reason I will go along with the gentleman from Eddington, Mr. Gilbert, and move for indefinite postponement of the amendment.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: I don't see anything wrong with the Personnel law. I have been working in politics for quite some time and I am more than seven years old, and I have seen some things happen before we had the Personnel law that wasn't anything to write home about. And the Personnel law, while it may not be perfect in every way, I think it is the best thing we have had to date and I think we should hang right onto it and I think this amendment should be passed. Thank you.

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

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker, I certainly go along with my good friend from Eddington, Mr. Gilbert. This is a sales proposition. I happen to know, I was forty years on the road selling, and I know if I didn't produce I was let out. If you have a man in there to go out and sell to some industrialist and you see one, two, three, you try for a good time and you don't accomplish anything for the state or the department that is interested, under the Personnel law

you couldn't get rid of him, he would be what we call a dud in our line of business, so you are hooked with him, but this way if he doesn't produce, you have the right to let him go. This way, I say, under the Personnel it is not good business for the State of Maine to hire our salesmen, commonly called a peddler.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Littlefield.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the Industrial and Recreational Committee and I heard this bill discussed pro and con. It is a — a lot of hard work went into the bill by the committee, and it is not a radical bill from what the department is at present working under. There were four main changes in the new bill. It did away with the Advisory Board; it placed the State Museum under the State Park and Recreation Commission; it did not spell out the powers and duties of the Division of Research and Planning. I was in favor of all of these, and the last one, it takes the directors, deputies, assistants and industrial specialists from the Personnel law. I was lukewarm to this proposition, and I go along with whatever the House votes.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith.

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would hope that you would go along with the amendment. I think if you remove these people from the Personnel law, you will immediately open yourselves to many other departments wishing to remove their heads from that law. You already have had indications of this through your newspapers from two of the department heads, as soon as this news was out they immediately were in and you have seen your Personnel Board have to go to work on their so-called complaints.

Now another department is already planning on how he can get some of his personnel out from under, so what you are essentially doing is breaking down or starting the

first step to break down your Personnel law. Now if you do not like the Personnel law, then you should work on it and do something to replace it, but to break it down without any — to begin to break into it, without any recommendation for what is going to happen, to me is certainly very bad legislation. I am inalterably opposed to this, I think it is the wrong thing to do; and I ask you, if you have a good commissioner, he writes the specifications for his personnel, and under the Personnel law this man must meet these specifications. It is up to him to see that he has good personnel; and furthermore, if you think this will protect you and give you good people under it, I ask you what is going to happen when some rather prominent politician decides to go over to the department and get someone fired because he didn't bring an industry to his town, and this is exactly what is going to happen. Those people are going to be at the beck and call of every politician in this state, and I don't want to see that happen to that department, and I certainly have worked and fought for that department as much as anyone, and I think this is one of the worst things that we could possibly do to it, and if we don't have a commissioner over there who can handle his department, we certainly should replace him.

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

Mr. BERRY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think that one of the most productive things that has happened out of the 101st Legislature has been the things that have been happening to the Department of Economic Development.

I think this bill goes right to the root of it. I am sorry indeed to hear my good friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith, say that she feels that we would be undermining the Personnel law, because in my opinion, we certainly will not. No longer will — under this proposed act, no longer will the Department of Eco-

conomic Development prove to be a sinecure for non-productive people who are supposed to be out selling the State of Maine to the Country. I think the committee that came up with this idea did a tremendous job of breaking with tradition, because the measure of success of the Department of Economic Development can be indicated in spite of what has been said; they can show, with actual figures, what they have done. I think under this proposed act, by putting these agents on their own, they have to prove their mettle. We certainly are not undermining the Personnel law, but we are going to strengthen the Department of Economic Development tremendously, and I hope the motion to indefinitely postpone the amendment does prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Belgrade, Mr. Sahagian.

Mr. SAHAGIAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: I wish to call your attention to the fact that if at this session of this Legislature we adopt the Committee recommendation for any one of the three new departments, it would set a precedent for other departments to follow in the years ahead and could mean eventually be the means of abolishing our present Personnel system to which I would be opposed. I believe the state employees are entitled to the security offered by our present laws.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Hendricks.

Mrs. HENDRICKS: Mr. Speaker, I feel this is the opportune time to tell you quite a story. There was a gentleman in Portland who was working in the Liquor Store; he had worked there for some time, although he was temporary help, because he had taken several exams and could not pass them. So he came to me for help. I talked to the Manager of the Liquor Store and he said yes, this man is doing a fine job, I don't want him to get through, but because of the Personnel law he had to pass a written exam or he couldn't serve the public. The Manager asked

me to go to the Personnel Board and explain how he felt about this individual. I did so. I even took a letter right from the Manager of the store and still the man couldn't stay on the job because he couldn't pass the written exam. This might be what could happen to the D.E.D. also.

