

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

Friday, June 9, 1967

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Allen Short of Augusta.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

Papers from the Senate

From the Senate: The following Joint Resolution:

WHEREAS, the interest in having attractive communities is reflected by the increasing community improvement and beautification throughout the State; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Appleton, through a group of civic minded women, has formed the Appleton Improvement Committee for this purpose; and

WHEREAS, the committee with the support of the townspeople have made substantial progress in the beautification of the Town of Appleton; and

WHEREAS, this public spirited community will receive the Keep Maine Scenic Trophy and cash award for 1966; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Senate and House of Representatives of the 103rd Legislature extend their congratulations to the Appleton Improvement Committee and the citizens of the Town of Appleton for having attained the outstanding achievement; and be it further

RESOLVED: That a copy of this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be immediately transmitted by the Secretary of State to the Appleton Improvement Committee and the proper town officials. (S. P. 674)

Came from the Senate read and adopted.

In the House, the Resolution was read and adopted in concurrence.

**Reports of Committees
Leave to Withdraw**

Report of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill, "An Act relating to Exemptions of Insurance Benefits from Claims of Cred-

itors" (S. P. 379) (L. D. 992) reporting Leave to Withdraw.

Report of the Committee on State Government reporting same on Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Provide for Direct Initiative to Amend the Constitution (S. P. 512) (L. D. 1225)

Came from the Senate read and accepted

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

Covered by Other Legislation

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Application of State Aid for School Construction" (S. P. 152) (L. D. 324) reporting Leave to Withdraw, as covered by other legislation.

Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting same on Bill "An Act Revising the Laws Relating to Disclosures of Debtors" (S. P. 190) (L. D. 425)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House Reports were read and accepted in concurrence.

**Ought to Pass with
Committee Amendment**

Report of the Committee on Business Legislation on Bill "An Act Reducing Maximum Amount and Duration of Small Loans and Establishing Equitable Rates for Small Loan Agencies" (S. P. 373) (L. D. 986) 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".

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence and the Bill read twice. Committee Amendment "A" was read by the Clerk and adopted in concurrence, and tomorrow assigned for third reading of the Bill.

Final Report

Final Report of the following Joint Standing Committee:

Liquor Control

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Election Laws on Bill "An Act relating to Recount and Other Election Procedures and Changing the Primary Election Date" (S. P. 649) (L. D. 1657) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. BERRY of Cumberland
COUTURIER
of Androscoggin
— of the Senate.
Mrs. BOUDREAU of Portland
Messrs. HAWES of Union
HENLEY of Norway
BOURGOIN of Fort Kent
BERNARD of Auburn
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. ANDERSON of Hancock
— of the Senate.
Messrs. HODGKINS of Greene
JANNELLE
of Scarborough
— of the House.

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

In the House: Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Union, Mr. Hawes.

Mr. HAWES: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move we accept the Majority Committee Report "Ought to pass."

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley.

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This morning I stand before you and ask you to please go along and oppose the motion to accept this report. I am astonished at the report; as

a matter of fact I attended the meeting. There were three proponents to the bill—something like a hundred, I didn't count them, but very close to a hundred people opposed it—there were three people for it and one spoke for it. The Secretary of State was careful to say that he was for or against it. I don't mind telling you that I was one of those of approximately a hundred people that opposed the bill. I too would like to see the date shortened, but this is a package deal and in the package you must accept this—that the Town Clerk in each town must count the recounts. Now let me point out this—this sounds good and it would work fine in the cities, but I represent eight towns, when Representative Starbird from Kingman represents some eighteen towns—seventeen or eighteen towns, in the county and these plantations.

These town clerks in these small towns are a part-time proposition. They work in mills up in our county either Millinocket or Old Town or Lincoln, and unfortunately they work shift work three to eleven, eleven to seven, seven to three, and they're very hard people to get hold of.

Now let me tell you that these are the same people that help make the original count, and it's just human nature—people don't like to change their minds and admit they made mistakes. Let me point out to you that not very long ago we had a referendum on the liquor question, and that these town clerks in my opinion in some places didn't do a very good job counting them. I don't think these same people should count recounts. But my biggest objection is how you're going to get this crowd together, and do it in the length of time that is set forth in the law? No provision is made to pay these town clerks. The town meetings, we can't raise extra money in a town after we've had a town meeting, you can't have another town meeting to raise money—and most of you people know that, so there's no provision made to pay these town clerks. Are we going to under this day and age expect people to do this

recount for nothing? They don't do it that way nowadays—everybody expects pay.

I think it's unreasonable in view of the fact that so many people opposed this bill—it was the most ridiculous thing I have seen to come out with a report, in my opinion, seven to three. "Ought to pass." I hope eventually we accept the "Ought not to pass" Report, and I'm not going to bore you with a lot of conversation, because I think you can well remember the liquor referendum and you must understand how—this particular man from Kingman, it's two weeks now before he can find out if he's elected in the House or not, just to find out if he was elected or not—chasing around these town clerks in these small towns to find out what the count was in his district, and it takes up to two weeks just to find out if he's elected or not. I just can't imagine how we'd ever get a recount in these small towns and these hamlets and plantations and what have you, and this is the very thing that we would be doing. Thank you.

(On motion of Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor, tabled pending the motion of Mr. Hawes of Union that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report and specially assigned for Tuesday, June 13.)

Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Revising the Laws Relating to Arson" (S. P. 301) (L. D. 740) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 675) (L. D. 1705) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. HILDRETH
 of Cumberland
HARDING of Aroostook
MILLS of Franklin
 — of the Senate.
Messrs. HEWES of Cape Elizabeth
DAREY
 of Livermore Falls
FOSTER
 of Mechanic Falls

QUINN of Bangor
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. BRENNAN of Portland
BERMAN of Houlton
DANTON
 of Old Orchard Beach
 — of the House

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed.

In the House: Reports were read.

(On motion of Mr. Berman of Houlton, tabled pending acceptance of either Report and specially assigned for Tuesday, June 13.)

Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Report "A" of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Providing for Implied Consent Law for Operators of Motor Vehicles" (S. P. 11) (L. D. 17) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 670) (L. D. 1701) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. HARDING of Aroostook
MILLS of Franklin
HILDRETH
 of Cumberland
 — of the Senate.

Messrs. DAREY
 of Livermore Falls
HEWES of Cape Elizabeth
 — of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. BERMAN of Houlton
FOSTER
 of Mechanic Falls
DANTON
 of Old Orchard Beach
BRENNAN of Portland
QUINN of Bangor
 — of the House.

Came from the Senate with Report "A" accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed.

In the House: Reports were read. The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, I move that we accept Report "B" of the Committee in non-concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, moves that the House accept Report "B" or "Ought not to pass" in non-concurrence.

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that this matter lie upon the table for one legislative day pending acceptance of either Report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Berman, now moves that this matter be tabled and specially assigned for Monday, June 12, pending the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, that the House accept Report "B".

Mr. Gill of South Portland then requested a division.

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

For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. LEWIN of Augusta: To change the date of tabling, sir.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may debate the time of tabling.

Mr. LEWIN: To the 13th, sir.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lewin, now moves that this matter be tabled until Tuesday, June 13.

Mr. Gill of South Portland then requested a division.

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I stand here this morning—

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may not debate the tabling motion.

Mr. BERMAN: I do not intend to debate the tabling motion but I wish to speak with regard to the time.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BERMAN: Now, ladies and gentleman of the House, for the benefit of orderly procedure there are three controversial bills coming before the House —

The SPEAKER: Will the gentleman confine his remarks to the time.

Mr. BERMAN: I will, Mr. Speaker, I am only asking that this matter be tabled, as I have suggested, for the purpose of orderly procedure. Now if you want to go ahead and take these matters up right across the board that will be perfectly all right, but if you want to debate these things on the merit and give enough time for orderly presentation, I would appreciate you're going along with the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? A division has been requested on the matter of tabling until Tuesday, June 13, pending the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn that the House accept Report "B" "Ought not to pass." All of those in favor of tabling will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

74 having voted in the affirmative and 45 having voted in the negative, the motion to table did prevail.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on State Government reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Creating a Department of Transportation" (S. P. 562) (L. D. 1487)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WYMAN of Washington
LUND of Kennebec
— of the Senate.

Messrs. DENNETT of Kittery
WATTS of Machias
Mrs. CORNELL of Orono
Messrs. RIDEOUT of Manchester
PHILBROOK
of South Portland
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. STERN of Penobscot
— of the Senate.
Messrs. MARTIN OF Eagle Lake

STARBIRD

of Kingman Township
— of the House.

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted.

In the House: Reports were read.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move that this lie on the table under Monday, June 12, pending acceptance of either report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin now moves that item 11, L. D. 1487 be tabled and specially assigned for Monday, June 12, pending the acceptance of either report.

Mr. Richardson of Cumberland requested a division on the tabling motion.

The SPEAKER: A vote has been requested on the tabling motion. All those in favor of this matter being tabled until Monday, June 12 will vote yes, those opposed will vote no —

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I request to debate the time of my tabling motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may debate his time.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There's a hope that this bill could be tabled until which time material could be prepared and presented to you.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman is not really debating the time. We confine it to the time and the reason for the time.

Mr. MARTIN: The reason for the tabling is that we hope that some material will be ready. If the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, feels that this is not necessary, then I would hope that you would vote with him, if not I would hope that you would vote against the motion.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman is not confining his debate to the time.

All those in favor of this matter being tabled until Monday, June 12, pending acceptance of either report will vote yes, those opposed

will vote no, and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

55 having voted in the affirmative and 61 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Manchester, Mr. Rideout.

Mr. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I now move we accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Manchester, Mr. Rideout, now moves that we accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report in concurrence.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This morning I am certainly not prepared to debate the merits or demerits of this bill because I had hoped that the bill would have been tabled until Monday. I find that the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, feels that this is not necessary, because obviously his intent is to kill the bill.

As you well know, the Department of Transportation idea in concept was a portion of the Governor's program, and this is at this time all that I can say and want to say on the creation of the Department of Transportation. I find it unbelievable that the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, refuses the courtesy of my tabling this bill for one day.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This morning I think probably the Majority Floor Leader could very well extend this very small courtesy of tabling for one day, because of the importance of this document and the importance of all transportation in this State for the years to come. It's not an issue at this particular point that, unless the merits and the demerits of the bill can be pointed out, that the State of Maine and the transportation in all areas, in all fields, needs some looking into and some revision, and I think this is part of the Governor's program that

warrants and merits the attention of not only the Minority Party, but I think the Majority Party could very well be justified in looking into the areas—I think the Majority Party could well realize and well appreciate that there are some difficulties. And, we this morning, certainly could go into some of these difficulties of trying to combine some of these means of communication by our citizens and by the citizens of the rest of the country that are going to come into the State of Maine so as we could provide the best ways of communication between all means of transportation. So, I certainly hope that the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, would reconsider tabling this to Tuesday, June 13.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In support of the motion of the gentleman from Manchester, Mr. Rideout, this bill creates a Department of Transportation. It constitutes a radical departure from our present law; it creates a transportation czar. The bill was introduced in the Senate March 9, 1967.

I'm not singling this bill out. I voted against tabling the preceding matter. I would remind the Members of the House that this is June 9, and I would also remind the Members of the House that all members of the Committee on State Government are represented on the Majority and Minority Reports combined, and I think that the bill is in order for debate at this time and therefore I would ask that the debate proceed.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? All those in favor of accepting the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report in concurrence will vote yes, those opposed will vote no, and the Chair opens the vote.

Mr. Martin of Eagle Lake then requested a roll call.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All those desiring a roll call will vote

yes, those opposed will vote no, and the Chair opens 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: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Manchester, Mr. Rideout, that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report in concurrence. All those in favor of accepting the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report will vote yes, those opposed will vote no, and the Chair opens the vote.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Allen, Baker, E. B.; Baker, R. E.; Benson, Berman, Birt, Bragdon, Brown, Buck, Bunker, Clark, Cookson, Cornell, Crockett, Crosby, Cushing, Dickinson, Drummond, Dunn, Durgin, Evans, Ewer, Farrington, Fuller, Gill, Hall, Hanson, B. B.; Hanson, H. L.; Hanson, P. K.; Harriman, Hawes, Haynes, Henley, Hewes, Hichens, Hinds, Hodgkins, Hoover, Huber, Humphrey, Immonen, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Littlefield, Lycette, McMann, Meisner, Miliano, Mosher, Noyes, Philbrook, Pike, Porter, Prince, Quinn, Rackliff, Richardson, G. A.; Richardson, H. L.; Rideout, Robertson, Ross, Scott, C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Shute, Snow, P. J.; Snowe, P.; Soulas, Susi, Thompson, Trask, Waltz, Watts, White, Wight, Williams, Wood.

NAY — Bedard, Belanger, Beliveau, Bernard, Binnette, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Bradstreet, Brennan, Burnham, Carey, Carrier, Carroll, Carswell, Champagne, Conley, Cote, Cottrell, Crommett, Curran, D'Alfonso, Danton, Drigotas, Dudley, Eustis, Fecteau, Fortier, Fraser, Gaudreau, Gauthier, Giroux, Harnois, Harvey, Hennessey, Hunter, Jalbert, Keyte, Kilroy, Lebel, Levesque, Martin, Nadeau, J. F. R.; Nadeau, N. L.; Rocheleau, Roy, Sawyer, Scribner, Starbird, Truman, Wheeler.

ABSENT — Couture, Darey, Dennett, Edwards, Foster, Healy, Jameson, Jannelle, Jewell, Kyes, Maddox, McNally, Minkowsky,

Payson, Pendergast, Quimby, Robinson, Sahagian, Sullivan, Tanguay, Townsend.

Yes, 78; No, 50; Absent, 21.

The SPEAKER: Seventy-eight having voted in the affirmative and fifty in the negative, the motion to accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report in concurrence does prevail.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may pose his inquiry.

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker, is a motion to table in order after a motion has been made to accept Report "A" or Report "B"?

The SPEAKER: Indeed it is.

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker, before this vote was made I had requested that this be tabled until June 13.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that he debated his tabling motion.

The Clerk will proceed.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Creating County Commissioner Districts" (H. P. 457) (L. D. 631) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendments "A" and "B" in the House on May 3.

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

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Denmark, Mr. Dunn.

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

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Denmark, Mr. Dunn moves that the House recede from its former action and concur with the Senate.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird.

Mr. STARBIRD: Mr. Speaker, I move that this item be indefinitely

postponed, and I would speak briefly to the motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman, this being a non-concurrent matter the only motions that can be entertained would be to recede, concur, insist and adhere.

Mr. STARBIRD: Thank you.

The SPEAKER: Recede and concur has priority over all of the others.

Mr. STARBIRD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then I would ask that the House vote against Mr. Dunn's motion and I will state my reasons why.

This is a bill, as you know, to bring the so-called one man-one vote decision into the bill to the county level. Now, at this point in our history, the Supreme Court has taken no action as to regards districting or non-districting of officers at the county level to my knowledge. Our County Commissioners in the State of Maine are elected on a system of multi-district representation. In fact, although we have three Commissioners to each county elected at large, we only have one elected every two years, so the argument that you have one or two or three or four or more people before you and cannot make a reasonable decision among a large group of candidates does actually not hold in this particular case because in each election you only have two, one from each political party, or possibly three with an independent, no more or no less than you would have from a single member district.

In addition to this, several times, the Court has upheld multi-member districts where these occurred and where they did not feel that, in the case of state legislatures where they did not feel that this was — there was an undue disproportion in the population. In many places they have ordered multi-member districts to be created. So that I do not think that at any time in the future the Court would rule that Maine's County Commissioner system was unconstitutional. It has worked well throughout the years, no one has found any fault with it to my knowledge, with the exception of one

or two or three counties that have large cities and people claim that these commissioners are sometimes, too many of them are elected from the large cities.

This may have been true in the past but I do know that in my own County of Penobscot, at this time, and for several years now, there have been no Commissioners from Bangor which is the largest city in the County. And I think that this situation perhaps will continue to occur. I think that most people realize that there should be a fairly balanced representation throughout the County and I think in the future this will be taken care of by candidates coming from some of the outlying towns. I, myself, would personally have no objection to anybody coming from Bangor provided he was a good man for the job.

I don't think there is any reason to create or divide the counties into districts, any good valid reason, and therefore I hope again that you will go against Mr. Dunn's motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Denmark, Mr. Dunn.

Mr. DUNN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Mr. Dennett from Kittery is absent at this time and I know he was quite interested in this bill and would have quite a little bit to say on it and I would hope that someone would table this until the next legislative day.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I move that this bill be tabled until Tuesday, next.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, moves that L. D. 631 be tabled and specially assigned for Tuesday, June 13.

Mr. Conley of Portland then requested a division on the tabling motion.

The SPEAKER: All those in favor of this matter being tabled until Tuesday, June 13, will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken. 55 having voted in the affirma-

tive and 62 having voted in the negative, the motion to table did not prevail.

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

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, I move that this be tabled until Monday, June 12.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that a tabling motion just did fail, that it was for June 13, and the Chair cannot entertain a tabling motion that is earlier than June 13.

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I will try to be very brief on this matter since it was not allowed to be tabled until Mr. Dennett could be back. I rise to support my good friend the gentleman from Denmark, Mr. Dunn. I think it is only fair that we should write into the books a law that these County Commissioner Districts should exist. There are, at the present time, without being specific, some counties where some inequities do exist and have continued to exist because of what we might call political power plays.

Now, without again going into specifics, this act actually makes very sound political sense, that so long as we have county government—and I hope we do have it for a very long time to come in the State of Maine, each area of the county should be represented. That guarantee should be written into law and that is exactly and precisely what this bill proposes to do, and therefore I support Mr. Dunn's position on this very important matter.

