

# 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 Third  
Legislature*

**OF THE**

**STATE OF MAINE**

**Volume II**

**May 10 to June 15, 1967**

**KENNEBEC JOURNAL  
AUGUSTA, MAINE**

**HOUSE**

Wednesday, May 17, 1967

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. John Humme of Burlington.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

**Papers from the Senate**

From the Senate:

Bill "An Act relating to Re-count and Other Election Procedures and Changing the Primary Election Date" (S. P. 649) (L. D. 1657) which was introduced pursuant to the Joint Order Establishing an Election Laws Study Committee (S. P. 341)

Came from the Senate referred to the Committee on Election Laws.

In the House, referred to the Committee on Election Laws in concurrence.

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that a convention of both branches be held in the Hall of the House on Thursday, May 18, 1967, at 11 o'clock A. M. to invite His Excellency, Governor Kenneth M. Curtis to attend the convention and address such communication to the convention as he may be pleased to make (S. P. 651)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

In the House, the Order was read and passed in concurrence.

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

Thereupon, Mr. Brennan assumed the Chair as Speaker pro tem and Speaker Kennedy retired from the Hall.

**Senate Reports of Committees Ought Not to Pass**

Report of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Increasing Fish and Game

License Fees for Forestry District Fund" (S. P. 502) (L. D. 1217)

Came from the Senate with the Bill substituted for the Report and passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A".

In the House: Report was read and accepted in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

**Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment Tabled and Assigned**

Report of the Committee on Education on Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Pledging Credit of the State and Providing for the Issuance of Bonds Not Exceeding One Million Dollars for Loans for Maine Students in Higher Education (S. P. 618) (L. D. 1616) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

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

In the House, the Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Gauthier of Sanford, tabled pending acceptance in concurrence and specially assigned for Friday, May 19.)

**Divided Report**

Majority Report of the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act relating to Approval of Secondary Schools" (S. P. 401) (L. D. 1032) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following members:

- Messrs. KATZ of Kennebec
- SNOW of Cumberland
- MacLEOD of Penobscot
- of the Senate.
- Messrs. SHUTE of Farmington
- ALLEN of Caribou
- Mrs. HANSON of Lebanon
- Mr. CARROLL of Limerick
- Mrs. BAKER of Winthrop
- Mr. LEVESQUE

of Madawaska  
—of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. RICHARDSON  
of Stonington  
—of the House.

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted, Committee Amendment "A" indefinitely postponed, and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "C".

In the House: Reports were read.

On motion of Mrs. Hanson of Lebanon, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted in concurrence and the Bill read twice.

Committee Amendment "A" was then read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Richardson.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker, I move that Committee Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed.

Thereupon, the House voted to indefinitely postpone Committee Amendment "A" in concurrence.

Senate Amendment "C" was then read by the Clerk and adopted in concurrence, and the Bill assigned for third reading tomorrow.

#### **Non-Concurrent Matter Tabled and Assigned**

Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Pledging Credit of State and Providing for the Issuance of Bonds Not Exceeding, at Any One Time Issued and Outstanding, Twenty-five Million Dollars for Loans to Private Colleges for Construction and Expansion of Facilities (S. P. 60) (L. D. 73) which was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence in the House on May 5.

Came from the Senate with that body voting to insist on its former action whereby the Resolve was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and asking for a Committee on Conference, with the following Conferees appointed on its part: Messrs. MacLEOD of Penobscot WYMAN of Washington SNOW of Cumberland

In the House: On motion of Mr. Shute of Farmington, tabled pend-

ing further consideration and specially assigned for Friday, May 19.

#### **Non-Concurrent Matter Tabled and Assigned**

An Act relating to Transportation of Disabled, Collision Damaged, Wrecked or Repossessed Highway Motor Vehicles (H. P. 59) (L. D. 84) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 12 and passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" on May 10.

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

In the House:

On motion of Mrs. Lincoln of Bethel, the House voted to recede from enactment and on further motion of the same gentleman to recede from engrossment.

On further motion of the same gentlewoman, the House voted to recede from the adoption of Senate Amendment "A" and the same was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

Senate Amendment "B" was then read by the Clerk and adopted in concurrence.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Drummond of Sidney, tabled pending passage to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "B" and specially assigned for Friday, May 19.

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

Bill "An Act relating to Approval of Plans and Competitive Bids under Bureau of Public Improvements Law" (H. P. 1127) (L. D. 1600) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on April 27.

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

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

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

Bill "An Act Revising Laws Relating to Exemptions and Inspections under Boiler and Unfired Steam Pressure Vessels Law" (H. P. 852) (L. D. 1266) on which the House on May 15 voted to insist on its former action whereby

the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs was accepted.

Came from the Senate with that body voting to adhere to its action whereby the Minority Report reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" was accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

In the House:

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

Mr. BELIVEAU: Mr. Speaker, I move that we adhere.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Richardson.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Is it now the pleasure of the House that we recede from our former action and concur with the Senate?

Mr. Beliveau of Rumford then requested a division.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Beliveau, has moved that we recede and concur with the Senate and a division is requested. All those in favor of receding and concurring will vote yes; those opposed will vote no, and the Chair will open the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

34 having voted in the affirmative and 82 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the House adhered to its former action.

#### Orders

On motion of Mr. Danton of Old Orchard Beach, it was

ORDERED, that Peter J. Truman of Saco be appointed to serve as Honorary Page for today.

On motion of Mrs. White of Guilford it was

ORDERED, that Rev. Gordon Hemphill of Dover-Foxcroft be invited to officiate as Chaplain of the House on Wednesday, May 31, 1967.

#### House Reports of Committees Ought to Pass in New Draft New Drafts Printed

Mrs. Baker from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act to Create a Hospital Administrative District in Washington County" (H. P. 1053) (L. D. 1527) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1161) (L. D. 1662) under title of "An Act to Create Down East Community Hospital District No. 1" and that it "Ought to pass"

Mrs. Wheeler from same Committee on Bill "An Act relating to Realty Subdivisions in Municipalities and Unorganized Territory" (H. P. 633) (L. D. 889) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1162) (L. D. 1663) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Reports were read and accepted, the New Drafts read twice and tomorrow assigned.

#### Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Beliveau from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Fees, Compensation, Trust Accounts and Criminal Offenses under Real Estate Law" (H. P. 714) (L. D. 1009) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read.

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

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, through the Chair I would like to ask what the nature of this Act is, what it purports to do.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, poses a question through the Chair to anyone in the House who may care to answer it if they choose.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Beliveau.

Mr. BELIVEAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The original bill would authorize the Real Estate Board to examine and audit trust accounts, which realty brokers are required to have. In addition it would increase the fees and also the compensation of the Real Estate Commission, and also

attempted to outline or clarify what is considered to be a conviction or what should be included in an application for a broker's license or a salesman's license.

Now the Committee Amendment "A" would strike out all of Section 1 or the bold print, which would give them the authority to examine trust accounts. It was the Committee's opinion that this authorization could be abused by some overzealous members of the Commission and there were no examples cited of abuse or where they really needed this power, so that in effect deleted that portion of the bill which would give them that authority.

Now that's about it — and then the rest of the amendment just renumbers the paragraphs.

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

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I was rather perplexed at this, the title and the explanation seems to state that this Act pertains to the real estate law. When I look at Section 5 of the Act it pertains to fish and game laws, motor vehicle traffic laws, and municipal ordinances. I move that this be laid on the table until Friday.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Farrington of China, tabled pending acceptance of Report and specially assigned for Friday, May 19.

#### Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act relating to Eligibility for Benefits under Employment Security Law by Those Attending Vocational Training Courses" (H. P. 794) (L. D. 1172) reporting same in a new draft (H. P. 1163) (L. D. 1664) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. JOHNSON of Somerset  
GOOD of Cumberland  
NORRIS of Oxford  
—of the Senate.  
Messrs. HOOVER of Phillips  
HUBER of Rockland

BEDARD of Saco  
DRUMMOND of Sidney  
EWER of Bangor  
—of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. DURGIN of Raymond  
—of the House.

Reports were read.

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

Mr. DURGIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: My name inadvertently got onto the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report, either by error or by habit. In either case I would at this time move the acceptance of the "Ought to pass" Report.

Thereupon, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted, the New Draft read twice and tomorrow assigned.

#### Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Taxation reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Providing for a State Income Tax" (H. P. 290) (L. D. 410)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WYMAN of Washington  
YOUNG of Hancock  
—of the Senate.

Messrs. HANSON of Gardiner  
ROSS of Bath  
ROBINSON of Carmel  
DRIGOTAS of Auburn  
—of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. FARLEY of York  
—of the Senate.

Messrs. HARRIMAN of Hollis  
SUSI of Pittsfield  
COTTRELL of Portland  
—of the House.

Reports were read.

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

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Some tax tables are being prepared so that every member of the House can have one. They're not quite ready yet, and these tables will show the tax liability of citizens with various incomes from \$3500 a year up through as high as you want to go, and it also is arranged so that you could quickly figure the tax liability according to your number of dependents. So I would hope that someone might table this until Friday.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson.

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker, I move that this L. D. 410 be tabled until Friday, May 19.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, moves that this item be tabled until Friday, May 19, pending acceptance of either report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

Mr. SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker: I wonder if it would be possible for the gentleman to change that to Monday or Tuesday of next week? That is simply a tentative suggestion because when that comes up I have quite a little to say about it and because of sickness in the family I may not be here on Friday. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, that this item lie on the table until Friday, May 19. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

#### Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act Revising the Motor Vehicle Dealer Registration Law" (H. P. 1066) (L. D. 1533) reporting same in a new draft (H. P. 1164) (L. D. 1665) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. BARNES of Aroostook  
 RENEY of York  
 JOHNSON of Somerset  
 —of the Senate.

Messrs. PENDERGAST

of Kennebunkport  
 KEYTE of Dexter  
 Mrs. KILROY of Portland  
 Messrs. CROSBY of Kennebunk  
 LYCETTE of Houlton  
 —of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. JEWELL of Monticello  
 LEBEL of Van Buren  
 —of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Crosby of Kennebunk, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted, the New Draft read twice and tomorrow assigned.

#### Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act Directing Review of the Liquor Laws" (S. P. 274) (L. D. 654)

Bill "An Act Appropriating Funds for Operation of the Governor's Advisory Committee on Education" (S. P. 645) (L. D. 1651)

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

#### Third Reader

#### Tabled Until Later in Today's Session

Bill "An Act Providing an Education Loan Fund for the Higher Education of Teachers" (H. P. 626) (L. D. 882)

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 Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Danton.

Mr. DANTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire through the Chair if there is anyone in this House that could enlighten us a little bit as to the details of this bill.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Pendergast of Kennebunkport, tabled until later in today's session.

Bill "An Act to Authorize Construction of Self-Liquidating Student Housing and Dining Facilities for the State Colleges and the Issuance of Not Exceeding \$5,400,000 Bonds of the State of Maine for the Financing Thereof" (H. P. 1160) (L. D. 1659)

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

#### Amended Bills

Bill "An Act Revising the Minimum Wage Law" (S. P. 91) (L. D. 172)

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

Bill "An Act relating to Charging Fees for Services to Persons Acting as Subjects for Student Instruction and Training in Beauty Schools" (H. P. 611) (L. D. 854)

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 Sanford, Mr. Nadeau.

Mr. NADEAU: Mr. Speaker, may I have this tabled until Friday please?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Nadeau, moves that this Bill lie on the table until Friday, May 19.

Mrs. Lincoln of Bethel then asked for a division on the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Nadeau, has moved that item six lie on the table until Friday, May 19, and a division has been requested. All those in favor of this item lying on the table until Friday, May 19, will vote yes; those opposed will vote no, and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

26 having voted in the affirmative and 78 having voted in the negative, the tabling motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by

House Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

#### Passed to Be Enacted

An Act Creating the Pest Control Compact (S. P. 630) (L. D. 1631)

An Act relating to Education of Indians (S. P. 633) (L. D. 1634)

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.