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

Mr. TYNDALE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I might bring out one other point here. It was our thought that we could hire a top notch commissioner that could produce and do the job. Now if you are going to hamstring this gentleman by saying well, the specification called for this man and you must take him, just because he passed a specific exam, you are hamstringing him, and I think that he should have the privilege to try to do a job for the State of Maine that he is hired for, and I think that is a very important point.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith.

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I think the representative from Portland, Representative Hendricks, has said exactly what is going to happen if this is done with these men. If you do not like the Personnel law, if it is not satisfactory to the greater part and Members of this House and of the Legislature, then we should bring legislation to do away with it, but we should not start this chipping away with no program to follow it up, and as Representative Hendricks has said, apparently in the Liquor Commission they also have ideas about getting out from under Personnel. This will happen on the one hand; on the other hand, when you get into bringing industry into communities you get into a great many jealousies, and certainly if there is a man out selling an industry and he doesn't bring it to the right town or to some town, and another town wanted it, he is going to be in a lot of hot water, and his job isn't going to be very secure if he isn't under Personnel.

But not only that, it will be very embarrassing to your commissioner, your new commissioner, and I certainly don't think anyone would consider me for the new commissioner, but I wouldn't want it if I had to have all of my personnel at the beck and call of every legislator.

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

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker, as one who is a freshman and very ill informed on many of these departments and regulations, I was going to ask this question to anyone who would answer it, and the question is this: Are there any limitations on salary in this particular Personnel Department of this department? For I understand that one of the reasons for taking this particular position from the Personnel Department was to be free to go out and get even a Rockefeller at a top salary or any outstanding person in this field, regardless of salary, to try to do a job; and that is what I would like to know, if there are any salary restrictions in the Personnel Department. If there are no salary restrictions, can you remove this person from the Personnel Department if he does not satisfactorily do the job?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cottrell, poses a question through the Chair to anyone who may answer if he chooses.

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

Mr. TYNDALE: Of course Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there would be a set salary if he came under the Personnel law. And another thing, you would have a great deal of difficulty in removing this gentlemen under the present Personnel law setup.

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

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, a top man would be hired through the Governor and his Council, salary would be set by them, and they naturally will go out and get one of the best men

they can in the Country to try to promote the industry of the State of Maine.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: From the question asked and the question answered, I presume that we are talking about the head of the department. I thought we were talking about the entire personnel of the department. I would like to have somebody state just what we are talking about. I was under the assumption that the head of the department, in any event present head of the department, was hired by the — nominated by the Governor and hired by the Council anyway. Maybe I am having a bad day, but I am really confused.

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

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speakers, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am only answering the question of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cottrell. The commissioner would not be subject to Personnel law and there would be no fixed salary. In addition to no fixed salary, it would include the directors of each division, the deputies, the assistants and industrial development specialists, all others would be included in the Personnel law.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Kennebunkport, Mr. Tyndale, that House Amendment "A" to Bill "An Act to Reorganize the Department of Economic Development, L. D. 1561, be indefinitely postponed. A division has been requested.

All those in favor of the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "A" please rise and remain standing in your places until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

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

Thereupon, House Amendment "A" was adopted, the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would request the Sergeant-at-Arms to escort the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease, to the rostrum to serve as Speaker pro tem.

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

Third Reader Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act Providing for Public Facilities for Boats" (H. P. 1097) (L. D. 1573)

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

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Anson, Mr. Viles.

Mr. VILES: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: L. D. 1573 provides that a new committee will be created, and it defines the duties of the committee and they are thus, the committee shall acquire, construct and maintain within the funds available, public facilities for boats in the waters of the state including but not limited, launching ramps, etc. Then it defines waters as waters of the state means any waters within the territorial limits of the state and the marginal seas adjacent to the state. I would like to pose a question to any of the committee members that heard this bill and ask that if this bill were adopted, would this mean that they could build a road to a private fish pond of which we are beginning to get many in the state, and allow the public to go in there and boat and fish under the same laws and rules that govern the state waters?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Anson, Mr. Viles, poses a question through the Chair to any member of the Committee who may answer if he chooses.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eddington, Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. GILBERT: Mr. Speaker, it certainly was not the intent of the committee on that; as the gentleman from Anson, Mr. Viles, probably knows, great ponds which are ten acres or more, people have a right to go to them to fish and fowl as it is. It was not the intent at all, and I don't believe the Commission as appointed would ever propose such a thing to build roads to these private ponds.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Anson, Mr. Viles.

