

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

SENATE

Thursday, June 1, 1967

Senate called to order by the President.

Prayer by Rev. Leslie R. Craig of Dover-Foxcroft.

Reading of the Journal of yesterday.

**Paper from the House
Non-concurrent matter**

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

In Senate, March 30, Passed to be Engrossed.

Comes from the House, Indefinitely Postponed in non-concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Katz of Kennebec, the Senate voted to Recede and Concur with the House.

Communication

State of Maine
House of Representatives
Office of the Clerk

May 31, 1967

Hon. Jerrold B. Speers
Secretary of the Senate
103rd Legislature

Sir:

The Speaker appointed on May 31 the following Committees of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on the following bills:

Bill, "An Act relating to Right to Vote on Approval of Final Urban Renewal Plans" (H. P. 829) (L. D. 1237)

Messrs. McMANN of Bath

RICHARDSON

of Stonington

HARVEY of Woolwich

Bill "An Act Establishing the Policemen's Arbitration Law." (S. P. 342) (L. D. 926)

Messrs. HARRIMAN of Hollis

DRUMMOND of Sidney

HUBER of Rockland

Bill "An Act Providing for Action in Aid to Dependent Children Cases Involving Fraud." (H. P. 672) (L. D. 944)

Messrs. HENNESSEY

of West Bath

CUSHING of Bucksport
HUBER of Rockland

Respectfully,

BERTHA W. JOHNSON

Clerk of the House

Which was Read and Ordered
Placed on File.

The President appointed the following Conferees on the part of the Senate on Bill, "An Act Providing for Action in Aid to Dependent Children Cases Involving Fraud."

Senators:

GOOD of Cumberland

SPOUL of Lincoln

RENY of York

**Committee Reports
Leave to Withdraw**

The Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Revising the Laws Relating to State Probation and Parole Board." (H. P. 999) (L. D. 1461)

Reported that the same should be granted Leave to Withdraw.

Comes from the House report Read and Accepted.

Which report was Read and Accepted in concurrence.

Ought to Pass

The Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act Relating to the Appointment of Clerks of the Judicial Courts." (H. P. 246) (L. D. 354)

Reported that the same Ought to Pass.

Comes from the House report Read and Accepted and the Bill passed to be Engrossed.

Which report was Read and Accepted in concurrence, the Bill read once and tomorrow assigned for Second Reading.

Ought to Pass — As Amended

The Committee on Business Legislation on Bill "An Act Revising Laws Relating to Licensed Small Loan Agencies." (H. P. 468) (L. D. 681)

Reported that the same Ought to Pass — As Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H. 318)

Comes from the House, report Read and Accepted and the Bill

Passed to be engrossed, As Amended by Committee Amendment "A"

(On motion by Mr. Katz of Kennebec, Tabled and specially assigned for Friday, June 2nd, pending acceptance of the Committee Report.)

Ought to Pass in New Draft

The Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Relating to Publication of Foreclosure Notices." (H. P. 588) (L. D. 819)

Reported that the same Ought to Pass in New Draft under New Title (H. P. 1182) (L. D. 1684) (An Act Relating to Publication of Legal Notices.)

Comes from the House, report Read and Accepted and the Bill, in New Draft, Passed to be Engrossed.

(On motion by Mr. Johnson of Somerset, tabled and specially assigned for Tuesday, June 6, pending acceptance of the Committee Report.)

Divided Report

Five members of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act Providing Funds for Residential Facility for Mentally Retarded Children in Aroostook County." (H. P. 659) (L. D. 914)

Reported in report "A" that the same Ought to Pass. As Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-360)

(signed)

Senators:

ALBAIR of Aroostook
DUQUETTE of York

Representatives:

BRAGDON of Perham
HUMPHREY of Augusta
JALBERT of Lewiston

Five members of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported in Report "B" that the same Ought Not to Pass. (signed)

Senators:

BERRY of Cumberland

Representatives:

DUNN of Denmark
BIRT of E. Millinocket
SCRIBNER of Portland
HINDS of So. Portland

Comes from the House, Report "A" Ought To Pass As Amended, Read and Accepted, and the Bill Passed to be Engrossed, as Amended by Committee Amendment "A"

On motion by Mr. Albair of Aroostook, the Senate voted to accept the Ought to Pass, As Amended, Report of the Committee and the bill was read once. Committee Amendment "A" was Read and Adopted, and the Bill, As Amended, tomorrow assigned for second reading.