#### Enactor

##### Tabled and Assigned

An Act relating to Form and Arrangement of Ballots in General Elections (H. P. 216) (L. D. 306)

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

(On motion of Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor, tabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for tomorrow.)

An Act relating to Adult Education (H. P. 311) (L. D. 445)

An Act relating to Trapping Beaver (H. P. 405) (L. D. 571)

An Act to Provide for an Economic Survey to Establish an Industrial Foreign Trade Zone (H. P. 1029) (L. D. 1495)

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.

#### Orders of the Day

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

SENATE MAJORITY REPORT (7)—Ought Not to Pass—Committee on State Government on Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Providing for Annual Legislative Sessions (S. P. 90) (L. D. 171) — MINORITY REPORT (3)—Ought to Pass.

Tabled—May 11, by Mr. Levesque of Madawaska.

Pending—Motion of Mr. Dennett of Kittery to accept the Majority Report.

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 think possibly that this was tabled last week in the haste of the session for the purpose of some discussion. This document had not been debated last week, so it is my feeling that this document of going to an annual session, that it has some very sincere and very good merits. Most of you will recognize that in your business you will have to alter most of your operations because of times. I think probably we in our State Government operations have sensed a change in its method of operation and in its method of allocating monies. Certainly no Board of Directors of any corporation or company would indicate in this day and age that the Board of Directors only meet once every other year. Certainly they are not in a lot of instances dealing with the kind of monies that are presently involved in State Government.

It is my strong feeling that this would be advantageous in this day where fast moving changes are being made throughout the country, that certainly with the kind of budgets that we have to deal with better planning, better allocation of money and a closer check on department allocations and expenditures could be made if we did meet annually thereby possibly cutting down the time that each Legislator would have to spend here in the State Capitol. It is with that and other reasons that it is my sincere feeling that this would be a good piece of legislation, that we could narrow the time of the meeting of the sessions of the Legislatures and also the promoting of better government to serve all the people of our State. I think most of these states that are now meeting on a yearly basis have proven that in some areas that this proves to be more economical and a closer tie between the department heads, their programs and the services rendered to its population. Thank you.

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

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in support of the motion to accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee. Ladies and Gentlemen, as you all know, in the beginning and for quite a number of years, the Legislature of the State of Maine met in annual sessions. This was found to be very impractical, and consequently it was changed to biennial sessions. Now, I'm quite aware that we perhaps seek progressive legislation in the State of Maine, but again I would remind the Members of the House to go back a hundred years is certainly regressive.

Now what can be the results of annual sessions? I think all of you know pretty well what the results could be. You would rehash the same old stuff that you had gone over in the previous session. Frankly, we have too much of it now. Bills return session after session, always in hope of ultimately receiving a passage. I have been here in Augusta off and on for some 18 years and even this morning I saw a bill killed that was killed 18 years ago. It has appeared at every session. I think that most of all this is very untimely. I think we have to change a lot of rules and regulations of the Legislature before we can ever entertain any idea of going back to the idea of annual sessions. There are many other reasons and I think I can stand here for quite some time and recite them, but I don't think this morning, owing to the press of business that is before this Body that you want to hear them. I can only ask that you accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee. When the vote is taken, I move for a division.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think that this is one area where I might possibly classify and qualify to be almost on an even keel with the knowledgeable gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Den-

nett insofar as governmental programs are concerned. I have been an arduous student of annual sessions for many, many years, to a point where I studied how we happened to go from the annual program to a two year program. Based on the fact that our budget one hundred years ago amounted to about \$450,000; based upon the fact that one hundred years ago there wasn't very much business done anyway; based upon the fact that legislators that would come here would stay here all winter travelling by horse and buggy, a team of oxen, railroads that you used to have to go if you travelled on the railroad, you had to go for instance from Lewiston to Portland, from Portland all the way around Brunswick to get to Augusta. For those reasons, the change was made.

Over the many years several states entertained the idea of going from biennial to annual sessions of the Legislature. A few years ago this was abandoned and recently the step-up is being thought of again, not necessarily based on the fact that we would have annual sessions as we do now, but based pretty much upon the fact that we would have annual sessions one as we do now and possibly a curtailed annual session taking up budgetary matters. It has now become a fact that it has become very difficult for us to project our financing programs into two years, and the good gentleman Mr. Dennett says that he has been here over the last eighteen years, this is true, and he would also admit that over the last eighteen years I have met him on at least a dozen occasions at special session. Since my tenure here of 1945 we have had twenty-three special sessions of the Legislature, and not that I am a gambling man, but if I were, I'd like to wager a little money that the 103rd will meet here to discuss money matters and other matters before it lays itself to sleep waiting for the 104th.

I think possibly it might be a thought, and I have discussed this with the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, it might be a thought

that a study, and bear in mind that people sometimes do not like the word study, but studies are made and many studies are done successfully, would be made now to study our rules to find out just what would happen to the thinking if we did go into the area of that suggested by this gentleman and then come up with the thought should we or should we not go into an annual session program.

I have presented this bill on two occasions, and the last time I presented it the other branch, the other branch consistently held the thinking overwhelmingly on this matter for it, and the last time I presented it, I believe it was six years ago, for two-thirds of the needed votes, this being a Constitutional Amendment, it lacked only seven votes. Certainly I see no area here where this becomes a party program or a party issue. I think the time has come when we must really look at this thought, with the thought in mind of saving time and with the thought in mind of allowing ourselves to be better knowledgeable in the affairs of government, particularly wherein it concerns its finances, and I certainly hope that if this measure would not have passage this morning, that the House would agree to referring this for study and see whether or not it would be advantageous for us to have annual sessions.

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

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In the past I have supported this legislature, I feel quite strongly that it is progressive legislation, particularly with the curtailment of one of the years of the session. I feel strongly enough about this to stand on my feet and to be recorded as being in favor of this. I think that the people of the State of Maine deserve a little more overseeing of their State government by the State Legislature. We come back here every other year and we find that the departments have increased their personnel, we don't know why because at the time we appropriated

the money they claimed we've just got enough to get by. We come back and they inform us that they've got twelve more on the payroll and if we do not treat them as current services, then these people will be out of work and programs will suffer, and as I say, in the past I've been in favor of this and I intend to vote in favor of it this time.