Mr. VILES: Mr. Speaker, however I appreciate the answer from the good gentleman from Eddington, Mr. Gilbert; however, I am quite concerned of the growing ponds that we have and it doesn't say the great ponds, it says waters. Does the state mean waters within the territorial limits, and if that is the case, then I would move that this bill and all of its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Anson, Mr. Viles, that this Bill be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Littlefield.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This L. D. could well be called a boating promotion bill. It is a bill to spend some gasoline funds to build boat launching ramps, parking lots and access roads. It would allocate some of the proceeds of the tax on gasoline used in motor boats. Most of this tax can be refunded to purchasers, but few pleasure boat owners claim it, and the unclaimed amount now goes into the highway fund. This fund would be handled by a committee of several department heads concerned with various aspects of recreation. This was a new aspect of the gas tax that I was not familiar with, and at our committee meeting, I sat back and listened while my good friend, Representative Jobin assisted by Representative Gilbert ironed out any objections that there might be. They have prepared this bill without a \$25,000 or \$30,000 survey. They have done the work, and I

believe it is a bill that should be passed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Viles of Anson then requested a division on the motion to indefinitely postpone.

The SPEAKER pro tem: A division has been requested. The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Anson, Mr. Viles, that this bill be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. HARDY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is one of those recreation bills that we have heard something about recently. I do not think that it will detract any great amount of money from the Highway Department, and I think that it is one of those things that will aid and abet the great need of facilities that our tourists and our recreation natives desire here in the State of Maine. As has been pointed out to you, a great deal of work was done on this bill. The original bill was, I think, L. D. 56 or some minor number like that. It has been in the committee all winter. I really don't see anything bad about it at this point.

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

Mr. JONES: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill in theory looks promising and progressive; however, when you look into the depths of it, and from an angle which you will have to look at it if it becomes a reality, these people who are using this gas will be required to fill out affidavits and statements to get the return from the State Department, that is, the return of the gas tax. In many instances, the amount of return is going to be so small that I doubt if they will take the time and trouble in order to try to obtain the return of the gas tax because it is quite involving and will take quite a bit of time upon the part of each and every one to get this tax back. Therefore, in looking at it from that angle, I wonder and I doubt very much if many people will take the time and trouble to get this tax back from one department or

shift it over from one area in the department over into another area in the department, and when that is done, I don't believe there will be much money left to build many roads or create many facilities. Therefore, I will go along with the idea for indefinite postponement. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eddington, Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. GILBERT: Mr. Speaker, this point alone that the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Jones, has raised, there has been on the books for quite a while, the provision that eight mills of the tax on fuel used in commercial motor boats which is not refunded shall go to the Sea and Shore Fisheries for the purpose of conducting research. Now under that bill as it has been on the books for many years, there is about \$22,000 per year that is going to the Sea and Shore Fisheries for development and propagation activities. We figure under the proposed bill, if it can be amended again, that there would be a considerable sum of money available to build these public boat facilities.

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

Mr. JONES: Mr. Speaker, I go along with my colleague, Mr. Gilbert's remarks. However, when I appraise a marine boat or seagoing boat with a large heavy motor using gas and fuel for propulsion why I can see there being a good return, because each and every one of those boat operators is using a large supply of fuel. Last Saturday I was in a boat and we motored all day on less than three gallons of gas, so if that had been one of the boats that he refers to, they would probably have been using several hundred gallons, but I was using — we used less than three gallons and that is what I am thinking about in this particular department. The amount of the gas being consumed is very small. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Humphrey.

Mr. HUMPHREY: Mr. Speaker, I move this bill be tabled until the next legislative day.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Humphrey, moves this item lay on the table and be specially assigned for the next legislative day. Is this the pleasure of the House?

(Cries of "No")

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

Thereupon, the motion prevailed on a viva voce vote.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act relating to the Excise Tax on House Trailers" (H. P. 1099) (L. D. 1576)

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

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

Mr. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise in opposition to Legislative Document 1576, as I feel that this bill is adding restrictions to the moving and the sale of house trailers within our state. This bill calls for a certificate of excise tax to be paid before the movement of a trailer over the highways of the State of Maine. Now if this is to be the case, it is certainly going to impose an undue hardship upon all dealers in this state handling house trailers. Also, it is raising the rates of the excise tax on house trailers throughout the state. I believe that the house trailer industry has had sufficient restrictions placed upon it, and I would not like to see this bill passed and therefor ask for indefinite postponement. I thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Taylor, that this Bill be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. JONES: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Being a member of the Taxation Committee through which this bill was heard, I would advise you that the remarks that have been made by Mr. Taylor are true. However, we have before us many cases where

people have moved their trailer from location, say right after April 1st, from the place of location or settlement and move out of town without paying a tax. After they are once gone, it is pretty hard to catch up with them and find out where they are. So that is the reason why this tough part was in the bill, it's to put teeth in there so that the towns of settlement can get some tax revenue from this source. And the people who own the trailers certainly are responsible people and should pay their taxes the same as anybody else. Therefore, I would hate to see this bill indefinitely postponed. I hope it will be passed. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Benton, Mr. Kent.