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

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise to support the motion to recede and concur. I come from perhaps one of the more populated sections of the State and come from the more populated sections of Cumberland County, and to my knowledge, in recent past years, quite a few, our County Commissioners have always come from the greater Portland area, that is the area that I'm

from. From a selfish point of view I possibly should be opposed to this; however, I feel that there are parts of our county that have not had proper representation in county government. With the passage of this bill, this would ensure that all parts of Cumberland County receive their proper representation.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Norway, Mr. Henley.

Mr. HENLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to briefly also second the remarks of the previous speakers in favoring this bill. I cannot feel that it is harmful, there may be some small counties where it would not make much difference. The large counties, large in area, as a lot of us realize, have almost different industries and different needs in various parts of the county. I feel that in some of the larger counties, with over a hundred miles in length and breadth, that the various areas should be properly represented at the county level. I feel that it is no particular matter of the Federal Supreme Court on this, it's just good sense I feel. Of course we know of our own situations, I do know that in some counties there have been in the past, a gentlemen's agreement that certain sections would at various times produce a candidate, but gentlemen's agreements apparently in politics do not always stand up, and we have found that there are certain counties where there has developed a certain area where the most votes produce the most of our county commissioners, and if not a fair situation of representation of areas and people. So, I support Mr. Dunn of Denmark's motion that we recede and concur.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Coming from the area of Aroostook County which presently has all three members on the Board of County Commissioners, I suppose I should normally be in opposition to this bill; however, I look upon it as a very fair bill at present

and very fair for Aroostook County. The present Commissioners are all within an area of ten miles in a county that extends some 150 miles from one end to the other. If this bill is passed I am sure that it will assure to each area of the county in the future one member on the Board of County Commissioners, and I believe that this is in the interests of good government for the County. I concur in the wishes of the gentleman from Denmark, Mr. Dunn.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird.

Mr. STARBIRD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: You will remember, those of you who were here last session, that in my championing of reapportioning the Senate, I said that I favored it because we had to, not because I wanted to. Over the years nobody ever seriously questioned how the Maine Senate has been made up. Most everyone, I think, was fairly well satisfied with the setup. However, the Court ordered the change and although it had not specifically ordered Maine to change, Maine did, realizing what might happen. In this case I feel the same way. There has never been any great clamor for this thing to my knowledge, over the years, and I would like to pose a question of Mr. Dunn of Denmark. I would like to ask him, why there has never been any clamor for this thing until now? Why, all of a sudden, when the Court hasn't indicated that it has anything against the multi-member district, in many ways it has favored it. I would pose that question to him, through the Chair.

The SPEAKER: The gentlemen from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Denmark, Mr. Dunn, who may answer if he chooses.

The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. DUNN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think the answer to that question mainly is the emphasis that has been put on the one man-one vote concept the last few years. I believe this follows that policy right down the line. I think each one of you know

how this is going to affect your own county and in most cases there may be one or two cases where it will not be an improvement, but I believe presently all counties will have better representation by this method.

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

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to add one thought to the question of Mr. Starbird. I would like just one time to see the Legislature do something that is a progressive movement to represent the people of the State without the Court coming to us and saying you have got to do it or we're going to do it, and this is our opportunity.

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

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion about whether cases of this type have ever been before the Federal Supreme Court. There were two cases of a somewhat similar nature but not exactly this type before the Supreme Court within the last three months. At that time the Supreme Court decided not to act on them but the comments that were made by commentators who covered the cases said that the thinking appeared to be that when a clear cut case was presented to the Federal Supreme Court on an apportionment of county officers that followed completely to the lines of one man-one vote situation that it would be very likely that the Supreme Court at that time would take action on a situation of this type.

Mr. Starbird of Kingman Township was granted permission to speak a third time.

Mr. STARBIRD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is my understanding in the cases that Mr. Birt presents and has spoken about that they were not dealing with multi-member districts as such. I should like to remind the House that in the case of the Illinois Legislature two years ago the Court when they found that the House was malapportioned ordered that the Legislature of that year be elected at large throughout the

entire State. The Court has ruled many Houses, many Senates that were elected on an at large or multi-member district system to be constitutional. I have, although I have not right in my hands now, a statement by Chief Justice Warren that this device could be used to promote differences between two Houses of the Legislature, so if this is true in the case of the Legislature, there is no reason in the world why it should not be used on the county level.

Now I might also remind the members of this House that if my memory serves me correct, the committee report on this was a majority ought not to pass. I forget the exact figures, but I think it was something in the line of six to four or seven to three and it was not divided on party lines either if I remember rightly.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Denmark, Mr. Dunn, that the House recede from its former action and concur with the Senate on Bill "An Act Creating County Commissioner Districts," House Paper 457, L. D. 631. All those in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

79 having voted in the affirmative and 47 having voted in the negative, the motion to recede and concur did prevail.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, before any further motions are made, the gentleman from Kingman Township made a comment a few moments ago that the vote was not decided in committee—

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, requests unanimous consent to briefly address the House. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I thought that the matter was before us. The gentleman from Kingman Township stated that the Report of the Committee indicated no party

lines, when the measure came out of committee. I hope he looked at the tote board when the vote was going on.

**Non-Concurrent Matter
Tabled Until Later in Today's
Session**

Bill "An Act Revising Laws Relating to Licensed Small Loan Agencies" (H. P. 468) (L. D. 681) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" in the House on May 31.

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

In the House: On motion of Mr. Scott of Wilton, tabled until later in today's session.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act Providing for the Official Observance of the 150th Anniversary of the Formation of the State of Maine (H. P. 723) (L. D. 1018) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 26 and passed to be engrossed on May 22.

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 Providing Appropriations for Payment of School Construction Aid to the Cities of Westbrook and South Portland (H. P. 1124) (L. D. 1601) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 22 and passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" on May 16.

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

In the House: On motion of Mr. Hinds of South Portland, the House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that when the Senate and House adjourn they adjourn to meet on Monday, June 12, at one o'clock in the afternoon. (S. P. 679)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Authorize General Fund Bond Issue in Amount of Two Million Eight Hundred and Fifteen Thousand Dollars and to Appropriate Moneys for Construction, Extension and Improvement for Airports" (H. P. 1166) (L. D. 1667) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendments "B", "C", "D", "E" and "I" in the House on June 1.

Came from the Senate with House Amendments "B" and "E" indefinitely postponed and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendments "C", "D" and "I", and Senate Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

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

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, moves that the House recede from its former action and concur with the Senate.

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker, for the point of record and clarification I would inquire if the House Amendment which I offered and which was accepted, and which I understand was approved by the House chairman of Appropriations is still with the bill?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Berman, poses a question through the Chair to the Appropriations Committee. Any member may answer if they choose, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon.

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have read over the amendment very hastily and my impression is that it is still included. I wonder if it may have only been a matter of addition. I see the total is different but as far as items are concerned I don't see any of them eliminated. Now if anyone has any better explanation.

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

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It appears to me that Senate Amendment, under filing number S-237, includes, it says—"Further amend said bill in section 6 by inserting after the paragraph designated 'Augusta' the following: 'Houlton resurfacing runway 12,500,'" which led me to believe that this is a technical change and it is still in the bill.

Thereupon, the House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of Mayor and Councilmen, Reducing the Number of Members on the City Council, Increasing the Term of Office of Mayor, City Council, Board of Police and Board of Education, Wardens and Ward Clerks of the City of Biddeford, Changing Date of Election, and Providing for Electing Civil Service Commission for the Fire Department of the City of Biddeford" (H. P. 1186) (L. D. 1687) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in the House on June 6.

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

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

Messages and Documents

The following Communication:

STATE OF MAINE
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
AUGUSTA, MAINE
04330

June 8, 1967

To the Honorable Senate
and House of Representatives
of the 103rd Legislature:

There is returned herewith, without my approval, Legislative Document 306, "An Act Relating to Form and Arrangement of Ballots in General Elections." My objections to this Act include all of those previously listed in my veto of L. D. 4, "An Act to Eliminate the Straight Party Ballot in the Election Laws." This Bill is a far poorer measure than L. D. 4, which was vetoed and sustained by this Legislature.

I object to eliminating the choice of voting by straight party ballot. I object in the belief that it will weaken party responsibility and place the personalities of its candidates above their positions on the issues.

I further object to L. D. 306 in that it would not only eliminate the party box at the top of the party column, but it would also eliminate the party column itself. The candidates would, therefore, be listed by office with only the initials R. or D. to indicate which party they were affiliated with.

Attached to L. D. 306 is a clause which would allow for a referendum on this issue. If the Legislature would likewise present me with the Constitutional Reforms that I requested several weeks ago to place before the people in referendum, I would find this an acceptable way of disposing of these controversial matters.

I would like to refer to the people the questions of abolition of the Executive Council, the appointment of the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, and the Treasurer of State by the Governor, annual legislative sessions, and lowering of the voting age.

If all these measures could be presented to the people for their decision, then I would permit—although I do not approve of this proposed ballot form change — L. D. 306 to be similarly referred to

the voters of the State of Maine. The people should understand that this proposed ballot change is not what I mean by desirable reform of our State Government.

Accordingly, I respectfully request that members of the House and Senate uphold this veto of Legislative Document 306.

Respectfully,
(Signed)
KENNETH M. CURTIS
Governor

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is, shall this Bill become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor?

(On motion of Mr. Ross of Bath, tabled until later in today's session.)

Orders

Mr. Hennessey of West Bath was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. HENNESSEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: "Lowery Fund for Sea Study." Friends of the late Charles R. Lowery, Brunswick Representative to the Maine Legislature, have established the Charles Lowery Memorial Fund, in memory of his efforts toward the development of Maine's oceanographic resources.

The fund will be used to help finance the higher education studies of students interested in the field of oceanography.

Organizers of the fund are Guy Johnson, Jr., James E. Weir, and Albert Gould Hopkins.

An account for the fund has been opened at the Brunswick branch of the Canal National Bank. Persons wishing to make contributions to it should mail their checks, made out to the Charles Lowery Memorial Fund, to the bank.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lewin.

Mr. LEWIN: Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if the House has in its possession House Paper 1194, L. D. 1697?

The SPEAKER: The answer is in the affirmative. It is in the possession of the House.

Mr. LEWIN: I wish to move that we reconsider our action of yesterday and I would like to speak briefly to my motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lewin, now moves that the House reconsider its action of yesterday whereby it indefinitely postponed Bill, "An Act relating to Excise Tax on Motor Vehicles," L. D. 1697.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. LEWIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: After I spoke on this matter the last legislative day, it appears to me that I was misunderstood by some. The review of 1697 would show that there is a big difference between that and the prior bill 1506, which had been submitted some time ago. There is definitely no increase in the minimum or maximum tax as is in effect at the present time. Secondly, the one mill increase is the only change. I might say that to a community of 13,000 registers this would amount to a gain for the community of twenty to twenty-five thousand, which the community greatly needs. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Manchester, Mr. Rideout.

Mr. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There is a built-in increase in the present law, without increasing the mill rate, because it is based on the factory list price of the vehicles. Now you know and I know that these prices are not going down, so that the excise tax will increase of its own accord. The excise tax receipts in almost every municipality have increased every year since the war, because of the escalation of cost of automobiles.

Now as I pointed out yesterday, we turned down the increase on cigarettes which to my mind is a luxury tax and now we are considering increasing on automobiles, which in my mind again is a necessity. So I urge you to vote against the motion to reconsider this bill.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to concur with the gentleman from Manchester, Mr. Rideout.

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

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker, I move that this item be tabled until Monday.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cottrell, now moves that L. D. 1697 be tabled until Monday, June 12, pending the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lewin, that the House reconsider its action of yesterday whereby it indefinitely postponed the bill.

Mr. Rideout of Manchester then requested a division.

The SPEAKER: A vote has been requested on the tabling motion. All those in favor of this bill being tabled until Monday, June 12, will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

35 having voted in the affirmative and 74 having voted in the negative, the motion to table did not prevail.

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

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to review the thinking of the Taxation Committee on this matter. You may recall that it came out of committee late in the session "ought to pass" eight to two, and the reason it was held in committee so long was to see what was going to happen to some of the other tax bills and tax measures. The thinking of the Committee was this, that since the auto trade-in tax was defeated and since we had this other bill concerning the taxation of automobiles, we discussed the matter and felt that this might be one way to give at least some crumbs to the municipalities, and the bill came out with greater percentages of excise tax than the one that has been redrafted and apparently have before us now. This simply

raises the excise tax one mill and I think that this has been reviewed by sponsor Representative Lewin and I would hope that he would review again some of these points that I think you should consider seriously before you finally make your decision.

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

Mr. DRUMMOND: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to go on record as being opposed to reconsideration of this bill. I am sure that we have talked about taxing most everything so far this session. I am sure that the expense of running automobiles and trucks is quite high. I think we pay tax enough and I hope that you will vote not to reconsider this bill.

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

Mr. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: When this bill originally came through, you will remember that I objected to it and voted against it. Since it was revised and during that period of revision, or recommitted to committee, I went home over the weekend, I talked to the local town officials, and they were all in favor of this, which is the reason why I signed the "ought to pass" and the reason why I am supporting the reconsideration vote.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lewin, that the House reconsider its action of yesterday whereby it indefinitely postponed Bill "An Act relating to Excise Tax on Motor Vehicles," L. D. 1697. All of those in favor or reconsideration will vote yes; those opposed will vote no —

Mr. Humphrey of Augusta then requested a roll call.

The SPEAKER: A roll call is requested. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All of those desiring a roll call will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens 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: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lewin, that the House reconsider its action of yesterday whereby L. D. 1697 was indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of reconsideration will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Baker, E. B.; Belanger, Binnette, Bourgoin, Bragdon, Brennan, Carroll, Carswell, Champagne, Conley, Cottrell, Darey, Dunn, Eustis, Evans, Fecteau, Fraser, Giroux, Hanson, H. L.; Hanson, P. K.; Harriman, Hawes, Henley, Hewes, Hinds, Huber, Jannelle, Levesque, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Martin, McMann, Minkowsky, Mosher, Nadeau, J. F. R.; Nadeau, N. L.; Philbrook, Porter, Quinn, Rocheleau, Ross, Sawyer, Scott, C. F.; Snow, P. J.; Susi, Thompson, Trask, Truman, Waltz.

NAY — Allen, Baker, R. E.; Bedard, Beliveau, Benson, Berman, Birt, Boudreau, Bradstreet, Buck, Bunker, Burnham, Carey, Carrier, Clark, Cornell, Cote, Crockett, Crommett, Crosby, Curran, Cushing, D'Alfonso, Danton, Dickinson, Drigotas, Drummond, Durgin, Ewer, Farrington, Fortier, Foster, Fuller, Gauthier, Gill, Hall, Hanson, B. B.; Harnois, Harvey, Haynes, Hennessey, Hodgkins, Hoover, Humphrey, Hunter, Immonen, Jalbert, Keyte, Kilroy, Lebel, Littlefield, Lycette, Miliano, Noyes, Pike, Prince, Rackliff, Richardson, G. A.; Rideout, Robertson, Roy, Sahagian, Scott, G. W.; Scribner, Shaw, Shute, Snowe, P.; Starbird, Watts, Wheeler, White, Wight, Williams, Wood.

ABSENT — Bernard, Brown, Cookson, Couture, Dennett, Dudley, Edwards, Gaudreau, Healy, Hichens, Jameson, Jewell, Kyes, Maddox, McNally, Meisner, Payson, Pendergast, Quimby, Richardson, H. L.; Robinson, Soulas, Sullivan, Tanguay, Townsend.

Yes, 50; No, 74; Absent, 25.

The SPEAKER: Fifty having voted in the affirmative and seventy-four in the negative, the motion to reconsider does not prevail.

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I present an order and move its passage and would speak briefly to the order.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Berman, presents an order and moves its passage, and the Clerk will read the Order.

Thereupon, the Order was read by the Clerk as follows:

ORDERED, that Mr. Jewell of Monticello be excused from attendance for the duration of his illness.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: My good friend, Mr. Jewell from Monticello has been suddenly taken by illness and is now at the Augusta Hospital. Some of us have taken some time off from our legislative duties to visit him yesterday afternoon. He told me that he will probably be there for a week and I hope that other members of this House may find time to visit with him later.

Thereupon, the Order received passage.

House Reports of Committees Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Gill from the Committee on Health and Institutional Services reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Transfer of Control of the Military and Naval Children's Home and Changing Name" (H. P. 489) (L. D. 702)

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Ought to Pass in New Draft New Draft Printed

Mr. Pike from the Committee on Natural Resources on Bill "An Act relating to a Comprehensive Water Resource Use Plan" (H. P. 373) (L. D. 520) reported same in a new

draft (H. P. 1199) (L. D. 1706) under title of "An Act relating to a Comprehensive Water Resource and Related Land Use Plan" and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was read and accepted, the New Draft read twice and assigned the next legislative day.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on State Government reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Revising the Maine State Personnel Laws" (H. P. 699) (L. D. 980)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. LUND of Kennebec
WYMAN of Washington
— of the Senate.

Messrs. WATTS of Machias
RIDEOUT of Manchester

Mrs. CORNELL of Orono

Mr. PHILBROOK
of South Portland
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee on same Bill reporting same in a new draft (H. P. 1200) (L. D. 1707) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. STERN of Penobscot
— of the Senate.

Messrs. MARTIN of Eagle Lake
STARBIRD
of Kingman Township
— of the House.

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Orono, Mrs. Cornell.