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

Mr. SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I've given this thing quite a good deal of consideration and the 102nd was my first term and of course I was a novice that knew very little. It took me at least that session, and so far this session to partially know my way around. Now when we had over 1600 bills the last session and we have 1700 this session. Now there's something got to be done about this in some form or another. In my opinion, just about 75% of the bills that come in here, a good many people in this Legislature including myself know very little about them. I'll give you an example with due respect to my good friend, Mr. Crommett, this is only an illustration, and has nothing to do with this particular bill, incidentally, it went through. They come in here with a bill about some ice fishing up in some small lake. How many know anything about ice fishing in a small lake? That takes up time. And other bills that are of a minor nature and the majority of the people in this Legislature know nothing about. Now either those things have got to be changed, or else we have to do something.

Now then my tentative suggestion for consideration is this, that we have annual sessions of say, for consideration, fifteen weeks. Fifteen weeks would mean that in the three months which business is very quiet, the poorest three months in the year in the State of Maine are January, February and March. And fifteen weeks would approximately take you to April 15th, and then those things could be split up along the lines that Mr. Jalbert suggests. And

along the line the gentleman from South Portland suggests, I myself started in the 102nd and went into a certain department that I was very much interested in knowing how it was conducted and what it cost the taxpayers of this State. I went into this particular department about quarter past one and a gentleman that was - - the top man and was out and the gentleman second in command was there and oh, he received me very graciously, sat down at the desk before me and offered me cigarettes, offered to send out for coffee for me and a few things of that nature. I finally asked him that I'd like to have the amounts of money appropriated for his department for the last four biennials and how that money was used. I said first, give me the amount of money that was appropriated, and how much of it was spent, and the details I'll get later. Oh, he said, this would take some time. Well, I thought to myself, some time, I said, sometime I thought he'd tell me to come back later in the afternoon, tomorrow, he was going to be busy. Oh, he said about a week or ten days. Well, that kind of got under my skin and the aggressive emotional temperament of mine came to the surface. So I pointed at the gentleman, and I said, look here, if I don't have those figures in fifteen minutes, it's going to be embarrassing for somebody and that somebody is going to be you. There were two sitting over on the side, smoking nice cigars, and seemingly having plenty of time and I judged they were not talking about State business. So he immediately called one of them over and I had what I asked for, he pulled them out of his desk, and I had them in eight minutes. Now that's what you have to contend with, and about the same thing happened in another department.

Now I was also interested in the last session in going up to some of these departments and particularly those two. It is my considered judgment that one person could do the work of at least 50% that was in those departments, 50% of them I could have one do what two of them are doing. In my opin-

ion, if this State business was operated on a businesslike basis, which it is not, and if the members of this Legislature would operate their own businesses, their own personal affairs, the way the business of this State is operated, I believe about three quarters of them would be bankrupt. And the way the taxpayers' money of this State is handled, why I get the impression that it grows on trees. So again, I reiterate that suggestion that they should have yearly sessions based on about fifteen weeks each session. And incidentally, I hope before this Legislature is over, I'll have a little more to say about the inefficiency and uneconomical way the business of the taxpayers of the State of Maine are conducted. Thank you.

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 think it's been very well pointed this morning the need and the justification for annual sessions. Certainly not too many years ago the modes of transportation in our State was quite a bit different than it is today. I can remember a gentleman from my area of the State which was considered the most traveled legislator in the State, had to leave Sunday afternoon to be down here and would only be going back home once a month because the trains did not operate on Sunday and therefore, was staying in Augusta. Even then, the length of the session was sometimes in March, when they met with adjournment. So today with the complexity of State Government and its operation and expenditures, it is my feeling, my very sincere feeling that some economy could be provided in our form of government by meeting annually with some limited length of sessions.

Now I think probably you'll find this more and more as you go along when the Members of this Branch and possibly the other Branch, are not in attendance, because they either have to tend to their business, or planting their crops or other matters that have to be taken care of early in the

spring. So by having annual sessions, we would possibly have better attendance, we'd have a more economical form of government, by having a closer check on the appropriations and the expenditures, and also that the modes of transportation now are such that in a matter of hours these members can be back in their seats. And for a shorter period of time, I think probably this would be quite an asset to all the members of this House, and the Senate, or the other Body, and also to the benefit of our people. I don't think that there's too many in this House this morning that like to see us sit here in this House from the first Wednesday in January 'till the end of June. So certainly we're hoping that by bringing annual sessions forward that it would cut down on the length of the session and better economy in government.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I rise only to request a roll call.

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

Mr. SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I'd like to give one more or two thoughts here. Since I've been up here this time I made a little personal poll. In the poll that I made I think there were three Republicans for one Democrat, and the question I asked these members of the Legislature was this: Do you believe that we could have a little more efficiency in State Government which would result in at least a slight bit more economy? There wasn't one I talked with that didn't agree to that. But I'd like to see that go through in action, not giving lip service to things, and then doing, not just sitting quietly and doing nothing about it. That's why I believe we should have annual sessions. Now it unquestionably would cost a little more but the amounts you would save otherwise would double, triple, quadruple the additional amount it would cost us. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tem: For the Chair to order a roll call it must

have the expressed desire of one-fifth of the members present. All those desiring a roll call will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair will open the vote.

A vote of the House was taken, and more than one fifth of the members present having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, to accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report on Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Providing for Annual Legislative Sessions, Senate Paper 90, Legislative Document 171. All those in favor of accepting the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair will open the vote.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA — Allen, Baker, E. B.; Baker, R. E.; Benson, Berman, Birt, Bragdon, Buck, Bunker, Carrier, Cookson, Crockett, Crosby, Cushing, Dennett, Dickinson, Drummond, Dudley, Dunn, Durgin, Edwards, Evans, Farrington, Fuller, Hall, Hanson, B. B.; Hanson, H. L.; Hanson, P. K.; Harnois, Henley, Hodgkins, Hoover, Humphrey, Immonen, Jewell, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Littlefield, McMann, McNally, Meisner, Miliano, Mosher, Pendergast, Philbrook, Pike, Porter, Prince, Quinn, Richardson, G. A.; Richardson, H. L.; Rideout, Robertson, Robinson, Sahagian, Scott, C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Snow, P. J.; Susi, Thompson, Trask, Truman, Watts, White, Williams.