Mr. KENT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill I believe is a very good bill. I rise in opposition to indefinite postponement of it. The time has come when that trailers are getting more popular than they have ever been before, and they move into these towns and they expect to have their children educated, they expect to have sewerage facilities available to them, and their roads plowed and all this for a very small tax. Now I have seen this grow in the last eight or nine years in being the assessor of a town, and a good many of these people are getting by on peanuts with these trailers and something has to be done to protect the real estate taxpayers who carry the burden, support the schools, the roads and all of these different things which we all enjoy. I certainly believe this is a good bill, and is a step in the right direction. I heartily support it. Thank you.

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

Mr. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, there is another thing that I would like to call your attention to. That is, any case where you haul your own trailer, you are definitely required to pay excise taxes and if it is a trailer that is stationary and has to be moved, you have to get permission from the State Police, spe-

cial permission and a special fee for moving such a trailer even though it is hauled by a company that transports trailers.

Now I realize that there is considerable feeling in certain areas regarding people who own house trailers. Personally, I find no reason why this feeling should be in effect. I, myself, own a travel trailer and I enjoy it tremendously during the summer months when I feel like using it. This restriction that is placed on house trailers by this bill definitely bars dealers in this state from moving house trailers over the highways without paying an excise tax on them, or having one bill, having one paid in a previous community. Now I say that this bill refers to new trailers coming direct from the factory as well as those that are privately owned and asking to be transported at a later date from one area to another. I believe this bill to be a very harmful bill to the dealers of house trailers within our state, and also, a bill that is going to add new restrictions and make it more difficult for the people who own house trailers and live here in our state.

Furthermore, I can see no reason why the house trailers should be discriminated upon any more than a person or family renting property within a town as, if trailers are here, they have to be in trailer parks and trailer parks are all under taxation from various communities. Now there is no difference between a person renting property and renting housing facilities or renting trailer rights in a trailer park. I do hope that this bill is indefinitely postponed. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Taylor, that Bill "An Act relating to the Excise Tax on House Trailers," House Paper 1099, Legislative Document 1576, be indefinitely postponed.

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

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

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

Resolve Appropriating Money to Supplement Federal Vocational Funds for Area Education Programs for Apprentices and Other Adult Workers (H. P. 324) (L. D. 451)

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

Amended Bills

Bill "An Act relating to the Department of Economic Development Advisory Council" (S. P. 578) (L. D. 1533)

Bill "An Act Providing for Holding District Court for Western Aroostook at Fort Kent" (H. P. 52) (L. D. 75)

Bill "An Act Appropriating Funds for Sewage Treatment Plant and Purchase of Equipment at Gorham State Teachers College" (H. P. 410) (L. D. 563)

Resolve Appropriating Moneys to Match Federal Funds Provided under Title VIII of the National Defense Education Act (H. P. 412) (L. D. 565)

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

Bill "An Act Revising Certain Laws under the Workmen's Compensation Law" (S. P. 583) (L. D. 1548)

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

Third Reader Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act relating to Investigation of Motor Vehicle Accidents by Highway Safety Committee" (S. P. 492) (L. D. 1344)

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

(On motion of Mr. Rust of York, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for tomorrow)

Enactors

Tabled and Assigned

An Act relating to Claims of Municipalities Against State for Taxes Lost From Veterans Property Tax Exemptions (S. P. 339) (L. D. 1004)

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

(On motion of Mr. Birt of East Millinocket, tabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for Wednesday, June 5.

An Act Increasing Salary of Forest Commissioner (S. P. 374) (L. D. 1040)

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

(On motion of Mr. Bragdon of

Perham, tabled pending passage to be enacted and tomorrow assigned.)

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act relating to Fees of Arresting Officers for Warrants (H. P. 655) (L. D. 911)

An Act relating to Boundaries of Western, Eastern and Central Aroostook District Court Divisions (H. P. 814) (L. D. 1201)

An Act to Promote Merchandising of Maine Sardines (H. P. 817) (L. D. 1204)

An Act relating to Operation of Retail Store and Restaurant Prior to Application to Sell Malt Liquor (H. P. 826) (L. D. 1213)

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

On motion of Mr. Wellman of Bangor.

Adjourned until nine o'clock tomorrow morning.