Mrs. CORNELL: Mr. Speaker, I move that we accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This, in my opinion, is a very sound piece of legislation. It is not my intention to take up a great deal of time. I think I spoke my piece rather vociferously before the State Government Committee when this bill came up for hearing. I don't intend to go through that procedure again today. I note that I am particularly happy to see that the gen-

tleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, the House Chairman of the State Government Committee, thought so much of the bill that he did not sign either report. I might say also in passing, that he informed me that he would do nothing to harm the bill nor me back weeks ago and I think it just indicates the type of gentleman that Mr. Dennett is. The fact that the other people signed the report "ought not to pass" certainly is not a reflection upon them. I had at least one member of the Committee, who signed the report "ought not to pass" admit to me that there was not too much understanding of the measure, in any event, by that individual.

Over the many years we have tried, repeatedly, to do something to better the policy of the Personnel Department. We have done it by giving them more funds to work with. On more than one occasion I can recall the Governor in a Budget Committee meeting and at the time that we did entertain a Budget Committee the Governor, who had just been re-elected, stating flatly to the Personnel Board that as far as he is concerned in government, this is the last time he would kowtow to the State Personnel Board. On this occasion he did agree to advance more funds to them.

I can also remember that twice, on two occasions, in a heavily Republican controlled House that the elimination of the Personnel Board was voted upon overwhelmingly.

This bill does not call, in any way, for the elimination of the Board. This bill calls for what is very badly needed. It calls for a complete reorganization of the policy. It calls for reducing the Personnel Board to a Board on an advisory basis, leaving the policy to the Director. The Director would be nominated by the Governor and approved by the Council. Insofar as I am concerned, it would be perfectly proper with me if the present Director would stay in office. I think he is a very competent and dedicated State employee.

This bill is sound, and is part of the Cresap, McCormick and Paget Report. The people who did this report were amazed when they first met some of us on the Com-

mittee of both parties. They were amazed in thinking that we were living in our area with such an antiquated program as this.

The bill, as has been revised and signed by the members who signed it in a New Draft, would have an appeals board feature in it. I think it has been properly drafted. I think it is a sound piece of legislation. I think it ought to have its proper passage by this branch. I certainly hope that the motion of the gentleman from Orono, Mrs. Cornell, will not prevail so that I can vote to accept the New Draft version of the measure.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: For the edification of those persons in the House who might not know, the present Personnel Board consists of three appointive members plus one member of the Maine State Employees Association elected by that group, plus one member representing department heads.

Now, among other things, the Board appoints a Director of Personnel, they set the salary which then has to be approved by the Governor. Of course, they have a long list of duties and responsibilities. In my opinion the procedure as is now works fine, with the exception of grievances that the employees might have and appeals. And they have to handle both of those things now. But, already we have overcome this problem because a separate grievance and appeals board was approved by final enactment in this House this year.

Now this bill would completely abolish the present Board. Then, the Governor would appoint three new persons. They would be citizens, they would be called the Personnel Advisory Board. The Governor and not the Board would then appoint a director and set his salary. I do not believe that the change is necessary. One of the objections that the Cresap, McCormick and Paget Report had was that they couldn't understand how we could live with a part-time Board. But this bill does the

same thing. It just substitutes a new part-time Board for the present part-time Board that we have. Furthermore, at the end of the bill, you will note that it adds seven new positions for a total additional expense for the biennium of some \$105,000 and I concur with the gentleman from Orono, Mrs. Cornell, in acceptance of the Majority Report.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do not intend to belabor the issue I assure you. I merely would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross. He states that the Board is made up of a representative of management, a departmental head is on the Board, and then a representative of the State Employees Association is on the Board and three members representing the public, is that correct?

Now, let's rehash this, three members, five members are on the Board, three members are representing the public, one departmental head on the Board representing departmental heads, one member of the Board is representative, elected by the State Employees Association, correct? Now, staying with the State Employees Association representative only, I would like to ask the gentleman from Bath a two pointed question. Number one, who on the Board represents the A.F. of L.-C.I.O. end of the members of the Union, or those members of the State Employees family who neither belong to the Union or to the Association? Two, if the State Employees Association and the departmental heads have a representative, shouldn't the members of the A.F. of L.-C.I.O. end of the state employees family, have representation on the Board also?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, who may answer if he chooses.

The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. ROSS: The Board, as presently made up, they do not specifically have a member repre-

senting the A.F. of L.—C.I.O. It is my opinion that, my understanding, that under the present one, although they might have a member they wouldn't necessarily have to.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentlewoman from Orono, Mrs. Cornell, that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report. The Chair will order a vote. All those in favor of accepting the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

Thereupon, Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston requested a roll call.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All of those desiring a roll call will vote yes and those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the Hosue 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: The pending question is on the motion of the gentlewoman from Orono, Mrs. Cornell, that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report on Bill "An Act Revising the Maine State Personnel Laws," House Paper 699, L. D. 980. All those in favor of accepting the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

ROLL CALL

YEA—Baker, E. B.; Benson, Ber-
man, Birt, Bragdon, Brown, Buck,
Bunker, Burnham, Clark, Cookson,
Cornell, Crockett, Crosby, Cushing,
Darey, Dickinson, Drummond,
Dunn, Durgin, Ewer, Farrington,
Foster, Fuller, Gill, Hall, Hanson,
B. B.; Hanson, P. K.; Harriman,
Hawes, Haynes, Henley, Hewes,
Hichens, Hinds, Hodgkins, Hoover,
Huber, Humphrey, Immonen, Jan-
nelle, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln,
Littlefield, Lycette, McMann, Mili-
ano, Minkowsky, Mosher, Noyes,
Philbrook, Pike, Porter, Prince,

Quinn, Richardson, G. A.; Rideout,
Rocheleau, Ross, Sahagian, Scott,
C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Shute,
Snow, P. J.; Snowe, P.; Soulas,
Susi, Thompson, Trask, Waltz,
Watts, White, Wight, Williams,
Wood.

NAY — Bedard, Belanger, Beli-
veau, Bernard, Binnette, Boudreau,
Bradstreet, Brennan, Carey, Car-
rier, Carroll, Carswell, Champagne,
Cote, Cottrell, Crommett, Curran,
Danton, Drigotas, Eustis, Fecteau,
Fraser, Gaudreau, Gauthier, Gir-
oux, Hanson, H. L.; Harvey, Healy,
Hennessey, Hunter, Jalbert, Keyte,
Kilroy, Lebel, Levesque, Martin,
Nadeau, J. F. R.; Nadeau, N. L.;
Rackliff, Robertson, Roy, Sawyer,
Scribner, Truman, Wheeler.

ABSENT — Allen, Baker, R. E.;
Bourgoin, Conley, Couture, D'Al-
fonso, Dennett, Dudley, Edwards,
Evans, Fortier, Harnois, Jameson,
Jewell, Kyes, Maddox, McNally,
Meisner, P a y s o n, Pendergast,
Quimby, Richardson, H. L.; Robin-
son, Starbird, Sullivan Tanguay,
Townsend.

Yes, 77; No, 45; Absent, 27.

The SPEAKER: Seventy-seven having voted in the affirmative and forty-five in the negative, the Majority "Ought not to pass" is accepted and will be sent up for concurrence.

Order out of Order

Mr. Sahagian of Belgrade presented the following Order and moved its passage:

WHEREAS, Miss Lynette Miller, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Robert E. Miller of Vienna, and a seventh grade student of Ingalls School at Farmington, is our State of Maine spelling champion; and

WHEREAS, Miss Miller, at age twelve, has brought credit to herself and her State by her participation in the National Spelling Contest at Washington, D. C.; now, therefore, be it

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the 103rd Legislature extend its congratulations to Miss Miller and best wishes for the future; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Secretary of the Senate be directed to send

a duly attested copy of this Order to Miss Miller, her parents and to her school.

The Order received passage. and was sent up for concurrence. (H. P. 1202)

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Towns and Counties on Bill "An Act Decreasing Annual Expenditure for Economic and Recreational Development in Oxford County" (H. P. 559) (L. D. 791) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. COUTURIER
of Androscoggin
Mrs. SPROUL of Lincoln
Mr. MILLS of Franklin
—of the Senate.
Messrs. ROBERTSON of Brewer
FARRINGTON of China
WIGHT of Presque Isle
MEISNER
of Dover-Foxcroft
SNOWE of Auburn
—of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee on same Bill reporting same in a new draft (H. P. 1201) (L. D. 1708) under title of "An Act Repealing Economic and Recreational Development in Oxford County" and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. NADEAU of Sanford
CROMMETT
of Millinocket
—of the House.

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mexico, Mr. Fraser.

Mr. FRASER: Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of the Majority Report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Mexico, Mr. Fraser, moves that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

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

Mr. NADEAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to explain my stand for signing another report which would

eliminate the development. It was the feeling from the Committee, a general feeling, there had been many abuses in this respect. This was why there was two reports brought to your attention. However, the majority as stated here, eight to two, felt—well, maybe by decreasing it that was the reason why at one time it was unanimous it was going to be that we eliminate the whole report. However, this group put on pressures enough on the County Commissioners, to our own legislators—in fact this group even had a meeting this morning and they're trying to salvage some of this. But I don't think however, they are going to salvage any part of this. For the reason that at one of the hearings and in all the time that we allowed this group to come up before this Committee on Towns and Counties, the County Commissioner said and I quote—and these people here remember this, Mr. Beliveau will remember this. "I'll take the money elsewhere even if you approve this decreasing bill." That is one point I want to bring out to you. Secondly, I have to bring this up, I have here a list of overdrafts, mind you, twenty-three different departments had overdrafts to the tune, well, there's one here overdrafted by \$8500 another one \$1300, \$1900, \$3400, \$6400, \$5200, \$1,000, \$7,000, \$500, \$819, \$3700, \$3400, \$4500; someone, somehow, somewhere has to protect those taxpayers and this is why I signed this report to eliminate just this little factor.

Now on this mind you, ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you how they spent this money. For instance, weekly pay of Mr. Michaels, \$288.46, the other gentleman, Mr. Whelan, \$153.00, these are actual figures, it comes from that County. Expenses of these gentlemen, mind you, they are as high as \$449.00 per month. This is beside the salary now, mind you, And I could go on, and even the assistant, who was not supposed to be doing too much traveling, he I would say for all the months, 80% of it—over \$200. This is just expenses. Now, for instance, here is other items of expenses they

spent, \$100 here industrial development, some council in Boston, trips to Boston, Portland, \$25, \$100, they've got all kinds of things, but this ought to be good, hotel dinners two hundred some odd dollars, Country Way Restaurant, doesn't say who they entertained there, \$492.96, I hope it was a large group or the steaks were expensive. Geiger Brothers, ashtrays for the above dinner, ashtrays mind you, at the tune of \$338. Mind you, that's a heck of a lot of ashtrays. I presume they bought the cigars but I didn't get a copy of that bill.

So knowing what the County Commissioner said that "I don't care" and these are facts here about the overdrafts. I ask each and every one of you, you can check them if you want to, and I would like to have the ex-County Attorney deny these things. These come from his County. In view of all of this, this is why I had to make this known. Now, I personally don't care. I hope you will accept our report and demolish the whole thing because at the hearing it was quite interesting. The majority of the people spoke against continuing this. Everybody seemed to be taking recognition for what had been done. Of course there was a few that spoke for it. I don't know whether they were on the payroll or not but that's for them to decide. Even this own particular group, mind you, overexpended by \$1,003. But when you have one of the County Commissioners come up and say "I don't care what you legislators do, I'm going to take the money elsewhere." And that statement was made I swear to God, and I know Mr. Beliveau and the other who were there will admit this, so in all fairness I felt that he's not going to stop at \$20,000 and this is why I want to explain to you people. There's been so many abuses, but I am going to save it when they try to increase the pay raises of some of those people in that area.

I have pay records here. I have expenditure bills here taken out from the office and these records have been notarized. These are truths. I could go on and on and

give you abuses in that County, it's terrible. But, now, if you people feel that you still want to go along permitting one group, and the County Commissioners to go along and say, "Let's have a ball, it's only taxpayers money," then, may you live with your own conscience.

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

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to explain to you my reasons for signing the majority "Ought to pass" report. We did have an extremely interesting hearing. Both the proponents and the opponents gave us their reasons, some of them wanting to continue the program and others, of course, wanting to abandon the program. Two years ago I was very much opposed to starting a development process of this type in the counties. I do, however, frown upon the fact that when a program is started, and there appears to be substantial gains, whether or not it is by the people who work directly with this development organization or whether it's a stimulant because this organization is there, and I will point out to you that this appeared to be the case.

Those claiming to have played a major part in getting some industry to come to that county indicated to me that competition in this respect did do some good for this county, industrywise. I think the program is under way and I think it should be continued. I don't think that they have had a sufficient amount of time to prove definitely that they are or are not worthy of the privilege to continue.

Of course, when you get into the area of promotion, it is pretty difficult sometimes to measure how much is done by what party because these areas of promotion are very, very difficult to measure. I am in favor of continuing this for at least two more years. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Norway, Mr. Henley.

Mr. HENLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Mr. Nadeau has given us a very accurate sum-

mation of our situation as it has prevailed and does prevail. I think some of the information is a little bit out in left field. A few of us did get together this morning but I assure him, as far as I know, this subject was not brought up. I will also assure Mr. Nadeau that the County Commissioners in my County certainly have not got to me on anything regarding this, favorably anyway, and I think the other legislative people from my County will probably assure you that about the only way that the County Commissioners approach me would probably be with a shotgun, so whatever I do, I am doing entirely based upon my own opinion. If I based it entirely on my personal opinion, I would certainly go along with Mr. Nadeau, I would vote to completely wipe out the organization.

But I agree, in part, with Mr. Farrington, the organization has been functioning, there have been some new industries come into the County. Now I am not at liberty, I wouldn't say that, I don't mean that I am not at liberty, I mean I do not have exact knowledge enough to say outright that this department did not bring in some of that business.

I think that they have had some influence, but what I told the Committee in general was that based on what information or lack of information that I had, and I told that in answer to Mr. Michaels who is the Director, that the program was a failure mainly because it had not been sold to the people of Oxford County. There was a failure to that extent, whether they brought the business in or not is beside the point if they cannot sell themselves to the people that raise the taxes.

Now possibly, based on that, if the department continues on a reduced monetary scale, they might take that into consideration and sell their program more to the people.

Now, over two years ago when the program was first mentioned, I happened to be present, I was a county official at the time, appointive, I was present when the program was mentioned to a public

hearing and practically everyone but the Chairman of the County Commissioners himself, were against this suggestion. Nevertheless, as I understand it, it was put in as an addition after the budget went in. I remember that the Chairman of the Commissioners went on television trying to sell his program and the Legislature allowed him a \$35,000 a year, he asked for \$50,000. The gentleman employed to direct the organization, I have taken issue with several times. A lot of us have felt that he was more a figurehead than worker. We may be wrong. I still feel that. I feel that the job was overpaid. I don't feel that at the County level the expenditure right off the bat of \$15,000 salary is justified. I know in my investigation throughout this legislative session back home, I could not find much approval of the office among my constituents and I told the Committee, as I am telling the legislative body, I went out of my way to try to find people who approved of the department. I had very little success. Almost without exception businessmen, town officials, farmers and factory workers insisted that they couldn't see much use in maintaining the office.

But as I delved deeper into the quest I did find a few people that said that, based on their lack of knowledge, the same as my own, it might be well to maintain a reduced staff, maintain the office with perhaps one official, paid a little bit less, and a part-time secretary to coordinate with the State Department of Economic Development, so that seems to be the general outcome that I am faced with today. Again, I feel that if this motion to vote on the reduced figure down to \$20,000 a year were defeated, I would very gladly go along with the substitute bill and completely eliminate the office.

Then, if it was felt at some later time that the County wanted to reinstitute the office, if it left a vacuum, then I would feel that we could go ahead and do it over again. I do feel that the amendment that has been attached to this bill

is improperly worded relative to surplus funds, and I feel that that should be changed if this bill is going to be accepted.

I am not going to urge this Legislature either way; as long as we have reduced the figure if that is the way this body wants it, I will go along with it, I think we have gained something. So I do not even know this moment how I will vote. I would like to leave it that way and hear from some of the other members of the Committee.

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

Mr. CROMMETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a signer of the minority report, I would like to make my position clear. I was a member of the 102nd Legislature, a member of the Towns and Counties Committee, I heard the arguments for and against this proposal. I have heard it several times during this session. Not having the courage of my convictions, I voted for this in the 102nd, and I say to you, ladies and gentlemen, I made a mistake in having played a part in inflicting this curse on the people of Oxford County. I can do no other than to vote for the abolishment of the Commission. I do not believe it should be the part of any county to do what this Committee's Development Authority is trying to do. I think it is wholly within the Department of D. E. D.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Paris, Mr. Immonen.

Mr. IMMONEN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Most of the people who have spoken on this have pretty well spoken the truth, as I understand it. This bill would reduce the annual expenditure ceiling from \$35,000 to \$20,000. This is sort of permissive legislation for any amount below \$20,000 if this is adopted, whether it is \$15,000 or \$10,000 in the future.

The present law was passed two years ago authorizing the County Commissioners to expend not exceeding \$35,000 annually for economic development and employ an agent and administrative assistants required, whose office

shall be at the Oxford County Courthouse.

Oxford County is stated to be the first county to have this special legislation and could be considered an experiment in this field. Two years ago the County had a surplus of over \$200,000 and funds from the surplus were appropriated for this venture and so did not reflect an increase in that budget. According to the biennial estimates of the County Commissioners for the present biennium, it showed a huge increase of assessment against the towns.

In evaluating the needs of the county services, the appropriation of \$35,000 for economic development seemed vastly excessive to most of the County Delegation and to most of the municipal officers. For this reason this amount of \$20,000 was proposed in the budget and this bill for the change of the ceiling to \$20,000 is now presented.