NAY — Bedard, Belanger, Beliveau, Binnette, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Brown, Burnham, Carswell, Champagne, Conley, Cote, Cottrell, Crommett, Curran, D'Alfonso, Danton, Darey, Drigotas, Eustis, Ewer, Fecteau, Foster, Fraser, Gaudreau, Gauthier, Gill, Harriman, Hawes, Haynes, Healy, Hennessey, Hewes, Hichens, Hinds, Huber, Hunter, Jalbert, Jameson, Keyte, Kilroy, Kyes, Lebel, Levesque, Lowery, Lyette, Maddox, Martin, Minkowsky, Nadeau, J. F. R.; Nadeau, N. L.; Quimby, Rocheleau, Roy, Sawyer, Scribner,

Shute, Starbird, Sullivan, Tanguay, Townsend, Wheeler, Wood.

ABSENT — Bernard, Bradstreet, Brennan, Carey, Carroll, Clark, Cornell, Couture, Fortier, Giroux, Harvey, Jannelle, Noyes, Payson, Rackliff, Ross, Snowe, P.; Soulas, Waltz, Wight.

Yes, 67; No, 63; Absent, 20.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Sixty-seven having voted in the affirmative and sixty-three having voted in the negative, the motion does prevail.

Sent up for concurrence.

At this point, Speaker Kennedy returned to the rostrum.

SPEAKER KENNEDY: The Chair thanks the gentleman for his services. He did an excellent job and I would also say particularly so because this is the first time that Mr. Brennan has presided over this body, and I think it was exceptional the way he handled himself.

Thereupon, the Sergeant-at-Arms escorted the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Brennan, to his seat on the Floor, amid applause of the House, and Speaker Kennedy resumed the Chair.

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

An Act to Clarify the Meaning of a Labor Dispute Under Employment Security Law (H. P. 322) (L. D. 456)

Tabled — May 15, by Mr. Drummond of Sidney.

Pending — Passage to be enacted.

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

Mr. McNALLY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is an act to clarify the meaning of a labor dispute under employment security law and I wish to inform the House what the meaning of this act is and what it will do. Now under the existing section 1193 in subsection 4 which deals with the conditions that will disqualify an individual for benefits as the re-

sult of stoppage of work, it says that an employee is not eligible for unemployment compensation if his unemployment is caused by a labor dispute unless it can be shown that he is not participating in or financing or directly interested in the labor dispute which caused the stoppage of work. Then it goes on with other conditions, but they are not relevant to this particular bill. Now presently the law you have does not define a labor dispute, and so far up until now there has been a broad interpretation used which I will give you an example, being a contractor. Supposing I had a job here in Augusta and some Union that was interested in my job voted to strike and threw up a picket line. The people who would not cross the picket line and honored the picket line would not be eligible to receive any unemployment compensation because they would be participating. Now suppose also that the same Union decided they would throw up a legal picket line which would be an informational one on the job say Stewart & Williams has, and so the Union members so chose on the Stewart and Williams crew that they didn't care to go to work by those informational pickets, so they stayed home. Well, according to the present law they could not receive unemployment, but once you enact this law, then those people if they honored the informational picket line, they could immediately go and sign up for unemployment and be paid.

Now we had a very concrete instance only a few months ago over in Bangor where a contractor was picketed and also an informational picket line was thrown up where over a hundred men honored it and in that case the State of Maine would have been paying out approximately \$4500 a week out of the unemployment rolls. Now I wish to call attention of the members of the House that nobody pays the unemployment as far as — the employees themselves do not pay any unemployment is what I wish to say, but the employer does pay unemployment and then there is

monies made up from the Federal Government and so on, so that in case that this law was passed, the drain would be much greater on the Unemployment Commission and would probably have to have its percentage raised as to what employers would pay, and because of this fact, I wish to move that this bill be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. McNally, now moves that item 2, L. D. 456 be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. EWER: Mr. Speaker, while I agree with some things that have been said in regard to this bill, I do not agree with the complete premise of the gentleman from Ellsworth.

The facts of the matter are these, that we receive certain Federal Funds to go with what is contributed locally for our unemployment security law. This bill, L. D. 456 is simply the definition of a labor dispute clarifying that in our present set-up. The language is that used in the Norris-LaGuardia Act and the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Taft-Hartley Act and the Landrum-Griffith Act. It puts us in complete accord with the Federal regulations, and there has been some legal question that we might not be able to keep getting the Federal support if we do not adopt the Federal definition of a labor dispute. For that reason, I hope that this matter does not receive the indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sidney, Mr. Drummond.

Mr. DRUMMOND: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Ewer, a question through the Chair. I felt that under this L. D. that under certain conditions people who were on strike could draw unemployment benefits. If I am wrong, I wish Mr. Ewer would correct me.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Sidney, Mr. Drummond, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from

Bangor, Mr. Ewer, who may answer if he so chooses. The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. EWER: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question, I can only say what I have been told in regard to this, that this does not change the eligibility of anybody in one way or another. This simply defines the term labor dispute.

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

Mr. DURGIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I suspect very strongly that this bill does hit the fringes of a secondary boycott and I would suggest that you go along with the motion for indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. McNally, that "An Act to Clarify the Meaning of a Labor Dispute Under Employment Security Law," H. P. 322, L. D. 456 be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of indefinite postponement will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

69 having voted in the affirmative and 44 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail. Sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Hanson of Solon was granted unanimous consent to briefly address the House.

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker and Fellow Members of the Legislature: Yesterday afternoon this body took precipitous action and voted to indefinitely postpone L. D. 487 which would grant representation on the Maine Milk Commission to those Maine dairymen shipping milk to the Boston Federal Order. This action was taken late in the day after 5:00 p.m. and after a hard, long session with only slightly more than one-half of the membership present and voting. This action causes me personally more concern than any other action of this House. Other so-called milk bills resulted in majority ought not to pass re-

ports, and one was pre-conditioned to expect defeat.