In support of this reduction may I compare this to the more democratic operation in this field of economic development in York County. Some fifteen years ago Sanford lost its large industry and they had an emergency. My friend of student days, Mr. Carl Broggi, instituted programs there and later headed the economic development system of the State. In 1966, York County had a budget of less than \$13,000 and this year is less than \$20,000, with the interested towns and counties participating together. Now, the population of York County is about double that of Oxford County. Would it not be proper for me to surmise that the \$35,000 ceiling is very excessive and had been tailored for a certain operator in defiance of democratic procedures?

Some three or four years ago, various selectmen supported by town appropriations and business leaders in Oxford County were working together on cooperative plans for advertising and endorsing future development by printing county-wide brochures for nationwide distribution. This grass root democratic procedure and planning group was brushed aside by this spending and money wasting organ-

ization. I also want to mention that I had been a member of the school board in my town and at a time when we were joining the School Administrative District mention was made that by joining and having the more modern schooling systems the industry will follow and I am quite certain by the activities of the school administrative district and the town officials previously and putting out the brochures have done a very good job, so I hope you will support the Majority Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Nadeau.

Mr. NADEAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to add, and Mr. Henley did admit it and Mr. Immonen here that previously they supported to abolish the whole doggone thing. And I know they won't deny this. The only thing, I would like to read a portion of a letter here, "Our Chamber of Commerce Area pays in excess of 50% of the taxes assessed by the County from which the allocation of funds is made to this Commission." This is signed by Harry Beach, Director of the Rumford Chamber of Commerce and he was completely in accord for complete abolishment.

It was also noted at the hearing that thirteen selectmen signed a sheet, and we have that copy on record, that they considered this abolishment. Various other areas from that County came up and said they couldn't afford it. I would like you people to think about this.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mexico, Mr. Fraser.

Mr. FRASER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I introduced this Resolve two years ago which created this office and naturally I feel that I ought to defend myself. Last summer I heard dissent regarding this office, hearing that they were not earning their money, so I personally traveled and talked with four of them without letting them know which side of the fence I was on. They didn't even know who I was. What influenced them to come to Oxford County? Two of them mentioned

the South Paris office, two of them mentioned Sam Michaels by name. One of them went even further and said that were it not for Sam Michaels we would right now be located in Laconia, New Hampshire and this is the plant that is located in Norway where my good friend Mr. Henley said he don't know anybody there who opposes this office.

I then went to the office to interview the Directors, and I found there prospects in their files enough to equal their production in the next two years as they have in the last two. The last two created 500 new jobs, approximately, with an annual salary of \$2 million. You add \$2 million annual income to a county the size of Oxford with a population of something like 44 or 45,000 and you can't very well do that without increasing the tax base which will return to the county much of the money spent to develop this office.

By allowing this to continue another two years, I feel quite sure that this amount would be doubled and can you imagine what \$4 million a year will do for this County? Those who opposed it mostly came from towns who did not care for any further development. This man that he speaks of, Mr. Beach, comes from the town of Rumford which has the Oxford Paper Company in the area, something probably like 200 or \$300 million. They don't care for small industries which will employ 50, 75 or 100 people, but we have towns in the County who do care for that. My own town is one of them, and there are prospects on the books right now for one for my town which has a population of 5,000 people and a small wooden novelty mill employing about 30 people which is all the industry we have.

I would like very much to see this office continue long enough so that we can get a shop which is in prospect for now.

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

Mr. BELIVEAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Very briefly, I would like to just clarify what this bill does. As was men-

tioned by previous speakers, this document would reduce the expenditure for economic development \$35,000 to \$20,000 and we have no objection to reducing this amount. We are the first to admit that this was a novel approach and we are very certain without listing for you the accomplishments of the department that there have been several new industries located in Oxford County in the last year. Now, whether or not this is coincidental is something else. But, we strongly urge all the members of this House to support the motion to accept the Majority "Ought to pass" report of this L.D. which was introduced and sponsored by the gentleman from West Paris, Mr. Immonen.

Now, as he indicated, there was \$20,000 allocated in the County budget for this. Now this means that the County Commissioners cannot expend any monies which exceed that amount. We are very — in anticipation of this passage of this bill, which will reduce the money from 35 to 20, the County Commissioners have dismissed one of the members of the Department of Economic Development. Now, this Department has been in existence and in operation for approximately eighteen months. The first six months certainly were devoted to administrative matters and we do not believe, and I know that the majority of the members of the Committee on Towns and Counties agree with me, that they have not been given an opportunity to prove themselves. Now, certainly, representing the town of Rumford, which pays 42% of the County tax, I believe I can speak for that area. Between myself and Representative Fraser, I believe, the two towns that we represent pay approximately 62% of the tax, we are certainly for this program. We are convinced that it has done some good and the potential is invaluable and I strongly urge you members to vote for the motion to accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Bethel, Mrs. Lincoln.

Mrs. LINCOLN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: First

of all I apologize that our County has taken up so much time on the Floor of the House. Secondly, I would like to say that some of the things that have been said this morning I do not agree with; others I do. Thirdly, I would like to say that our County is the only County with this setup of economic development and it was voted in at the last session of the Legislature. Then I would like to say that this is a compromise bill. There were several that wanted the \$35,000 but we all decided, the House members of the delegation, to go along on the \$20,000. And again I apologize for so much time our County is taking up.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Norway, Mr. Henley.

Mr. HENLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I won't take but a moment, but I want to thank my good friend Mr. Crommett and Mr. Nadeau. I feel that if they had never enacted the program I would be much happier about it. But I agree with Mr. Beliveau and my good friend from Dixfield, and Mr. Farrington, that the program is in operation and as one of the delegation who more or less agreed that we would allow \$20,000 a year, I will go along for another two years and support the \$20,000 a year motion.

The SPEAKER: Is it now the pleasure of the House to accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report?

The motion prevailed, the Report was accepted and the Bill read twice.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 559, L. D. 791, Bill, "An Act Decreasing Annual Expenditure for Economic and Recreational Development in Oxford County."

Amend said Bill by inserting after the word "expend" in the 8th line (7th line of L. D. 791) the underlined punctuation and words 'excluding county surplus funds,'

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

Divided Report

Report "A" of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act to Authorize Bond Issues in the Amount of \$3,000,000 to Provide Funds for the Construction of Regional Technical and Vocational Centers under the Provisions of Section 2356-B of Title 20, R. S." (H. P. 399) (L. D. 565) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. BERRY of Cumberland
ALBAIR of Aroostook
DUQUETTE of York
— of the Senate.
Messrs. HUMPHREY of Augusta
JALBERT of Lewiston
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. BRAGDON of Perham
HINDS of South Portland
DUNN of Denmark
BIRT of East Millinocket
SCRIBNER of Portland

Reports were read.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move the acceptance of Report "B" "Ought not to pass" of the Appropriations Committee. In making this motion I would like to make a brief statement as to my position on this bill. I am not against education and I am not against vocational education. However, I have grave doubts in my own mind that the area vocational bill in the form that it is before us at the present time, this bill to create vocational education at the high school level I refer to, I do not believe that it is a good vehicle for the expansion of vocational education and I think it should have more study before we proceed along this line. Over the past few years we have developed a very good program of post-vocational education in this State. I hope that we will not jeopardize

the expansion of this post-high school program by embarking upon a new phase of vocational education which I feel needs a lot more study before we embark upon it. I hope you will go along with Report "B" of the Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Speaking on this measure I think that my devotion insofar as vocational education is concerned being on a post-secondary or an area level, wherever it is in the State, it's correct. The gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, makes comment that we have a fine program concerning the vocational schools that we presently have. This is a correct assumption.

Back in 1945 I worked with the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Spear, in going to the program of — initiating the program of vocational training which has proven so successful in the City of South Portland. I can recall that hearing very vividly because at the time of the hearing the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Spear, and myself were the only two who appeared for the bill. I can recall subsequent bills being presented during my several years as a member of this body and often times one, two or no more than three persons would be present in the presentation of this legislation, this type of legislation. I can remember education itself, particularly on a higher level, being very cold toward vocational education.

It is to be recalled that a few years ago both branches were gracious enough to endorse a program that made it possible for us to have a vocational school, post-secondary school in Auburn, in Androscoggin County. I can recall that during that very session I spoke in seconding the motion to set the wheels for a vocational school in the eastern part of the state by setting up the sum of money that would start the program going. This school now is a reality, will be completed and the program is in such good order

that I would wholeheartedly endorse the thought of putting in a sum of money for self-liquidating bonds in a dormitory at the Eastern Maine School as I wholeheartedly endorse also such a program for the school in South Portland.

Also, it is well noted that I, on more than one occasion, endorsed such programs in the northern part of the State, namely Presque Isle. This session I was more than helpful in working with the member of another branch, and also the Speaker of this House, so that the program of vocational education could be started in Washington County. Certainly I don't say this to give impetus, I don't make these comments to give impetus to my plea here, but mainly to point out that as far, by going all over the State, insofar as I am concerned, it makes no difference where vocational training or programs are, it makes no difference what they are, I am for vocational education. It is true we have a fine program started now, we hope to embark on another fifth program of post-secondary vocational education in Washington County. We are in our infancy insofar as this type of program is concerned. L. D. 44, which was my measure at the last session and which was reported out unanimously by the Appropriations Committee of which the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, was a member, as well as the gentleman from Denmark, Mr. Dunn, this imposed the mechanics to start out on such programs and now we are attempting to implement them. The program means that we would cut down from the \$3,000,000 bond issue to \$2,212,000 so that we would conform to the present law that we went to under L. D. 107 on the installment payment.

In my very humble opinion, this program is needed almost as much, if sometimes I think not more, than post-secondary vocational education because this is absolutely the answer to the dropout program. This program here must start and must continue and continue all over the State of Maine. This would set forth programs in S.A.D. 1, in S.A.D. 54, the Bath area and

my area. This program is both in the Budget Message of the Governor asking for an additional sum of money recommended at \$3 million as the State's share which has now been cut down to \$2,212,000 as the State's share in support of a number of already approved area vocational high schools.

This also is in the Republican Program as given to us recently.

Certainly I do hope that the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, will not prevail so that I can move the acceptance of the "ought to pass" report. When the vote is taken, I vote it being taken by the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Solon, Mr. Hanson.

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to pose a question to any member who may answer if they choose. I looked at this L. D. and from the comments and the debate thus far, I am not sure in my own mind as to just what the intent of this bill is. Is this different from the area vocational schools? Would this set up vocational schools within existing school systems? Is my understanding correct? Would somebody spell it out, please, for me?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Solon, Mr. Hanson, poses a question through the Chair to anyone who may answer.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In answer to Mr. Hanson's question. This bill will provide the funds for construction of area vocational schools at the local level. The State Board of Education has approved I think approximately eleven of these schools, maybe more now, but they have approved locations for these. Their total—the total number of schools under this information that I have from the State Board is that they would plan eventually on twenty-five of these centers in the State and their figures show that at a cost, at least this was from the Department of Vocational Ed-

ucation, show that they figure the cost would be around \$25 million, the State's share being around \$15 million of this, and that under this particular bill, and I might add because I am going a little further than answering your question, and I am not prepared to debate this fully today but I would like to make a few comments on it.

I signed the "Ought not to pass" report and I have always been a strong supporter, as most of you members that have served with me before know, for vocational education on the post-secondary level. But the State, under this particular plan, this plan is much better than the Sinclair Act because of the subsidy involved. This bill pays regardless of your valuation or the wealth of the town or anything, this bill pays 75% of the construction cost and equipping cost for these centers. Besides this, we will pay, and this is not in this bill, but the State will pay two-thirds of the Area Vocational School's operating costs. This includes the staff and what have you. This is a yearly affair and would be budgeted every biennium by the Legislature and naturally will increase as more of these schools increase and it's going to be a very similar type bill, in my opinion, to the present Sinclair Act which we face every session, the large increases that are faced here, perhaps not anywhere near as large, but they are going to be sizeable.

This sheet that I have here was drafted by John Snell and some of you may have received it during the pre-legislative conference. It shows that the twenty-five centers are estimated at a million dollars apiece, would be \$25 million, the local share would be \$6,250,000, Federal funds would provide somewhere in the vicinity, over a period of years, not right away, but \$3,750,000. Presently there is a million dollars a year available which can be used at our present vocational schools, these are the State schools at Southern Maine, Central Maine, Eastern Maine and Northern Maine, or the money can be used to build vocational schools. If this bill should be defeated this million dollars could be used at the

vocational schools for building, this million dollars a year; if not, it will be funded into the area—in this particular area on the high school level.

The State will have paid in on these twenty-five centers they figure the annual operating costs, and these were just round figures that were put out by the Department, they figure an average annual operating cost of \$190,000 a center or an annual cost of \$4,750,000. And of this, the local share would be \$1,583,000, that's their one third and the Federal funds would provide at least approximately \$666,000 and the State's share would be \$2,525,000 per year.

The State report on higher education which we paid \$50,000 for recommends against the establishment of area vocational schools. On page 4 of the report which I have in my hand, the report recommends that the State consider some type of the similar program to what we have, except perhaps in all school systems of industrial arts, leading towards vocational education at our post-secondary schools in the four we have in the State at the present time.

This particular bill will take care of four of these schools and that is all and the other areas of the State that have been approved there would be no funds for unless this Legislature amends this legislation upward. This amount of money \$215,000 would go for the annual payments which would go to four communities to pay off their bond issues on the construction of these schools but does not include the operating revenues for this. This is just—because they wouldn't be built during this biennium probably anyway and this money only includes the next year of the biennium because according to this bill this would have to be approved in a total bond issue by the end of the year, so the money wouldn't be available until next year and there would be probably no operating funds until the following biennium or at least no requests from the Legislature until that time.

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

Mr. SHUTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This morning when I saw House Amendment H-411, I was frankly shocked. I'll tell you why. In the fall of 1965, the Board of Directors of School Administrative District No. 9, which at that time comprised only three communities, Farmington, Chesterville and one other, approved a plan to ask the State Board of Education to designate School Administrative District No. 9 as the location of a Regional Technical and Vocational Center. Now, since that time, nine communities comprise School Administrative District No. 9. It is one of the largest School Administrative Districts in the State of Maine with well over 3,000 pupils. Next Wednesday, the voters in all nine towns in this District will be voting on a \$2.7 million high school.

Part of this high school includes a vocational wing. Now, in 1966, the State board of Education approved Farmington as the site for a vocational, an area vocational high school. This was submitted to the architect, plans have been brought out, the people in these nine communities have been told that part of this high school will be dedicated to vocational training on the secondary level. If this is constructed, this would serve not only the nine communities at S. A. D. 9, it would serve the towns of Northern Franklin County, comprising S.A.D. 58, Strong, Phillips, Madrid, Stratton and the Town of Rangeley, and also would serve the towns of Jay and Livermore Falls. It would serve over 50,000 people in our area.

Now I maintain that the State has a commitment, the State Board of Education has made a commitment to fourteen centers in the State of Maine, Farmington is just one of those. Now, next Wednesday we are voting on this \$2.7 million high school and \$800,000 of this constitutes an Area Vocational High School. Now the State's share of this, under the plan that was submitted to the voters is 75% or \$600,000 and yet, when you look at this amendment which says

only \$215,000, where in the world are we going to tell our voters that we are going to get this extra \$400,000? I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen of the House, that the State of Maine is obligated to keep faith with these people, not only School Administrative District 9, but Skowhegan has also been designated as an Area Vocational Center. The other night at a community meeting in Farmington and in Wilton, questions were asked about this and I said, "Well, there's a \$3 million bond issue which is coming before the Legislature shortly and the people will be asked to vote on this in November and if this is approved by the voters in November, then you will get your money." And I suggest to you, ladies and gentlemen, that these School Administrative Districts had better have paid lobbyists over here in the State Department, or somewhere in the Treasurer's Office to get their money the minute it is delegated to them because \$215,000 is insufficient.

In regard to the comment of the A.E.D. Report suggested by the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hinds, this is true, the A.E.D. Report does recommend that "vocational education be restricted to post-secondary level." However, there are many other things in the A.E.D. Report with which we all disagree. This is just one of them. I submit to you, too, that the State of Vermont has not gone into the post-secondary area vocational level at all. Indeed, Burlington, Vermont is a model school of area secondary vocational education. They start their vocational education training in the eighth grade at Burlington Junior High School and they bring them up through an organized, orderly program through the four years of high school and they turn out kids who are well qualified in many phases in the technical and vocational levels.

The Area Vocational-Technical Institutes that we have on the post-secondary level in the State of Maine are technologically oriented, they are higher graded than the area vocational centers. So the A.E.D. report, you can accept it or

not, we'll have that discussed quite thoroughly next week I am sure and other phases. So the Board of Education then has approved fourteen areas in the State of Maine, Farmington is just part of School Administrative District No. 9, comprising nine communities. The Town of Wilton joined with School Administrative District No. 9, mostly on theory that we would have an Area Vocational School, and that this was something that was sorely needed in our area. I hope you will vote against the motion of Mr. Bragdon to accept his report.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I had not intended to comment extensively on this bill at this time. However, after listening to the remarks of the gentleman, Representative Shute, I feel it might be appropriate at this time, to read into the record a statement from Commissioner Logan of the Department of Education, which was handed to the Appropriations Committee the other day. It might clear up some — help somewhat in understanding the situation we are now in. I regret having to take this amount of time but I feel that I would like to do this at this time. This is the statement from William Logan; he says:

"The Attorney General has ruled that C. 224, Public Law 1967 places all school construction assistance back on the so-called installment basis regardless of whether funds may or may not be available in sufficient amount to permit lump sum payments.