This proposal however, had had a very thorough hearing and even two members of our committee who as Maine shippers had been unalterably opposed to the other legislation were impressed enough with the need and fairness of this measure to sign a unanimous ought to pass report. How then, with the unanimous ought to pass report, and after surviving two former presentations on the Floor of the House could this measure be lost? One legislator, who by his own statement, is a black sheep of the Boston market producers indicated that in his opinion there was not sufficient reason to justify the addition of a member. He indicated that his figures showed only a .003 decrease in the Boston market because of the activity of the Maine market. I have been unable to ascertain the accuracy of his figures, though my own indicate that the depressing effect of the Maine market activity costs the Boston market producer 6c per hundredweight, plus the loss of at least three 20c per hundredweight price increases due to the supply-demand factor in the Boston market pricing formula; loss of at least one of these increases resulted from a factor of only .001; compare that to his factor of .003. Each and every one of these price increase losses has cost the dairymen shipping to the Boston market about \$120,000 each three months quarter. This is also a serious loss to the Maine economy. I believe this qualifies as more than a minor inconvenience to the Boston producers.

A point that should be made is that any activity of the Maine Milk Commission which affects the Boston market, affects 671 Maine dairymen or forty percent of the total industry. These people are deserving of recognition and should not be relegated to the role of second class citizens. As former Senator Ralph Hilton testified at the hearing, if these people had a different colored skin, something would soon be done.

In summary, let me reiterate: One, this proposal would not re-

quire any additional funds either public or private. A tax on the milk from the Boston market currently contributes considerable to the support of the Maine Milk Commission. Two, the two markets are becoming more and more interdependent. Three, certainly one member representing the dairymen shipping to the Boston market would not be able to control the Commission, but he would be able to present the views and interests of those dairymen for the Commission's consideration. Being reasonable and fair-minded people, they would at least consider the effect on the Boston market producers of any rules or regulations they might promulgate. I believe we should at least allow these dairymen that right. Four, historically, in the more than thirty years of the Maine Milk Commission there has never been a member who was a Maine dairyman selling on the Boston market. Their needs and interests should be represented and I would point out that even the dairymen selling on the Maine market do not see in this measure any threat or cost to themselves. Mr. Speaker, might I ask if a motion to reconsider would be in order? Or should I ask if the bill is in possession of the House?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that the bill is not in the possession of the House.

Mr. HANSON: Is there any recourse, is there any action that could be taken?

The SPEAKER: This depends on the action of the other body.

Mr. HANSON: Thank you.

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

Bill "An Act Creating the Short Form Deeds Act" (S. P. 537) (L. D. 1442) (In Senate, passed to be engrossed)

Tabled—May 15, by Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed. (House Amendment "A" (H-252))

On motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland, retabled pending pas-

sage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Friday, May 19.

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

Bill "An Act Creating the Maine Higher Education Loan Authority Act" (S. P. 59) (L. D. 72)

Tabled—May 15, by Mr. Richardson of Cumberland.

Pending—Passage to be enacted.

On Motion of Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor, retabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for Friday, May 19.

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

HOUSE MAJORITY REPORT (8)—Ought to pass with Committee Amendment "A" (H-291)—Committee on Business Legislation on Bill "An Act Revising the Credit Union Law" (H. P. 963) (L. D. 1406) — MINORITY REPORT (2) — Ought Not to Pass.

Tabled—May 15, by Mr. Hewes of Cape Elizabeth.

Pending—Motion of Mr. Scott of Wilton to accept Majority Report.

On motion of Mr. Dennett of Kittery, retabled pending the motion of Mr. Scott of Wilton to accept the Majority Report and specially assigned for tomorrow.

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

An Act relating to Wages Paid for Benefits and Eligibility Under Employment Security Law (H. P. 515) (L. D. 728)

Tabled—May 15, by Mr. Durgin of Raymond.

Pending—Passage to be enacted.

On motion of Mr. Durgin of Raymond, the House voted to suspend the rules and to reconsider its action of May 4 whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed.

Mr. Durgin of Raymond then offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 515, L. D. 728, Bill, "An Act Relating to Wages Paid for Bene-

fits and Eligibility Under Employment Security Law.”

Amend said Bill by inserting after the enacting clause, the following section:

‘Sec. 1. R. S., T. 26, § 1082, sub-§ 13, repealed and replaced. Sub-section 13 of section 1082 of Title 26 of the Revised Statutes is repealed and the following enacted in place thereof:

**13. Filing payroll reports; penalty.** Every employing unit shall furnish the commission or its authorized representative, upon request, and in accordance with the form prescribed by the commission, quarterly payroll information applicable to any present or former employee who files a request for determination of his insured status. Such reports of base period wages will be due within 10 days of the date the request is mailed by the commission or its duly authorized agent and the failure on the part of any employing unit to file the payroll information within said time shall render the employing unit liable to a penalty of \$10, unless the delay was occasioned by the illness of the person in charge of records of the employing unit or by other unavoidable incident which shall excuse the employing unit from said penalty. In addition any employing unit which has received and failed to respond timely to 3 successive requests without justifiable excuse shall furnish the commission a payroll report for each quarter showing the name of each person employed by such employing unit at any time during the quarter, his social security account number and the total wages paid to him, except that the amount of wages in excess of \$4,000 per quarter need not be reported.’

Further amend said Bill by re-numbering sections 1 and 2 to be sections 2 and 3.

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

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

Bill “An Act Creating a State Employees’ Suggestion Awards Board” (S. P. 643) (L. D. 1648)

Tabled—May 16, by Mr. Bragdon of Perham.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

On motion of Mr. Bragdon of Perham, retabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Thursday, May 18.

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

HOUSE REPORT—Ought Not to Pass—Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill “An Act Clarifying the Location of Town Line Between China and Winslow” (H. P. 1118) (L. D. 1595)

Tabled—May 16, by Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor.