Since regional technical and vocational center construction assistance by provisions of Sec. 2356-B, Title 20, MRSA, is payable at the same time and in the same installments that general school construction is paid (Sec. 3457, as amended by C. 224, P. L. 1967, or L. D. 107) there is no requirement for a bond issue of any amount for regional construction subsidies provided a direct appropriation from current revenue is made to cover the subsidies payable on the installment plan.

A further condition of Sec. 2356-B and of Sec. 3457 is that payment will be made annually in December covering expenditures made by the unit during the year as shown by information filed with the Commissioner of Education on or before November 1 of that year. The Attorney General previously had ruled that the "year" from which the expenditures were to be subsidized was the twelve months period ending November 1, and not the State or local fiscal year or the calendar year.

Only four regional technical and vocational centers conditionally approved by the State Board are far enough advanced in construction plans to permit any possibility of completion by November 1, 1968 which would be the latest date on which assistance payments during the 1967-1969 biennium could be based. The law also forbids construction subsidy payments prior to the completion of a building.

Consequently, the only cost required to be met in the 1967-1969 biennium is the installment reimbursement on the four projects which we estimate will be completed.

As we estimate them, the reimbursements payable will be: Bath, \$29,655, Lewiston \$77,520, S.A.D. No. 1, \$63,660 and S.A.D. No 54, which has the Skowhegan District, \$42,000, making a total of \$212,775.

We point out that \$104,715 of the estimated \$212,775 total will represent reimbursements on interest expense of the local units. Federal vocational education funds may not be used for the reimbursement of interest costs.

The State Board of Education has approved regional centers only conditionally except for those that do not require building construction. It has taken the position that it would approve no center where construction is required until the State funds for reimbursement are made available. Therefore, even the four centers named have received only conditional approval and are undertaking development of plans and specifications at their own risk.

This position will be maintained and, if any funds provided by the

Legislature are sufficient only for the four units named, it is doubtful whether further development of regional centers will ensue since they can not receive final approval until State money is available and the money apparently will be made available only for approved centers. This creates a situation where the State Board will be unable to give final approval to other units which have been designated as centers because of the continued unavailability of State construction funds."

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The gentleman mentions the various areas where these funds would be expended and the memo from the Education Department naturally indicates where they would be. As a matter of fact, the City of Lewiston, presently, the project is presently on the table in the State Board of Education until they meet such requirements as they must meet. I think these will be met, but nevertheless, their application has not entirely been approved of and it would make no difference to me whether it would be. As a matter of fact, one of these projects, SAD 1, is directly in the back yard of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, as it concerns itself with Castle Hill, Chapman, Mapleton, Presque Isle and Westfield and knowing where the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon lives, I don't think that is too far distant from his area and I am sure the people within his own back yard would take advantage of this program.

It is only natural for the Department of Education, rightfully so, to say just what this program would do with the limited funds that they have. They watered the bond issue originally to \$7 million, then it was cut down from 7 to 5 and the Governor's Program called for \$3 million and the Republican Program, as set forth recently, calls for \$3 million. This since then, according to a ruling of the Attorney General has gone under the L. D. 107 concept of installment program so it is now

down to \$212,775. I think that these figures, these memos as set forth by the Department is fair. I think that they have spelled out the programs as they would be. It is only natural that this program will expand, and certainly I do hope it expands. It wouldn't hurt my feelings any if it would expand and double itself even right now. But I think this is what the traffic can stand and can bear and I think we ought to go along with it.

And I repeat, I do hope the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, does not prevail so that we can move with the "Ought not to pass" and go along with the starting of this program.

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

Mr. McMANN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have plans drawn for an addition to the high school in Bath which costs \$1,300,000. I had the privilege to be on that Committee and I just read in this morning's paper where night before last the city government has authorized their payment to go along with the plans and we are in hopes to get one of these schools. I believe both parties have come up with the proposition that it is nice to keep the young folks in the State of Maine. There are a great many young folks who do not desire to go to college, but do like to work with their hands and we have a few of those people in Bath and it would not be only for Bath, it would be Bath and the surrounding territory for around 17 or 18 miles both ways and we think it would take in about 40 or 50,000 population altogether and we hope that the motion is defeated so that we can go on with business.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Winthrop, Mrs. Baker.

Mrs. BAKER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am going to vote against this motion on the Floor of the House. I agree wholeheartedly with the Representative from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert. I want to bring out just a couple of reasons for this decision. In the 102nd

Legislature we started out with the first vocational technical high school—that is aid to the vocational school on the secondary level. That was in York, and I went with that all the way and very proud that I did. This was sort of a pilot program and I think it has demonstrated its worth and this year in our Committee on Education we had data on these eleven high schools that would have been OK'd by the State Department of Education on the vocational level for aid.

I'm very sorry and concerned that we have to drop it back to four, as this bill would do now, because I think this is an area we need to enlarge upon and go forward. I might bring out this point. Many of you of course realize it but I want to stress it.

We have such a large dropout in the high school level, and I believe wholeheartedly that this will stem that tide; it will help so much in keeping our young people in high school if they can be working along this line, the vocational, and stress more on that line, it's going to keep them in school. Every child is not wholly ready for the academic course of study, and the manual arts in a lot of the high schools are just not far enough advanced to do that child as much good as he wishes so he still drops out. This will help I am sure on the dropout feature, and I hope you will defeat the motion before the House at the present time.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Lebanon, Mrs. Hanson.

Mrs. HANSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As all of the previous speakers have stolen all of the thunder that I was going to try to throw — I will simply say that I am very much in favor of this money being allocated to the high school level of vocational education. For years we tried to get vocational education to save the young people who were not interested in school, and I visited not only the Burlington High School that Mr. Shute mentioned, but I visited the Sanford Vocational School and it is amazing the interest in these young people, that this

has stirred up in these young people as a result of these courses, some of them going on and realizing they needed more academic education. But all of our young people cannot go to vocational technical institutes or to college, and if we do not take care of these young people and give them some interest in working, in wanting to work, we are going to have that many more people who will be on our Health and Welfare rolls because they won't know how to work, they won't want to work and they will just have their hands out and you have got to take care of them. I am very much in favor of this bill, the passage of this bill for the \$3 million.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Solon, Mr. Hanson.

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I believe now that I have this thing resolved in my own mind and I understand that this bill does apply to vocational training within the secondary school system.

This is something in which I wholeheartedly concur. For a number of years I felt very strongly that the small school systems in the various small towns have a very difficult job of providing adequate vocational and home economic training for their young people. I do feel that the small schools do provide an exemplary training for college preparatory work; I think they send some very fine college students on, but it is difficult for them to finance and provide good teachers for vocational training.

I feel myself that a vocational training school within the secondary school system to which they can commute, within commuting distance of these small towns would be of very, very worthwhile benefit. These area post secondary school vocational centers often times require housing, dormitory facilities and as has been pointed out by previous speakers, many of our young people cannot take the opportunity to have the advantage of going to these far-removed school systems. I do feel further that incorporating vocational training within existing school systems

such as Farmington or Skowhegan, and some of these areas where they are going to build a school system, school buildings, and have a vocational training anyway, that with the expenditure of slightly more State funds we can get a facility that will service a great number of these small towns.

I feel this is a very worthwhile proposition and I hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Gauthier.

Mr. GAUTHIER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am very much interested in vocational schools. As you know I sponsored a bill in this House in regards to loans for these vocational students, and I feel that in our high schools we've had quite a few dropouts in all these years, and I think that one of the reasons was that our students — we have about probably seventy percent that won't go to college, but at least if we work hard in this direction to furnish them with a certain amount of vocational education I think you will cut down immensely on these drop-outs and will give a chance to these people to earn a living for themselves later on, so I hope that you defeat the motion of the gentleman, Mr. Bragdon.

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

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I'll probably go along with the crowd and vote for this, but it still raises many questions in my mind.

We talk about the dropout. I think we would have less dropouts if we had a better secondary school system than we presently have. I would rather see emphasis given to television and modern technology in our present schools. One of the reasons that we have dropouts is because, partly because of teachers like me I suppose, although I might say this — that I don't have dropouts from my class because when they get in my class and are good citizens and try — they're going to pass anyway; a certain group of them.

Probably forty percent of our students in high school today are non-academic, but that doesn't mean that they do not learn anything.

Now a great many of them we call them lugs. The lug is sort of a boy who we haven't given up on, but we know he's young, he hasn't gotten interested in anything yet; if you build him a million dollar vocational high school he will not be interested in vocational education at that time. But some of these lugs who are not interested in anything at the time, we put them down in the vocational department of our present high school and they do have a chance to move around, they don't have to sit at a desk, in a chair. Some of these kids — the reason they drop out they get bored — awfully bored because of the routine; they come to school at eight o'clock in the morning and they sit in a little chair at a little desk until 2:10 in the afternoon and lots of them don't sit up — they go to sleep, and we let them sleep because we don't want to disturb the students that are studying. And if you think I'm not speaking the truth, I wish you would spend some time in the classroom — spend a few years. It sometimes gripes me that all of these people up here in the Legislature think they can solve problems by simple symbols. Oh we have dropouts. Let's give them vocational education and we'll stop our dropout problem. I don't think that is the case.

Now it seems to me also that we're starting in on a multi, multi, multi-million dollar program here and we don't see the end of it. We've heard it mentioned that we have four centers established — then we hear the figure fourteen, and then twenty. I would recall to your mind that this vocational education at the moment is going through a great revolutionary change just like all things in our educational procedures.

If you read the New York Sunday Times you will see the debate that's going on. Some of our vocational schools today teach things that will never be used. They're

teaching skills that have gone out of date.

I would personally like to see this thing started even though we know in the educational field that the emphasis has always been in getting our post secondary vocational schools started. They don't want the unacademic boy in a post secondary vocational school. You've got to learn to study a square, and you've got to know mathematics and you've got to be able to read well and comprehensively—and they don't want them—even in high school they don't want the kids that can't read and write and spell and figure, and if you think there aren't a lot of them in high school that can't, you're just fooling yourself.

I would like to see this thing started—I really would, but I'd like to see it started on a pilot-school venture. Get one good school started, concentrate on it, get your vocational teachers, and I don't know if you've got enough vocational teachers in this State to supply four vocational schools. It just does seem to me that we're putting a lot of carts before the horses.

As I say, I'll probably go along with this and vote with the crowd, but I would rather see it—because Portland is going to get one of these and it will probably be a beautiful, nice centrally located vocational school to take care of Westbrook, South Portland, Portland and what not. I'd like to see one good pilot school started, estimate the expense, estimate the product, that's one thing we have never done in our schools yet is estimate the product. The only test we've had, testing the product, is the international test in mathematics. Of all the nations in Western Europe and ourselves, and the Orient, and who came out first in mathematics in the international test? Japan! And the United States came out lowest.

Now I say we're going through a revolutionary period in our education and I hate to see us come up here and put our names to a multi, multi, multi-million dollar program without some testing of it before we start.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I'm going to speak this morning to you not as the Minority Floor Leader but in an individual capacity as a Representative of this House.

It is my sincere feeling that over the years we have discussed the possibilities of vocational education to take care of some of our students that were not able to go to college, and to further help to eliminate some of the dropouts. On some bases we have used the State of Connecticut or Massachusetts or a very highly industrialized state, that have had these kind of vocational schools since the early '40s to take care of their industrial growth. My feelings on this area of area vocational schools over and above our regional technical vocational schools will be too thinly spread throughout the State for the amount of population that we have and the amount of industrial development that we have.

I think probably this morning this House would be wise in its adoption of trying to expand our present vocational facilities rather than going to small area vocational schools tied in with the high school level.

As was pointed out, the technical needs of now and the future will not be tied in too closely with these area schools tied in with the high school programs, but will be very much tied in with the regional vocational high schools which are becoming very technical in their teachings. So this is why this morning I don't feel that it would be wise for this House to adopt this type of a program. We would too thinly spread our vocational monies rather than to expand our presently and very efficiently operated regional vocational schools that are being proven to be tremendous in its providing efficient school system for our secondary trained people of the future. So that's why that I feel that if we spread it too thinly over all the state with the amount of population that we have, the amount of industrial needs that we have, I

feel that we will be spreading it a little bit too thin for what our needs will be.

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

Mr. SHUTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to ask Mr. Levesque what he would suggest that I go back and tell the voters in the nine towns that are voting on this problem next Wednesday. Shall I tell them, Mr. Levesque, that we are not going to pass on this—a bond issue—because the State Department of Education and the Legislature no longer wishes you to teach our building trades, electricity and electronics, our power mechanics, plumbing and heating, metal trades, forestry, special education, distributive education, vocational industrial cooperative education, industrial arts which now is being taught in shop form at Farmington High School, and drafting. Should I go to them and tell them that, no they should vote against this bond issue? Remember this \$2.7 million bond issue which we're voting on in our nine towns next Wednesday includes an \$800,000 area vocational school which will serve northern Androscoggin and all of Franklin County and parts of Somerset, and parts of Oxford County. Should we go back and tell them that no, the Legislature doesn't want you to vote on this—vote it down?

Now I would like to ask a question through the Chair, Mr. Speaker, of Mr. Bragdon, the gentleman from Perham or any member of the Appropriations and Financial Committee if they care to answer it—what indeed shall we tell our people back home—back in Eoulton and Farmington and our area—what shall we tell them? How shall we tell them to vote? Shall we tell them that if they approve this bond issue next Wednesday that they'll have to wait a long time before they see their \$800,000 or their \$600,000 portion of their area vocational school? What shall we tell them, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House? This is what we want to know. We would like to have the answer. Are we going to

tell them—no you can't start building your school in August of this year—you can't start your students in the sophomore, junior and senior years in the fall of 1968 when this building will have been completed. What shall we tell them, Mr. Speaker? Can we have this answered?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Shute, poses a question through the Chair to any member of the Appropriations Committee who may answer if they choose, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hinds.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I might say first of all, for Mr. Shute's information, that his school is not included in this memorandum at this time anyway; of course this could be changed by an amendment of the Legislature. Number one.

Number two. I do believe that your area is eligible for subsidies under the Sinclair Act and under the Building Construction Act, so you would be eligible for funds on this building anyway under that Act. It might not be quite as glamorous to you as seventy-five percent which is available to you under this Act, but any community that wants to build a vocational school or improve their vocational system may do this and if they're eligible for Sinclair funds they're entitled to apply for these.

Now I'm going to give you one example, and first of all I want to say that I am a hundred percent in favor of vocational education and have been for years and I'm not talking against vocational education, I'm just saying and echoing some of the sentiments of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cottrell, that I don't think—I think this should be a pilot thing first, and as a matter of fact what little bit of a pilot program we have right now in my estimation hasn't proved very satisfactory, and I'm going to tell you what I mean by that.

The City of Westbrook is established as an area vocational center. There's been no construction funds available but they do get the two-thirds subsidy of their operating cost. They notified the

City of South Portland that they could take approximately ten or fifteen of our students in a vocational education program. This has been going on this whole school year, and the guidance people and the school system tried to find ten or fifteen students who would be willing to go to an area vocational program in the City of Westbrook. They were able to find four, and in talking with the Principal here a week of so ago one of the four have dropped out of the course and now they have started on a new year in interviewing students to try to talk more students into going—and by the way, we have to pay a tuition charge, the local communities pay a tuition charge to the community that has the area vocational school, and our School Board allotted enough for quite a number of students to go there.

They're going to have a surplus in that account because all they could at the date I talked to them a week ago was find two additional students who would be willing to attend this school. They don't want to leave their school system—they don't want to leave the boys and girls they've been brought up with or the teachers they know, and the sports they participate in, and things of this nature; and so consequently I don't think—and this is my personal opinion from discussing it with my school officials, I don't think it's panning out. I think maybe in a different setup it would, and I'd be very willing to try a pilot program somewhere and go for that whole hog and let the thing be sold for a few years, and if I was proven wrong I'd vote for the whole program, but I'm not voting necessarily against expenditures although that's one thing I think we're moving in the wrong direction to help these students.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, two years ago we voted for a \$500,000 bond issue to have a school program on area vocational schools in York County. We voted then a sum — an out and out sum on a bond issue of \$500,000. I re-

peat myself, we voted two years ago to allow the people to vote on a \$500,000 bond issue for a school on a secondary level in York County. At the same time we voted on L. D. 44 which would be the start of the implementation of a statewide program of area vocational schools. We started to implement the program; we set up the mechanics for it; we set the whole program up under one roof.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque, how he voted on setting up the secondary vocational school in York County — number one. Number two — how he voted on L. D. 44 which sets this program up?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque, who may answer if he chooses.

The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Question number one. On the question of area vocational school two years ago, I voted against it, because I did not feel that that was going to provide that kind of a program in York County, or certainly if it was going to provide a good program in York County on the high school level that all the high schools throughout the state could benefit. And this probably bears my thinking out that in an area vocational school tied into the high school, being a state of less than a million in population and not a very highly industrialized state, that the type of training that they would have in these schools would be very minimum and would not serve in the best interest of our state.

Then question number two. I voted purely on L. D. 44 that if it was going to be of some benefit to some areas that certainly I should not vote against it for those particular areas.

Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston was granted permission to speak a third time.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman

from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque, for his affirmative answer. This bill does just that — it satisfies a few areas and later on subsequent legislation will satisfy other areas.

And while I'm on my feet I might make this comment here. Insofar as I am concerned personally, many years ago and wherein this bill involves my area in Lewiston it would take sections of, even go into this northern part of Cumberland and go into even around the Brunswick area and some even the southern part of Oxford as the other school does — the other post secondary school does. The fact of the matter remains that it would be, however, constructed in my area.

I can well recall many many years ago when I voted and spoke for the Sinclair Act, I knew that when I voted for the Sinclair Act that it would cost the City of Lewiston continuously year in and year out, thousands and thousands of dollars as it did, as it does, as it will continue to do — for two reasons, and we know both reasons. That, however, did not deter me from voting to help out the further expansion of our badly needed expansion programs on whatever federal level they need to be expanded. Insofar as the AED Report, I would like to ask any member of this House to not only read the AED Report as it was originally given to us but the second and third versions of the report concerning AED, and see what their thinking is on the programs of vocational training. When we first read the program wherein it concerns the AED program, wherein it concerns vocational training, why what we read about the vocational training — education in this State, I shudder. I mean they quickly retract their statements, because even the opponents of this measure today very graciously admitted that we have very fine programs of educational training. However, as the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Shute, said, we will get to that area later on.

I certainly hope again that the measure will have passage.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wilton, Mr. Scott.

Mr. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This matter has been thoroughly debated here this morning. I do want to support the position of the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Shute, one hundred percent.

I'm a little shocked at the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon. I feel it is somewhat of a low blow, especially to Franklin County after what the Senatorial Reapportionment Committee has done to that area, and I hope that you will defeat his motion today. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. D'Alfonso.

Mr. D'ALFONSO: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would feel somewhat remiss if I did not add at least a few comments to this particular piece of legislation, and I say this simply for the reason that I had the opportunity to experience five wonderful years as a school teacher at the Junior High School level. This is the time of the year when we hear commencement speakers emphatically make reference to the fact that we should train our youth to be useful and productive citizens.

All our students are classified usually into three broad categories: The twenty percent who are going to be thoroughly qualified to go onto higher education; the sixty percent who are the multitude who will go on to be the backbone and bulwark of our society, and the twenty percent at the bottom rung of the ladder whom the other eighty percent will have to take care of. And what has happened in education — particularly since the advent of "Sputnik". We have seen the tremendous emphasis on orienting our educational program towards the post secondary level. It seems that everyone wants to become a college graduate. I don't say that this is wrong, but I do say it's impossible.

What is happening to our students, particularly as they reach that crucial moment in their educa-

tion at the Junior High School level? They are finding themselves in a position where they have to decide either — I train myself to go on to college, or I just sit and listen. And I can assure you as a teacher, having taught science and mathematics for five years at the Junior High School level, that the multitude of students at the Junior High School level are spending nothing more than perfunctory days in the seventh, eighth and ninth grades. Their education is not realistic; their education is not functional. They are not in a position where they can look towards an immediate program that will make them useful and productive citizens; and to my way of thinking, the most adequate way to make them useful and productive citizens is to embark on this program of secondary, vocational education.

This, I think, will help this country, this state and our local areas a lot more than it ever has in the past. So, if we would make our educational programs functional and realistic, let us by all means vote to see this program go through and to be initiated.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Allen.

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Every time I see statistics on education I am disappointed in the showing of Maine. The other side of the shield is that I went over to Manchester, New Hampshire and met with other members of the Education Committees of three states and I was impressed with what Maine is doing, particularly at the high school level. How much farther along the road we are with our Sinclair Act than those two states are.

I also went to Burlington, Vermont. I was very much impressed with what they had in Burlington. They had a high school, a dandy high school, on a 50-acre lot; a good vocational department where the boys in that vocational department mingled with the other high school students, and I couldn't help but come away and think that was a fine idea.

I was impressed with the fact that in Vermont, however, the emphasis on vocational education is at the high school level. The emphasis in Maine has been at the post-graduate level. Vermont is thinking of perhaps doing something at the post-graduate level, but recognizes it's a pretty expensive field. We may have gone down the wrong road — I don't think so, in emphasizing at the post-graduate level. I would like to see many things done in education. I recognize also that we must be fiscally responsible. I recognize also that we've just started on the road of post-graduate vocational education and I think that we shouldn't spread out too far at this time. Let's do a good job at these post-graduate vocational schools. I would agree with Mr. Levesque, the Representative from Madawaska, that we ought to, at this point, emphasize post-graduate vocational education.

I know that there's a small group that goes on to college. There is an intermediate group going to these vocational schools, and in the lowest group we do have the dropouts. I want to see us tackle that problem, but if I have to decide between the two problems, I think that our emphasis now should be on that center group that is going mainly, I hope, to our post-graduate vocational schools — then tackle the other later — do a good job with one and then go on with the other. I'm afraid that we can't do both at this time.

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

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think there have been some very excellent discussions on both sides of this issue. Several points that I have come to mind though. One of them is the area of dropouts in the State of Maine, and there are some very interesting statistics put out by the National Education Association which are up to date, and surprisingly the State of Maine has one of the highest percentages of people between the ages of five and seventeen in school at the present time. Last year the aver-

age daily membership in schools in the State of Maine between five and seventeen was 84.3 percent which is the highest in New England, which is about seven percent above the percentage in Vermont which is better than two percent above the entire country, and it would indicate that the dropout level may not be as acute as it is in other areas of the country.

I know in my own experience home, and I think the gentleman from Madawaska enjoys the same experience, that the dropout level in the schools home is at an extremely low level. This is partly done by the encouragement of the local company in not hiring our young people until their class graduates from high school and encouraging them to stay in school, and this has worked very successfully.

I do also believe that the desire for post secondary vocational schools, improving them, is a worthwhile area. We presently have four of these schools going in various stages of development and indications are that there may be a fifth one develop from the outcome of this Legislature. There's only one of these schools that in my mind that is one hundred percent up to the level that it should be, and that is the one in South Portland.

If we are going to continue we should continue to develop this area before we start to branch out into other areas. I also know that the availability of teachers is very limited; I know that there are many schools in the State of Maine today that presently can't even hire vocational teachers. I'm not even sure where we could find teachers to staff these schools if we did have them going. The cost of operation to the state is going to be excessive because the state is obligated to pay sixty-six percent of the cost of operating these schools for students at the secondary level, and is obligated to pay ninety percent of the cost of all adult education. This can run into a figure that in future legislatures could cause the requirement for a great deal more taxing. Right now we're facing with the tax problem, and whether we are able to pass

it through this Legislature, and I'm sure that programs of this type are going to require a great deal more taxing and it would seem that we should primarily develop what we have in the operating stage right now before we should branch out into other areas.

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

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I just want to define the dropout a little bit more comprehensively. I think I am most accurate when I state this fact—that the dropout rate in college is about the same as the dropout rate in high school, and it indicates that in our society today we are in a great revolutionary period, that all of our educational procedures are being closely studied. The Carnegie Foundation wants to put up millions of dollars along with Harvard University as its guide to test the product of our education on all levels, and there are going to be more polls from teachers, from students, to check our total educational system.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lincoln, Mr. Porter.

Mr. PORTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: For thirty-five years I've lived with a program similar to what we're talking about now. I know the strengths, I know many of the weaknesses. My advice to the State of Maine is to go slowly—very, very slowly.

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

Mr. HEALY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: To speak against education at any level is about as popular as speaking against the Bible. However, I note that the accumulated bond issues are totaling about \$70 million, and I haven't forgotten what the people said about them in June of last year. If we keep pyramiding bond issues for these propositions it's conceivable that the whole works could go down the drain.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Brag-

don, that the House accept Report "B" or "Ought not to pass" Report. A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All of those desiring a roll call will vote yes, those opposed will vote no, and the Chair opens 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: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, that the House accept Report "B" or "Ought not to pass" Report on Bill "An Act to Authorize Bond Issues in the Amount of \$3,000,000 to Provide Funds for the Construction of Regional Technical and Vocational Centers under the Provisions of Section 2356-B of Title 20, R. S.," House Paper 399, L. D. 565. All of those in favor of accepting the "Ought not to pass" Report will vote yes, those opposed will vote no, and the Chair opens the vote.

ROLL CALL

YEA—Allen, Berman, Birt, Bradstreet, Bragdon, Champagne, Cottrell, Crosby, Drummond, Dudley, Dunn, Durgin, Hanson, P. K.; Harnois, Harriman, Hawes, Healy, Henley, Hinds, Huber, Immonen, Janelle, Levesque, Littlefield, Lycette, Minkowsky, Mosher, Nadeau, J. F. R.; Philbrook, Porter, Prince, Rackliff, Rocheleau, Scott, G. W.; Scribner, Snow, P. J.; Susi, Thompson, Trask, Waltz, Watts, Wight.

NAY—Baker, E. B.; Baker, R. E.; Bedard, Belanger, Beliveau, Benson, Bernard, Binnette, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Brennan, Brown, Buck, Bunker, Burnham, Carey, Carrier, Carroll, Carswell, Clark, Conley, Cookson, Cornell, Cote, Crockett, Crommett, Curran, Cushing, D'Alfonso, Danton, Darey, Dickinson, Drigotas, Eustis, Evans, Ewer, Farrington, Fecteau, Fortier, Foster, Fraser, Fuller, Gaudreau, Gauthier, Gill, Giroux, Hall, Hanson, B. B.; Hanson, H. L.; Harvey, Haynes, Hennessey, Hewes, Hich-

ens, Hodgkins, Hoover, Humphrey, Hunter, Jalbert, Keyte, Kilroy, Lebel, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Martin, McMann, Miliano, Nadeau, N. L.; Noyes, Pike, Quinn, Richardson, G. A.; Rideout, Robertson, Ross, Roy, Sahagian, Sawyer, Scott, C. F.; Shaw, Shute, Snowe, P.; Soulas, Starbird, Tanguay, Truman, Wheeler, White, Wood.

ABSENT—Couture, Dennett, Edwards, Jameson, Jewell, Kyes, Maddox, McNally, Meisner, Payson, Pendergast, Quimby, Richardson, H. L.; Robinson, Sullivan, Townsend, Williams.

Yes 42; No, 90; Absent, 17.

The SPEAKER: Forty-two having voted in the affirmative and ninety in the negative, the motion to accept Report "B" or "Ought not to pass" Report does not prevail.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, thanking the House very warmly, I now move the acceptance of Report "A" "Ought to pass."

Thereupon, Report "A" "Ought to pass" was accepted and the Bill read twice.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 399, L. D. 565, Bill, "An Act to Authorize Bond Issues in the Amount of \$3,000,000 to Provide Funds for the Construction of Regional Technical and Vocational Centers Under the Provisions of Section 2356-B of Title 20, R. S."

Amend said Bill, in the Title, by striking out the figure "\$3,000,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure '\$215,000'

Further amend said Bill by striking out in the 4th line of section 1 (same in L. D. 565) the figure "\$3,000,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure '\$215,000'

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of the last sentence of section 3.

Further amend said Bill by striking out in the 2nd line of the 2nd paragraph of section 7 (same in L. D. 565) the figure "\$3,000,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure '\$215,000'

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill assigned for

third reading the next legislative day.

**Third Reader
Indefinitely Postponed**

Bill "An Act Appropriating Funds for Fort Fairfield Municipal Park" (S. P. 422) (L. D. 1076)

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

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

Mr. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Because one of the towns I represent is interested in a municipal park and funds to expand the same, I was particularly interested in this document. I want to read you what it says, what it does, and I will just read the last three lines in the first paragraph. It says: "The Town of Fort Fairfield is authorized to accept from any source, federal, state or local, further funds to aid in accomplishing the purpose of this Act." And in the statement of facts, it says: "The funds requested would, together with substantial federal, state and local participation, permit Fort Fairfield to establish a municipal park * * *."

Number one, I have checked this out, there is no such thing as state funds available for this type of a park. Number two, in order to get federal funds you have to have—the federal funds will match them, in other words, if you put in \$9,000 or \$10,000 whatever the figure may be, the federal government will match it.

Now it looks to me in this bill as though Fort Fairfield was trying to get \$9,000 from the taxpayers of the State of Maine to help pay for their fifty percent matching funds or a portion thereof, and I think if we pass it we'll have a lot of other towns that need it and I furthermore don't think it is fair to the other taxpayers to ask them to subsidize the Town of Fort Fairfield, and I move for indefinite postponement of this bill.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Hollis, Mr. Harriman, now moves the indefinite postponement of item 1, L. D. 1076.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I concur with the gentleman, Mr. Harriman. In 1959 before this Legislature was a bill to build an addition to the private hospital in Fort Fairfield under the guise there would be a T.B. wing. This passed finally over my objection and it cost the State \$550,000 and the Federal Government \$550,000 or a million a hundred thousand dollars. The last session of the Legislature realized by then that it would not be used for that. We sold Fort Fairfield that addition for one dollar. I think we have done enough for Fort Fairfield.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Hollis, Mr. Harriman, that Bill "An Act Appropriating Funds for Fort Fairfield Municipal Park" S. P. 422, L. D. 1076 be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. Snowe of Auburn requested a division.

The SPEAKER: A vote has been requested. 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. 92 having voted in the affirmative and 11 in the negative, the Bill was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act relating to Salary and Expenses of Third Member of Atlantic Sea Run Salmon Commission" (H. P. 1195) (L. D. 1698)

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

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

Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Speaker, may I have this item tabled until Monday, June 12?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Littlefield, now moves this matter be tabled until Monday, June 12.

Mr. Healy of Portland requested a division.

The SPEAKER: A vote has been requested. All those in favor of this matter being tabled and spe-

cially assigned for Monday, June 12 will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

39 having voted in the affirmative and 50 having voted in the negative, the tabling motion did not prevail.

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

Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: When this bill first came in here under Document 530 it said that the Commissioner of Sea and Shore Fisheries and the Commissioner of Inland Fisheries and Game shall receive an annual salary of \$500, and the bill has been put out in new draft, and the third member is to receive \$1500. He shall receive necessary expenses when engaged in the discharge of his official duties. Now I looked up under the Atlantic Sea Run Commission and I find that they have three biologists at about an average salary of \$9,000 a year which is \$27,000 and a Clerk for \$4,000 a year which makes an expense of about \$30,000 a year. It seems to me that's money enough. They have the three biologists and I therefore move that this bill and all its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Littlefield, moves this bill be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. NADEAU: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make just one slight correction. Ever since that time the Commissioner of Inland Sea and Shore has gotten a raise, it is not \$500, it's gone up again. I hope you will back this up and kill it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird.

Mr. STARBIRD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am not certain of the salaries of anybody going up. There are two documents, two redrafts concerning salaries of all department heads that will be before this House before too long. However, this does

not concern any department head. The department heads have been amended out of the bill. The original bill as Mr. Littlefield reminded you did have the department heads included, and then taken out. What this bill is now saying in the new draft is as it will read in the law, the third member shall receive an annual salary of \$1500, he shall receive necessary expenses when engaged in the discharge of his official duties. You can read it in Document 1698. There will be appropriated for 1967-68 \$1125 and in '68-69 \$1500. This is the third member, this is a public member and that's all he will receive with the expenses. We went all over, as I told you and the other members of the Committee did, we went all over these pros and cons in the Committee. We went over the idea of bringing the bill out ought not to pass. Finally we brought it out with this provision in it and I might remind you again that the State Government Committee were unanimous on this bill and I might remind you again that when you can get the State Government Committee to be unanimous on anything you have accomplished quite a lot in itself, so I beg you sincerely to go along with this.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Manchester, Mr. Rideout.

Mr. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I'm getting just as hungry as anybody else, and this is the time for shooting ducks in the pond, but the Committee was unanimous for this bill and I would remind you that yesterday we voted 93 to 12 in favor of it and I would urge you to do the same today.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Nadeau.

Mr. NADEAU: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question through the Chair as to who the other two members are and how much they will be getting paid?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Nadeau, poses a question through the Chair to any member who may answer if they choose and the Chair rec-

ognizes the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: May I remind you that the original L. D. under 530 provided that the department heads would have also received a raise. Under 1698, the redraft which we are now debating, the department heads of Sea and Shore and Fish and Game will receive only their regular salary and will not receive any other salary for this particular function which has to do with the Atlantic Sea Run Commission. The only one of the Commissioners that will receive a salary increase will be the third member of that commission who is a public member, and I also want to remind the House that this has nothing to do with the staff of the Commission, but has to do with the Commissioner.

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

Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Speaker, may I ask who this public member is going to be whose salary is going to be \$1500 and how much time is he going to put in for that amount of money?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Littlefield, poses a question through the Chair to any member who may answer if they choose and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, first of all there is presently a third member; I do not know who he is. As to the second portion of the question posed by Mr. Littlefield, at the present time the only thing he receives to my knowledge is the expenses that would go with his functions.

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

Mr. PHILBROOK: Mr. Speaker, at the present time he receives \$10.00 a day plus expenses. I think his name is Bond.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Littlefield, that Bill "An Act relating to Salary and Expenses of Third

Member of Atlantic Sea Run Salmon Commission" H. P. 1195, L. D. 1698 be indefinitely postponed. The Chair will order a vote. All those in favor of the indefinite postponement of this bill will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

27 having voted in the affirmative and 77 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

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

Third Reader Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act relating to Highway Commission Land Taking" (H. P. 1196) (L. D. 1699)

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

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There are some problems that have come up relative to L. D. 1699 and I would appreciate it if someone would table this until Tuesday, June 13.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Tuesday, June 13.

Bill "An Act relating to Salaries of Jury Commissioners and County Officers in the Several Counties of the State and Court Messenger of Cumberland County" (H. P. 1197) (L. D. 1700)

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

Mr. Beliveau of Rumford offered House Amendment "B" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "B" to H. P. 1197, L. D. 1700, Bill, "An Act Relating to Salaries of Jury Commissioners and County Officers in the Several Counties of the State and Court Messenger of Cumberland County."