Pending—Acceptance.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from China, Mr. Farrington.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Because of new evidence and because I believe I have done my homework in contacting several members of this Committee, and because I think there may be some change in the decisions as to the report, I now move this matter be recommitted to the Joint Committee on Legal Affairs.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from China, Mr. Farrington, now moves that the Report and Bill be recommitted to the Committee on Legal Affairs. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed. Sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the matter tabled earlier in today’s session and assigned for later in today’s session:

Bill “An Act Providing an Education Loan Fund for the Higher Education of Teachers,” (H. P. 626) (L. D. 882)

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

Mr. DANTON: Mr. Speaker, as this matter was tabled as the result of an inquiry that I made through the Chair, the gracious lady from

Lebanon, Mrs. Hanson, and the gentleman from Kennebunkport, Mr. Pendergast, have provided me with the information that I was curious about, and I am content to allow this matter to continue.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt.

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, I would inquire if House Paper 1015, L. D. 1522 is in the possession of the House.

The SPEAKER: The answer is in the affirmative.

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, I would move that we reconsider our action of yesterday whereby we receded and concurred with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from East Millinocket Mr. Birt, now moves that the House reconsider its action whereby the House receded and concurred with the Senate, and the Bill is 1522, "An Act Providing for Pensions for Widows of Former Governors." The House receded and concurred as of yesterday and the gentleman from East Millinocket now moves that the House reconsider its action of yesterday whereby it receded and concurred. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, I now move that we recede from our former action.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to reconsider its action whereby it receded and concurred?

(Cries of "No")

The gentleman may debate his reconsideration motion.

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House: This particular bill has been the subject of quite some discussion and there is a good deal of interest on it, and if I am allowed to initiate the action which I have requested, I would then present an amendment which has in there an annual income maximum amount and also a small pension for governors' widows where there is a need factor. Now there are, I think some governors' widows in the state at the

present time who to a small pension would certainly be worthy. These very honorable ladies have at one time or another been the First Lady of our State and it would certainly seem reasonable that if some assistance could be given to them that we have a responsibility to do so.

We, just a short while ago, passed a similar bill allowing pensions, and this was a rather generous pension, to widows of justices. Now I fully realize that members of the Superior and Supreme Courts have spent a good deal more time down through the years on their particular jobs than possibly the Governors have, but I also do believe that if anybody has been elected to the highest office in this State, and his wife has served honorably as First Lady of the State and caretaker of the Blaine House and performed the many services that are required socially in that office, that we would not be completely wrong, and I do feel that we almost have an obligation to provide something towards their livelihood, particularly when they are elderly and their income may not be as high as what it might be to require them to live in the status that we would expect them to live, and I would ask for a division upon this motion.

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

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to support the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt, in his motion, and I hope the House will see fit to go along with him.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hollis, Mr. Harriman.

Mr. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question from anyone who may answer, as possibly I do not have all the amendments, but it occurred to me that the original bill reads for \$5,000, and if there is no amendments this would bring it down to \$2,000 unless the widow discloses that she had an income of less than five, is that correct?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Hollis, Mr. Harriman, poses a question through the Chair to any member who may answer if they choose.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from East Millinocket Mr. Birt.

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, to answer that question, that would be the intent of it today, if they had an income of below \$5,000 then the state would grant them the \$2,000 annual income. That amendment, for your information at the present time, it is the only amendment presently on the bill to my knowledge, and would be under Filing No. H-314.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It didn't seem to me that the explanation was just as I recall the bill. I think that the bill as originally written would provide a pension of \$5,000 for widows, and this would mean widows of all governors. I believe under that bill an appropriation of some \$40,000 annually would have had to have been provided. It did come out of the Appropriations Committee unanimous "Ought not to pass" and it did not come out with any amendment. I believe it's before you now as it originally appeared before the Committee.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hollis, Mr. Harriman.

Mr. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think we owe the widows of our governors the right to live out their old age in dignity. I think if we are going to give them anything, we should give them \$5,000 a year. I think they should all get it. I don't think that anyone should have to disclose their financial condition, and I think \$2,000 in this day and age is an insult.

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

Mr. McMANN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I concur with Mr. Harriman one hundred percent. In this day and age

what is \$7,000? Some people can laugh, but on the other hand, \$7,000 this day and age living, the way they have been used to living is nothing, and I agree with Mr. Harriman one hundred percent that they should get \$5,000 and not disclose anything. Let's let them live in peace.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: How much does this present bill give the widows?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Sullivan, poses a question through the Chair to any member who may answer if they choose.

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

Mr. QUINN: The bill proper, as written, would give them \$5,000 a year.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I like to see everybody taken care of—that's fine, but, when one of these gentlemen get up here and say that under the present day and age that \$7,000 amounts to nothing, how many widows in this state do you think have an income of \$7,000? I don't believe ten percent of them have, and probably less. So I believe that that should be changed and we should reconsider on the basis the gentleman, I forget what his name is — here in front. I'm for reconsideration.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland Mr. Scribner.

Mr. SCRIBNER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There are a couple of items which I would like to bring to the attention of the ladies and gentlemen of the House regarding this L. D. I'd like to point out first of all that the Governor for example is not a full time career position, and we've had one Governor who served one day — I assume his widow would qualify. The average Governor — well he cannot serve more than eight years at the pres-

ent time. We may have governors that have served four years; the pension I believe should be predicated to a small degree based on this particular factor.

Also, many of our governors, some of the governors anyway, have been fairly wealthy men. I don't believe that if a widow has a substantial retirement income from her husband's estate, and in this day of Social Security and other items, the Governor — as I said it is not a full time career position. He made his mark in some business or profession, and it is assumed that he at least tried to do something and to leave some sort of an estate for his widow.

Now, the bill as is drawn I believe there should be some provision for needy widows, but I don't believe we have to go a great deal beyond that and pay a substantial pension to every widow of every governor with no restriction whatsoever. I think we should look out for the taxpayer to a small degree in this type of a bill.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I support the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Birt, in his effort to reconsider. I support the amendment which he offers. I commend him for trying to save this Legislature from an act of ingratitude.

There are only six widows involved here at the present time. I am very much impressed with those who said that the First Lady of Maine, who perhaps knows better than anyone else just what that job involves, should not be required to live under circumstances which to her are embarrassing.