Amend said Bill in section 1 by striking out all of the 11th paragraph, which relates to Oxford County (same in L. D. 1700), and inserting in place thereof the following:

'Oxford County: County commissioners, \$1,950; chairman, \$2,150; clerk of courts, \$4,500; county attorney, \$5,000; county treasurer, \$3,000; sheriff, \$4,800 \$5,500; register of deeds, eastern district, \$4,500; western district, \$2,700; judge of probate, \$4,200; register of probate, \$4,400.'

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

Mr. BELIVEAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: House Amendment "B" will increase the salary of the Sheriff of Oxford County from \$4800 to \$5500, and under the bill under L. D. 1700 the Committee on Towns and Counties increased it from \$4800 to \$5,000. Now there were two bills introduced into the House, one which would have given the Sheriff an increase to \$6,500 and the second one to \$6,000. Now the reason why this amendment was prepared, under another bill passed by the Legislature and which has been enacted and signed by the Governor I understand, the deputy sheriffs and chief deputies were all given a \$2.00 per day raise, so in Oxford County for instance, the Chief Deputy would have an annual salary of \$5760—no, \$5824, the Deputy Sheriffs would be receiving \$5760 and the Sheriff under the proposed salary increase would have received \$5,000.

Now the Oxford County Delegation has met on this matter and we voted unanimously to support this amendment at the \$5500 figure. Now I do not want to take up too much time here, but I am going to attempt to speak in anticipation of certain objections that may come out later on. Now the Sheriff in any county of course is the chief law enforcement officer, and it is quite apparent that he as well as any other state, municipal or county employee is entitled to a living wage. Now a salary of \$5,000 per year, which is less than a hundred dollars, certainly is not a living wage, and again it is not

good for the morale of the department, good for the morale of the Sheriffs and certainly would also make it difficult to attract competent, qualified law enforcement officer to become Sheriffs.

Now I believe the objection will be raised that the Sheriff has other fringe benefits. The Sheriff, as all other sheriffs and deputy sheriffs is entitled to mileage, the mileage of course is based on the number of miles which he actually operates his vehicle and is not a very profitable venture. In addition to this, I think another objection that will be raised is that this Sheriff as other Sheriffs is entitled to living quarters. Now it is not mandatory that the Sheriff live at the jail, he does not have to live there, it is provided for the chief jailer. In our case, the Sheriff lives some ten or twelve miles outside of town and commutes every day. But in summation, very briefly, ladies and gentlemen, this amendment had received the unanimous support of the Oxford County delegation and I trust you will support us in accepting the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Nadeau.

Mr. NADEAU: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. Beliveau for telling us there was a unanimous report for their part, but our committee gave it a unanimous report. He brought out some of the objections I might bring up, he is right, but he forgot to bring out some other plush things that go along with these jobs.

First of all I have here an attested copy signed by the County Commissioners of how they purchase their autos mind you, in the name of the county to evade all types of taxes, you know, sales tax, use tax, registration tax, the whole works, and then of course I understand this year they brought them back and you know what they had to pay, a lesser price. This is one little plush thing.

Secondly, I would like to bring to your attention that this same Sheriff's Department also overdrew to the tune of \$8543.06, only one minor thing. Also, I have the at-

tested sheets, this comes from their county, and they are up here for inspection, he has seen them, I could go on, I have a dozen of them here, but I'll just give you—there isn't one month that any of them are under \$200 for gas expenses. Now you know that's a lot of mileage. So you tack that onto their salary, plus other unmentionable things and I think they are getting a fair salary. We on the Committee of Towns and Counties are supposed to represent the whole state, we had a fair hearing, we came out with a good bill, it was used under the rule, it was unanimous that of the recommendation of the raise we gave them, but Mr. Beliveau even came up to us four extra times as late as June 1st to beg.

Now I would like to remind you that his county, there is only 44,000 people, and we thought that it was fair. If you raise this one I beg you to raise the other seven, and then we have not done our job and you should eliminate all committees. Our Committee was unanimous that it be left at \$5,000 and I would like to remind you that if you open the door for one you are going to open it for many, thank you.

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

Mr. SNOWE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am not necessarily opposed to this, I just hope we aren't setting any precedents. There are very few bills introduced for salary raises that we gave the entire amount to; we weren't very lenient this year on the Towns and Counties Committee, and I certainly hope that this is not setting a precedent. That is the only reason I would be opposed to this amendment.

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

Mr. CONLEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Looking over L. D. 1700 and just going through it rapidly the sixteen counties, the raises that have been given, I notice it is outstanding in Oxford County where there the Sheriff's increase was a few hundred dollars I be-

lieve from \$4800 to \$5,000, and yet when you come back here and check Androscoggin from \$5900 to \$6700; Aroostook from — well, I came right down through the list ladies and gentlemen and many of them are \$1,000, some of them \$900, some of them \$500, but I certainly believe for the raise specified by the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Beliveau that an increase of \$200 is not really much of an increase when you figure that the chief deputy would be making more money than the Sheriff who has to work to be elected for his office.

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

Mr. WIGHT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This salary bill was very well reviewed; it was considered by the reports from our County Commissioners as well as our reports from our delegations. Many of the salaries were adjusted to the best of our ability, and from the population, the size of the county and the area all was considered. We have many letters from our Oxford County towns and cities that oppose any increase in their budget. They feel that the budget should have been cut and in these reports from the selectmen of the various towns, I can only pick one, there are several proposed increases which are especially large, for the Sheriff's Department in particular, and I feel that these reports that we have received from the towns of Oxford County oppose much of any increase. We did increase some and we felt it was fair. If we start increasing these salaries now I feel that there will be others and I hope this amendment is not adopted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Norway, Mr. Henley.

Mr. HENLEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I intended to get up in defense of this amendment, but I wanted to sit and listen to the objections. I realize that several of them are valid, there may be some other counties that wish to follow; be that as it may, I feel that each act which we make here must stand

on its own merits regardless of what it may bring about or what has gone before.

I feel that in a lot of ways I am in a very good position to judge this. I worked with the Sheriff's Department as Civil Defense Director for the County for several years; I worked with two Sheriffs; I am quite familiar with their problems, with their so-called fringe benefits, with their mileage. We do have a problem of mileage in Oxford County as several others do, several counties do not, and the mileage situation is sort of an X factor, we cannot tell a deputy who is doing a job night and day when he gets so many miles run up, well, you will stay home the rest of the month.

As to my friend Mr. Nadeau's mention of the cars, and several others mentioned of budgets, there probably is no place in the State of Maine where politics rears its ugly head any more than at the County level especially in the Sheriff's Department. There have been rank accusations both ways politically. The purchase of automobiles in the past biennium was laid open to question but it was found to be completely legal at that time, even though I have been given to understand now that the practice was discontinued. The cars were paid for by the deputies, but I understand that they were allowed deferred payment and for a long time they were called County cars. Be that as it may, that is another question which has no bearing on this particular case. If you are going to have equality in your chief enforcement administrator who is the Sheriff of your County, a large county of around 45,000, not 44,000 people, a county 150 miles long with forty miles of Canadian border and 150 miles of State border for coordination and cooperation with the other states, and you have got twelve or fourteen full time deputies with a lot of part time deputies, the administrative responsibility of that man calls for a caliber which should receive definitely more than \$100 a week. I submit that regardless of the judgment of the committee, regardless of the fact that County

government is skyrocketing in cost, and as I stated the other day it may work itself out of a job, perhaps it will, but until such time as something else is substituted, I feel that we must have a strong Sheriff's Department, one that is going to call for quality in administrative leadership, for its law enforcement, someone who can control the manpower involved as well as to know politics.

I have no brief particularly with the present Sheriff or any other particular Sheriff. I still contend that the leader and the man who is going to make the responsible decisions in controlling this organization certainly is worth more than \$95 or \$98 a week. If not, we had better completely do away with it now. Possibly, we were ill-advised in upping the deputy salaries \$2 a day, be that as it may, it is law right now. They are getting more money than the Sheriff will be drawing even if we give him this \$5500 which the amendment calls for. But it certainly will be a nearer point of leadership. He can possibly excuse himself by saying that he stays home one day a week, or something like that. I want to mention in connection to one other objection to this thing. It is stated that our County had a lot of deficits, that we had a high budget which was not cut down, which is untrue. Our delegation, perhaps to the consternation of some of the officials involved, possibly to the Minority Party in this delegation, did cut the County Budget considerably. We cut in all directions because it was the mandate of the people, and I think that some of the objections which have gone into the Committee from individuals in some parts of the County, were motivated by personal political views rather than feeling that the job itself should have a good standing. So, I say that this amendment should be accepted and if we are going to have a good leader in that job, regardless of which party he is, that he should get a reasonable sum of money for his labors.

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

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would appreciate it if someone would make a motion to table this so that I could prepare an amendment from our county and I know of quite a few others that would like to do it at this time.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Winslow, Mr. Roy.

Mr. ROY: I move that this lie on the table until Monday, June 12th.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Winslow, Mr. Roy now moves that L. D. 1700 be tabled until Monday, June 12 pending the adoption of House Amendment "B."

Mr. Brown of Augusta requested a division.

The SPEAKER: A vote has been requested on the tabling motion. All those in favor of this matter being tabled will vote yes and those opposed will vote no and the Chair will open the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

14 having voted in the affirmative and 92 in the negative, the tabling motion did not prevail.

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

Mr. CROMMETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a member of the Towns and Counties Committee for the last three sessions, last two and this one, I would say that our House Chairman, Mr. White, has worked very diligently and conscientiously and I will support his remarks and hope the amendment B, this amendment here is not adopted.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the adoption of House Amendment "B." The Chair will order a vote. All those in favor of the adoption of House Amendment "B" will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

53 having voted in the affirmative and 57 having voted in the negative, House Amendment "B" failed of adoption.

Mr. Farrington of China 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. 1197, L. D. 1700, Bill, "An Act Relating to Salaries of Jury Commissioners and County Officers in the Several Counties of the State and Court Messengers of Cumberland County."

Amend said Bill by adding after section 1, a new section 2, as follows:

'Sec. 2. R. S., T. 30, § 3-A, additional. Title 30 of the Revised Statutes is amended by adding a new section 3-A, to read as follows:

§ 3-A. — Employees

All county employees, except those whose salaries are fixed by statute, shall receive, as of the first pay period following the effective date of this Act, a minimum hourly pay rate of \$1.60.'

Further amend said Bill by renumbering sections 2 and 3 to be sections 3 and 4.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the same gentleman.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House:

Bringing your attention to L. D. 1690 which sets the minimum wage for all state employees, this simply does the same thing for counties, sets the figure at the same amount, \$1.60 per hour. I have made inquiries, there are very few throughout the sixteen counties that are not now receiving this amount. This would not be expensive, and I urge you to support this amendment.

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

Mr. WIGHT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This amendment is being put on without any hearing and without too much concern from this Committee. I don't know just what this will do to our budgets that we have set for the various counties, how much effect this may have. And, I don't feel this amendment is necessary at this time. I move it is indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Being somewhat concerned with the general economy, I think most House members will agree with me that the inequity lies in the economy when we fail to be consistent in the area of setting wage scales especially, and more so where this House has acted in the area of State government and where County government is actually a creature of state government, I think by and large we have a duty to protect those employees on the county level. They do similar work to those who are on the State level. I see no reason, whatsoever, for this House leaving this segment out as far as the minimum wage goes. Kennebec County especially, where the Court House and those employed on the county level are but a few blocks from the State Capitol, there is a competitive area here. Although, as I said before, I was inquiring at the Kennebec County Courthouse only yesterday, I find that only one or two working for the county do not already receive over this \$1.60 per hour. Probably some would say that these areas are political plums, so to speak, but it is my contention that I think without a doubt, we would avoid some of these political plums if the County Commissioners knew that they were required to pay at least a minimum wage, and they would look hard and fast at some jobs called political plums. In the best interest of the taxpayer, in the best interest of the economy in order that we as Legislators are consistent, I again urge you to pass upon this amendment.

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

Mr. CROMMETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am right in the middle here, between my two very good friends of the opposition party, but I am going to support the House Chairman of the Towns and Counties Committee and urge you to oppose this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Nadeau.

Mr. NADEAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I hope you will not accept this amendment. First of all, it didn't go up before the Towns and Counties Committee, it didn't go up in front of your own people. The Federal government doesn't pay this amount of money at this time, no one knows whether the State level will be approved at this rate. In six months from now, we're going to be back here. We can always put it in then, and I'll be one of them that will be glad to do it, if at that time there is an injustice, but I do know in my own county when I was serving on the jury in the late months of 1966, I asked one of the girls how come, what's your job here? She says, "I come down here, my job is to see that they have coffee and donuts." No doubt we have coffee and donut girls in all counties and I think we should respect the people's wishes and not go through this back door.

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

Mr. SNOWE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a member of the Towns and Counties Committee, we spent a great deal of time studying this bill and we gave it serious consideration and I must stand behind my House Chairman and ask that you support his motion to indefinitely postpone this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Wight, that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed. If you are in favor of indefinite postponement you will say yes, if you are opposed you will say no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion to indefinitely postpone did prevail.

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

Third Reader Tabled and Assigned

Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Insuring Payment of Industrial Loans to

Fisheries and Agriculture (H. P. 1035) (L. D. 1501)

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

(On motion of Mr. Littlefield of Hampden, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Tuesday, June 13.)

Amended Bill

Bill "An Act relating to Qualification of Witnesses" (H. P. 510) (L. D. 723)

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.

Passed to Be Enacted Emergency Measure

An Act Revising the Laws Relating to the Reformatories for Men and Women (H. P. 742) (L. D. 1121)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 122 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Bond Issue Tabled and Assigned

An Act Providing a Bond Issue in the Amount of Fifty-nine Thousand Dollars for Constructing a Day School in Central Maine for the Mentally Retarded (S. P. 466) (L. D. 1158)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Denmark, Mr. Dunn.

Mr. DUNN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I opposed this when it came up a few days ago and I still am opposed to it. I think there is a better answer to this problem than to start a lot of local facilities around in various communities. I think something perhaps up around Bangor

would be sensible; I don't think this one is. I am going to vote against it and I hope you do too.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 14 of Article IX of the Constitution a two-thirds vote of the House being necessary, a total was taken, 90 voted in favor of same and 25 against.

Mr. Richardson of Cumberland requested a roll call.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, requests a roll call. 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 vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Southwest Harbor, Mr. Benson.

Mr. BENSON: Mr. Speaker, I move this matter be tabled until Monday, June 12.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Southwest Harbor, Mr. Benson, now moves this matter be tabled pending passage to be enacted and be especially assigned for Monday, June 12.

Mr. Nadeau of Sanford requested a division.

The SPEAKER: A vote has been requested. All those in favor of the tabling motion will vote yes and those opposed will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken. 71 having voted in the affirmative and 48 having voted in the negative, the tabling motion did prevail.

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act relating to Foreclosure of Bonds for Deeds and Contracts for Sale of Real Estate (S. P. 336) (L. D. 869)

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

Enactor Tabled and Assigned

An Act Creating the Maine Higher Education Development

Authority (S. P. 495) (L. D. 1257)

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

(On motion of Mr. Richardson of Stonington, tabled pending enactment and specially assigned for Tuesday, June 13.)

An Act relating to Dividends and Stock Held by Unknown Stockholders (S. P. 503) (L. D. 1218)

An Act Authorizing Joint Rates Between Certain Transportation Carriers (S. P. 609) (L. D. 1603)

An Act to Revise the Laws Relating to Authority for Granting Degrees and to Approval of Degree-Granting Institutions (S. P. 637) (L. D. 1641)

An Act Repealing the Law Requiring Assessment of Municipalities in Aid to Dependent Children Grants (H. P. 12) (L. D. 24)

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.

An Act relating to Wearing Fluorescent Clothing When Hunting in Southwestern Zone for Two Years (H. P. 671) (L. D. 943)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird.

Mr. STARBIRD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have debated long and loud about this item. To me, it is ridiculous. If this item is a safety measure as its proponents say, then it is good for the whole State. If it is not good for the whole State, it is not good for the southwestern zone or any other particular section of the state. To me this is dictation to the people; to me this means that the people who are hunting will say when a person is wearing fluorescent clothing that he is a hunter; when he isn't, he is some game animal, and this may not be completely true. There are other people besides hunters in the woods during the hunting season. I move that this item and all of its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird, moves that L. D. 943 be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Snowe.

Mr. SNOWE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to pose two questions to the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Gaudreau. What are the lines of the Southwestern Zone, and why doesn't this bill include the whole state?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Snowe, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Gaudreau, who may answer if he chooses.

The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. GAUDREAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The lines on this proposed zone now as it stands, is what was formerly known as the Southwestern Zone which is south of Route 2 to Skowhegan and west of the Kennebec River to its mouth.

I hope that answers your question.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley.

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I don't see this as a safety measure. I think more people could invariably get killed by this measure than we could save.

Now I see in the woods — because I have been a lumberman for a good part of my life and have had a lot of men working in the woods, and I'm in the woods a lot myself — not necessarily hunting — and no fooling, for the purpose for which I'm in there, I could very well get shot! Think about the children. Let's have the House's mind on children for a minute — let's reminisce about children for a minute.

In my area quite often children get lost in the woods where we'll spend days looking for them — at least one whole day, and it would seem that this bill would make them free shots, so to speak, because invariably they wouldn't have this fluorescent clothing and

our woodsmen don't have fluorescent clothing, and I think these hunters so to speak are a small percentage of the people that are in the woods. There are so many other things — and mind you this — there are so many other things that you'd be in the woods for other than hunting, and it would be too bad to shoot these people. (laughter)

I think at this point we're in a hurry, and let's not fool around. I move this bill be indefinitely postponed. I don't want to get shot.

The SPEAKER: The House will be in order, and the Chair will address the House.

Let's maintain a semblance of order and conduct the business of this Legislature as it should be done, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Gaudreau.

Mr. GAUDREAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: For the argument that they'd shoot at anything if they didn't have blaze orange, this is pure speculation. The records of hunting accidents in Maine show that almost without exception the victims are mistaken for game and out of sight of shooter accidents, are other hunters. There is nothing to indicate that the number of non-hunters will increase, or that the number of non-hunters that are shot at will increase. To repeat, accidents happen almost entirely where people are hunting, and the victims are almost exclusively other hunters. Frequently, in fact, the shooter and the victim are members of the same party and these accidents are even more tragic when those involved are related to one another.

Now there's thirteen other states that have color laws, and they do not have this problem. This bill was well debated by this House last week and I only want to make a few points clear.

Since the game wardens have made experiments in the field, they all agree that visibility accidents can almost completely be eliminated if all hunters wore some article of fluorescent clothing.

Massachusetts, for instance, has had no mistaken for game or visibility accidents since they adopted a similar measure. This measure would protect both the potential shooter and the victim. The shooter, although he may wear fluorescent orange to protect himself would be at fault if he injured or killed a hunter who doesn't care what he wears. This bill is aimed at stopping these tragic accidents where father shoots son, and brother shoots brother. Sixty-five percent of all hunting accidents happen between members of the same hunting party. The grief and economic loss to the families involved is great and this Legislature has a wonderful opportunity to do something worthwhile about safety. Let's not kill this opportunity. All we are asking is a two-year trial period in the most congested hunting zone.

Seventy-five percent of all hunters wear some type of fluorescent clothing now. It's the other twenty-five percent that we're concerned with. Out of the 420 hunting accidents that happened in the last eight years, only three victims were wearing fluorescent clothing, and if you'll just use a little arithmetic, if about seventy-five percent of these hunters wear these clothes you can see that only three of them were victims of an accident, and when the vote is taken I request a division.

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

Mr. SNOWE: Mr. Speaker, if I understand the gentleman from Lewiston correctly, Mr. Gaudreau, he says that this was formerly known as the Southwestern Zone. Well, what will we call it now, the "fluorescent zone?"

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Snowe, poses a question through the Chair to any member who may answer if they wish.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Woolwich, Mr. Harvey.

Mr. HARVEY: Mr. Speaker, just to Mr. Snowe, I'd like to see the whole State of Maine called the "fluorescent zone."

There's been three very good bills before this session—one was

a bill that I put in — a hunter safety bill which was scuttled — a guide's bill which was scuttled, and this bill here that looks like it's going to be scuttled.

Now it's a very enlightening experience to be sitting on a deer run at dusk, either in the morning or the evening, and see a patch of fluorescent orange come toward you with no figure underneath it. It also is an enlightening experience sitting on a deer run, still hunting, and see a blob coming toward you, not knowing whether it's a deer or a man or anything else. If you've been trained in safety, you won't shoot until you can see the legs, the neck and the whole animal, but if you've got an itchy trigger finger it has to be a deer that's coming out of a deer run and you can appropriately nail it, and then you've got a dead man on your hands, nine times out of ten.

I'll just relate a short experience I had last hunting season. Now at the last session this was up — I fought against it because I didn't want to be told what I was going to wear, but I think a few people in the woods now have to be told what they are going to wear.

We'd just shot three deer out of seven; four of them turned around and went into pine brush — four hunters went back into that little patch of woods to drive them out. I don't know why they picked me, but I was on the ledge to do the shooting when the other four came out again. They hadn't been there ten minutes when a nice little piece of buckskin came down through the brush there, it had to be a deer, it was the exact same color, so I eased the safety off my rifle — I didn't point it toward the object because I couldn't see it, and when it burst out of the pucker-brush about seventy-five yards — it was early in the morning — and I could see some long hair hanging down to the shoulders, and I said — that's an awful funny looking deer, it was spelled d-e-a-r, so I come off my ledge and walked down and said: "Young lady, you are going to get killed." She said: "Well" — she said "I didn't know anyone else was in these woods."

I said "Well back of you I don't know whether they are chasing you out of the brush or the deer that went in the brush, but there's four other hunters." It was a young lady, about 22, with a buckskin jacket on and not one bit of color. I had eased the safety off my rifle, but I hadn't pointed it because that was the way I was trained and brought up. You had to see the animal before you shot, and everything was a human being until you identified it as an animal.

If I had been another hunter with no training at all, who go out and say they're hunters and shoot anything that walks, she would have been dead, so at this Legislature just this small section of the State, I think it would be very smart of us to dictate to that section; give it a two-year trial period and if it works — fine. Let's make the whole State go blaze orange. If not, at the next session we can take it off the books, but I think it is well worth our while to go along with this trial. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley.

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, in a very serious vein, the gentleman just having spoken, from Woolwich, just about proves the point I was trying to make. A large percentage of the people that's in the woods are not hunters, therefore, they're not dressed in fluorescent yellow, they may be dressed in buckskin or something even lighter, but the point is, what they're saying is all true about the hunters. I'm talking about the other people that's in the woods, and there's been a lot of other people, surveyors for instance, lumbermen, and the lady in buckskin; I don't know what she was there for, but they're there nevertheless, and these are the people that I don't want to shoot at. I think that when you say — the people then assume that if you're in the woods you're going to have fluorescent yellow on, so what about the people that — may be an out-of-stater driving through? I've seen them park their car and go in the woods — I don't know what for, but I know they were in there, and you've seen it

too. I don't think we should make them fair play — shoot at them. I think this is a terrible bill; they might have been chasing rabbits, but nevertheless, they were in the woods.

I agree with everything they said; I'd like to see them wear fluorescent yellow, there's no law that says they can't. I wished we could impress upon them by putting posters along the road, or maybe on the cover of the Fish and Game books. "You may save your life by wearing fluorescent yellow — it may save your life." I think we should do something like that; I think we should point out to these people that are there hunting that they should do it, but I don't think we should say you must do it. This is the point that's wrong. I'm all for them wearing fluorescent yellow, but this saying you must do anything — it rubs my hair in the back the wrong way, and I hope you will go along with my motion and indefinitely postpone this bill, and I hope that we can make some advertisements or the Fish and Game Department will have some advertisements that will instruct people that this may save their lives and may be a good precautionary measure, but I just can't see part of the people in the woods with this on, and if the bill said that everybody in the woods had to have it on, this would be one thing — it doesn't even go that far, only hunters, and believe me they're a small percentage of the people in the Maine woods. Thank you.

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

Mr. CONLEY: Mr. Speaker, I pose a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, as to just how many people were killed in the woods last year that weren't hunting?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Conley, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, who may answer if he chooses, and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know as I can properly answer. One was killed in my

neighborhood, and he was sawing wood and had a chain saw going, and he had plenty of red clothing on. I can't think of any — I don't have time to run to the proper department to get it this minute, but I'm sure that a good percentage of them wasn't hunting. At least the one in my area wasn't hunting, and he had all red clothing on.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Woolwich, Mr. Harvey.

Mr. HARVEY: Mr. Speaker just to set the record straight, the young lady was hunting, if a 30-30 carbine is any indication. As far as woodsmen, surveyors, you never see a state surveyor in the woods any time during the fall without a cross of fluorescent and a fluorescent hat. I've never seen any woodsmen in the last several years, and I've been in the woods a lot hunting, without fluorescent clothing on. As a matter of fact, they recognize its value and they wouldn't go in the woods without it.

As far as children, the woods comes to the back of my house — there's hunters come out in to the little grove, pine grove right in the back of the house. I wouldn't even have my children out in that pine grove in the hunting season without fluorescent hats and crosses on — it's a matter of safety. As a matter of fact I've got a bullet through the screen in my bathroom which I've got to repair before mosquitoes come in here in a few weeks. That came out of the little pine grove. Thank you.

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

Mr. GAUDREAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In the education and information section of the Fish and Game Department under the direction of Mr. Mincher and Mr. Marsh, they've worked long hours to get something on the books. I have put in a lot of work in something I know will work. It's not for any special group or any special interest, but for something I believe in.

We have picked the most congested hunting area for a two-year

trial period to prove to the people of the State of Maine that this will cut these tragic accidents in half.

Now I'll have to repeat the problem that the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley posed, that these thirteen states that have these color laws have not run into any of the problems that he has stated. I thank you.

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

Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wish to support the motion to indefinitely postpone because three of us in the town of Northport have adjoining woodlots. There are a great number of out-of-state young people who come to Bayside for the summer and they do enjoy going through our woods. If this bill passes I shall be forced to post those woods and probably the others will, so I hope the bill is indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Thompson.

Mr. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I only wish that more of the people who are in opposition to this bill could have attended the hearing. It was a very good hearing, and there were many wardens and all of them there were heartily in favor of this bill. There were many guides there who were all in favor of it; people whose business it is to be in the woods during hunting season.

One warden in response to a question said that in his opinion ninety percent of the hunters he encountered in the woods were wearing some kind of fluorescent clothing — not necessarily blaze orange as proposed in this bill. In addition to that, statistics show that most hunting accidents — practically all of them — are from hunters shooting each other and not somebody else — a surveyor, or woodsman or somebody else.

This is a bill that has no price tag on it; it doesn't cost anybody anything perhaps except for a dollar and a quarter to buy a fluorescent cap if they didn't have one, and if it should save one life, I

think it's well worthwhile. I urge you to vote against the motion to indefinitely postpone.

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

Mrs. CARSWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I didn't intend to speak on this bill, but it seems to me that this fluorescent material that has been manufactured has been a Godsend. Our newspaper boys use it at night as a belt around them so that the motorist and others can see them. Our number plates on our cars are of fluorescent material now and I think perhaps that has been of an advantage to many of us and I do feel that many mothers who even send their children out to play in the daytime, they do not send them out with fluorescent material on them, but they may have a red cap, a red sweater, or something red so that in case the child gets lost the child may be easier found. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird, that House Paper 671, L. D. 943, "An Act relating to Wearing Fluorescent Clothing when Hunting in Southwestern Zone for Two Years," be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. Humphrey of Augusta requested a roll call.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All those in favor of a roll call will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair opens 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: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird, that L. D. 943 be indefinitely postponed. If you are in favor of the indefinite postponement you will vote yes, if you are opposed you will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Bradstreet, Carey, Cushing, Drummond, Dudley, Eustis, Ewer, Farrington, Hewes, Hichens, Hodgkins, Hoover, Humphrey, Immonen, Lincoln, Littlefield, Rackliff, Sahagian, Scott, G. W.; Snow, P. J.; Snowe, P.; Starbird, Wood.

NAY — Allen, Baker, E. B.; Baker, R. E.; Bedard, Belanger, Beliveau, Benson, Berman, Bernard, Binnette, Birt, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Bragdon, Brennan, Brown, Buck, Bunker, Burnham, Carrier, Carroll, Carswell, Champagne, Clark, Conley, Cookson, Cornell, Cote, Cottrell, Crommett, Crosby, Curran, D'Alfonso, Danton, Drigotas, Dunn, Durgin, Evans, Fecteau, Fortier, Foster, Fraser, Fuller, Gaudreau, Gauthier, Gill, Giroux, Hall, Hanson, B. B.; Hanson, H. L.; Hanson, P. K.; Harnois, Harvey, Hawes, Haynes, Healy, Henley, Hennessey, Hinds, Huber, Hunter, Jalbert, Keyte, Kilroy, Lebel, Levesque, Lewin, Martin, McMann, Miliano, Minkowsky, Mosher, Nadeau, J. F. R.; Nadeau, N. L.; Noyes, Philbrook, Pike, Porter, Prince, Quinn, Richardson, G. A.; Richardson, H. L.; Rideout, Robertson, Rocheleau, Ross, Sawyer, Scott, C. F.; Scribner, Shaw, Shute, Soulas, Susi, Tanguay, Thompson, Trask, Truman, Waltz, Wheeler, White, Wight.

ABSENT — Couture, Crockett, Darey, Dennett, Dickinson, Edwards, Harriman, Jameson, Janelle, Jewell, Kyes, Lewis, Lycette, Maddox, McNally, Meisner, Payson, Pendergast, Quimby, Robinson, Roy, Sullivan, Townsend, Watts, Williams.

Yes, 23; No, 101; Absent, 25.

The **SPEAKER**: Twenty-three having voted in the affirmative and a hundred and one in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be enacted.

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

Mr. **CONLEY**: Mr. Speaker, I now move that we reconsider our action whereby we just passed this

bill and I hope that everybody will vote against me.

The **SPEAKER**: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Conley, now moves that the House reconsider its action whereby this bill was passed to be enacted. All those in favor will say yes; those opposed will say no.

A viva voice vote being taken, the motion to reconsider did not prevail.

The Bill was signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Enactor**Tabled and Assigned**

An Act to Relieve Elderly Persons from Increases in the Property Tax (H. P. 953) (L. D. 1384)

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

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

Mr. **BIRT**: Mr. Speaker, I move this be tabled until Tuesday, June 13.

The **SPEAKER**: The gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt, moves this matter be tabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for June 13.

Mr. Philbrook of South Portland requested a division.

The **SPEAKER**: A vote has been requested. All those in favor of this matter being tabled until Tuesday, June 13 will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

71 having voted in the affirmative and 34 having voted in the negative, the tabling motion did prevail.

Enactor**Reconsidered and Amended**

An Act to Permit Savings and Loan Associations and Savings Banks to Consolidate (H. P. 1002) (L. D. 1464)

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

On motion of Mr. Robertson of Brewer, the House voted to suspend the rules and to reconsider its action on June 2 whereby it passed the bill to be engrossed.

The same gentleman 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. 1002, L. D. 1464, Bill, "An Act to Permit Savings and Loan Associations and Savings Banks to Consolidate."

Amend said Bill by inserting after the underlined word "association" in the 5th line (same in L. D. 1464) the underlined words 'located in the same county where the savings bank is located and'

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the same gentleman.

Mr. ROBERTSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This innocent looking little bill, which was not questioned when it went through the House last week, is now before us for the enactment stage, so I think it's perhaps about time we analyzed its contents. When it went through last week I had several reservations regarding the magnitude of its scope and since that time certain members of the other body have also raised serious questions regarding its intent. The amendment which I have submitted and which is before you will make the bill a little more reasonable and restrict any wild ideas that this bill might provoke.

I do not question the report of the Committee which passed this bill out, but I do not think they envisioned the implications of this measure. If you will peruse this bill I think you will ascertain that it grants somewhat unlimited powers for Saving and Loan Associations and Savings Banks to consolidate.

Now it doesn't say in this bill that the banks must be in the same municipality or that the banks must be in the same county — the limit is the entire state. I think you will recall that we had a credit union bill before this body and the other body and there was a concerted effort on the part of the banks to overrate its attempt to show, or I attempted to show or imply, that the bill was attempting to create a financial monster. Now they inferred that these twenty-three little state-chartered credit unions sought to merge, and they

only sought to merge on liquidation, that they had as an intent to force these other lending institutions out of business. Of course this was ridiculous.

In fact the banks were so concerned with this little bill that they spent considerable money, time, effort, telegrams, letters, calls and so forth with misinformation which was to create doubt in the minds of the voters in this Legislature regarding its intent. This erroneous interpretation which was given this so-called financial monster defeated this measure.

However, that's beside the issue. Now, if this little bill, however, did create a monster, if this liquidation assistance which the credit unions asked for was a monster in disguise, pray tell me ladies and gentlemen of this House, what is this bill which seeks State consolidation of Saving and Loan Associations and Savings Banks whether or not they are in financial difficulty? Is this an effort to create a financial octopus on the part of the banks? It appears, ladies and gentlemen, that the shoe now is on the other foot, only the shoe is a little bit larger. Now this bill doesn't even stipulate that either association must be insolvent in order that they might consolidate. They both can be enjoying financial success but decide that it is to their best interests that they become big and strong. Now, as I think this matter over, it appears the banking opposition must have confused the massive consolidation intent of this bill with the bill which was before you regarding the credit unions. Of course the old saying, when one is guilty of a crime he suspects all others.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, this bill is definitely far too inclusive in the authority it grants to these two types of banking institutions. This bill grants unlimited and state-wide consolidation. Doesn't that go a little beyond the point of being reasonable? Aren't we creating the possibility of a monopoly from the standpoint of lending institutions? Certainly, members of this Legislature, what if fair for the goose is fair for the gander.

Now this amendment which I am presenting is somewhat kinder to the banks than they have been to my bills, it allows the consolidation within a county area. Now, in my opinion, this is extremely lenient and fair and justifiable to both the banks, other lending institutions and to the citizens of the State of Maine. If I felt that we should, I probably should make a motion to indefinitely postpone the entire bill. I don't want to do that, I want to try to be fair. I want to try to give them an opportunity to join together in a county area rather than on a state-wide basis. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the adoption of House Amendment "A". Is it the pleasure of the House that House Amendment "A" be adopted?

A viva voce vote being taken, House Amendment "A" was adopted.

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

An Act to Provide a Minimum Wage Plan for State Employees (H. P. 1190) (L. D. 1690)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and

strictly engrossed, passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

**Enactor
Tabled and Assigned**

An Act Clarifying the Offense of Procuring Liquor for Certain Persons (H. P. 1191) (L. D. 1691)

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

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker, I have this morning received a letter from the Attorney General indicating that this bill is in conflict with an Act which we have already passed and which has been signed into law by the Governor. I therefore request that some member table this until Tuesday next.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Birt of East Millinocket, tabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for Tuesday, June 13.

Orders of the Day

On motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland,

Adjourned until Monday, June 12, at one o'clock in the afternoon.