Now as I understand, there are only a few of those; they are not here begging for anything. I regret very much that we have to ask that they do file a statement of income from all sources in order to keep this thing within reasonable limits. This I think is a reasonable compromise attempt. I sympathize with the desire of those

who say "let's give them \$5,000 right across the board regardless of their income," but I don't think our sense of economy would permit that.

I hope that you will go along with the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt, Thank you.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I'd like to direct a question through the Chair to the gentleman from East Millinocket if he'd care to answer. I would like to know if he would have any objection to adding to his amendment the widows of the legislators?

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt.

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, I think that probably I would. I think there are really some serious, honest factors that enter into a former First Lady. I think that the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, has covered some of these very amply. I do feel that these ladies are faced with additional expenses that possibly my own wife if she were in a similar position would not be faced with. She has a social position to maintain, she has social correspondence to maintain, even to governors who have been out of office for a good many years. I think that they have given a good deal of their time to the State even in short time they might have been in office, and with the need factor in there I personally, sincerely believe that there is a responsibility of this Legislature to attempt to do something.

To answer one other question, I think the good gentleman from Portland, Mr. Scribner, made some comment about one of the governors serving a very short term. In answer to that, if I'm not mistaken, he somehow managed to duck getting up before the altar and is a bachelor, so I don't think we would be faced with any problem in his situation.

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

Mr. LYCETTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As I said yesterday, my IQ is rather low and my hearing is not too keen. I'm confused—I thought that the original bill called for \$5,000. Despite the fact that a whole lot of us are living on less than \$5,000, I'd go along with that—but I'm confused because I understood someone to say—use the figure \$7,000, and I'd like to know what the answer to that is.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Lycette, poses a question through the Chair to any member who may answer if they choose.

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This morning I think is the first morning that some of us have seen or knew of this amendment, and I was looking at this amendment from a rather legal point of view and a technical point of view. It seems to me that if one of these ladies had an income of \$4,999 she would get \$2,000 from the state. If she had an income over \$5,000 she would get nothing. Now I would assume that these people are very intelligent people, and it would seem to me that if an estate planner were looking over a situation such as this and said now — look you have an income somewhat in excess of \$5,000—now all you have to do is to give your children or your grandchildren, a friend of yours, this income and that you in turn by having an income of less than \$5,000 would get \$2,000 from the State of Maine as long as you live.

No provision, as I understand it, is put into this amendment to prevent this sort of thing. Now if people are worthy and needy I see no reason why they shouldn't have the money, but there is no safeguards as I see it in the amendment, and I would like to ask the gentleman from East Millinocket who prepared this amendment why no such safeguards have been put in.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, only one comment, and that in regard to the remarks of the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt.

With regard to the fact that at least one Governor never has been to the altar, I would assume from his remarks that he must possess a crystal ball. He apparently assumes that this will not happen, but I don't know how we should get into that area—I would comment that this could happen and that this could be a very young and a very vigorous lady who might be a widow for a long time and that we would be imposing this on the state for years to come.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from York, Mrs. Fuller.

Mrs. FULLER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, this is going to be kind of an anti-climax. I strongly favor the bill, but I would like to ask a question. Does this pension continue if a widow remarries — thinking of Mr. Bragdon's young widow?

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from York, Mrs. Fuller, poses a question through the Chair to anyone who may answer if they choose.

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

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, the bill right now is in the course of reconsideration before anything can be done on it, and Mrs. Fuller has a good point which might be the grounds for another amendment, but until the bill is back on the floor, we can't amend it at all, so if we recede from our former position and get the bill back on the Floor, then the bill will be subject to the necessary amendments to make it in the form that the House desires.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The name of a gentleman that knows all has been withheld from this conversation, although some of us know who the very fine gentleman is —

he's a very dear friend of mine and I know a very dear friend of many of us who know him. And knowing the gentleman as I know him, make no mistake about it, even now the slide rule is out and he's figuring out a way out of the dilemma that Mr. Bragdon thinks he's in!

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

Mr. SCRIBNER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to make two comments, first of all regarding Mr. Berman, who must be a competent state planner. I believe he raises some very real questions regarding this, and I have one question that I'd like to pose to the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Birt. I realize the amendment strikes out everything after the enacting clause and it doesn't provide for any appropriation. I would hope we would discuss—possibly it might need to be further amended. I would support this in principle and we've had lengthy discussions on it in the executive sessions of the Appropriations and Financial Affairs Committee, but I do feel that in its present form perhaps it might have to be changed slightly and the discussion of the other members of the House it might make this possible to come up with something a little more acceptable; but could the gentleman, Mr. Birt, answer the question regarding the appropriation?

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt, who is answering a question of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Scribner.

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: If the action that I have proposed, or the motion that I have proposed, is given favorable consideration and this amendment is adopted, then I will attempt to work out with the very good gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, and Mr. Scribner a suitable amendment to the amendment that is being proposed to take care of all of the necessary legalities that might be necessary to make this thing workable.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt, that the House reconsider its action of yesterday whereby it receded and concurred in accepting the "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on House Paper 1050, L. D. 1522, Bill "An Act Providing for Pensions for Widows of Former Governors." All those in favor of reconsideration will vote yes, those opposed will vote no, and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

112 having voted in the affirmative and 16 having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt.

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede from our former action where the committee report was accepted.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt, now moves that the House recede from its former action. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The Motion prevailed.

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, I now move that we substitute the bill for the report.

Thereupon, the Bill was substituted for the Report and read twice.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt.

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, because of a suggestion or recommendation that this amendment be redrawn up and encompass all of the action that is necessary I would now move that this bill be passed with its second reading and I will submit the amendment—

The SPEAKER: What time does the House assign for the third reading of the bill? At the beginning of the next legislative day.

On the part of the House, the Speaker appointed the following Conferees on the disagreeing ac-

tion of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act Relative to Mental Illness as Grounds for Divorce," House Paper 319 Legislative Document 453:

Messrs. QUINN of Bangor  
BELIVEAU of Rumford

MEISNER  
of Dover-Foxcroft

On motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland,

Adjourned until nine-thirty o'clock tomorrow morning.