Senate

Leave to Withdraw

Mr. Hildreth for The Committee on Industrial and Recreational Development on Bill "An Act Creating a State Park Wildlife and Conservation Area Along Penobscot River Lying Between Old Town Dam and Howland Dam." (S. P. 501) (L. D. 1216)

Reported that the same should be granted Leave to Withdraw.

Which report was Read and Accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Farley for The Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Repealing Application of Sales Tax to Telephone and Telegraph Service." (S. P. 126) (L. D. 255)

Reported that the same Ought Not to Pass.

(On motion by Mr. Good of Cumberland, tabled and specially assigned for Monday, June 5, pending acceptance of the Committee Report.)

Mr. Stern for The Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of Mayor and Councilmen and Relating to City Council of City of Biddeford." (S. P. 111) (L. D. 182)

Reported that the same Ought Not to Pass As Covered by other Legislation.

Which report was Read and Accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

Divided Report

The Majority of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act

Providing for the Registration of Land Surveyors." (S. P. 550) (L. D. 1447)

Reported that the same Ought Not to Pass.

(signed)

Senators:

SPROUL of Lincoln
STERN of Penobscot

Representatives:

BELIVEAU of Rumford
SHAW of Chelsea
CUSHING of Bucksport
CONLEY of Portland

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported that the same Ought to Pass As Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-205)

(signed)

Senator:

GOOD of Cumberland

Representatives:

RICHARDSON of
Stonington
BAKER of Orrington
WHEELER of Portland

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Good.

Mr. GOOD of Cumberland: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I move that the Senate accept the Minority Ought to Pass Report of the Committee. This bill for the first time was set up for what is known as land surveyors. At the present time, there is no restriction as to who can or who cannot survey and record those plans in the registry of deeds. There is an amendment that will be offered if the report is accepted to include all registered professional engineers automatically as land surveyors. However, anyone subsequent to coming into the field who happens to be a registered professional engineer would have to take the exam to become a land surveyor. In other words, it's a grandfather clause for the professional registered engineers.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Cumberland, Senator Good, moves that the Senate now accept the Ought to Pass, as Amended Report of the committee.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Lincoln, Mrs. Sproul.

Mrs. SPROUL of Lincoln: Mr. President, I would oppose the motion of the Senator from Cumberland. There were several opponents to this bill. One, Ralph Farris, speaking for three hundred or more engineers and he had a signed petition saying that possibly something was needed in the way of registering land surveyors, but that it didn't need to be quite so elaborate. Charles Drew of Lincoln County, Henry Hill, James Burns for the Maine Central Railroad — apparently Maine Central is already hiring men who will do what surveying is needed, William H. Perry and another by the name of Shute, and the reason that I found it just a little difficult to accept — we have a very difficult time finding anyone to do any surveying at all. In fact it is not uncommon for us to wait two years in Lincoln County to find someone to survey. Believe it or not, but I know that is true because I have had experience. I, therefore, would oppose the motion of the Senator from Cumberland.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Sewall.

Mr. SEWALL of Penobscot: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I rise to support Senator Good. I would like to point out that this bill has been before the legislature several times in the past. It seems to always run into a fair amount of trouble. This year I was requested to submit a new bill which the sponsors felt answered the opposition of having this registration. In essence, this is a bill to upgrade and to give professional status to Maine surveyors. At the present time anyone having a transit or a compass can survey land either for himself or for hire. There are no restrictions whatsoever. This bill has the official sanction of the American Society of Civil Engineers, the Consulting Engineers of Maine, The Maine Association of Engineers and the Maine Society of Professional Engineers. These are the four major professional engineering societies in the state. It has their unequivocal support.

There was a petition against this bill circulated and presented to the

Committee which included some 300 names. An analysis of this petition indicated that approximately one-half of the signers are State House employees and the rest are pretty much based in the Augusta area. For some reason or other these people in this area determined that a bill for surveyor professional registration will not pass. There are approximately 1,700 registered professional engineers here in the State of Maine. I would earnestly hope you would support the motion of Senator Good.

The PRESIDENT: Is the Senate ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the Senator from York, Senator Farley.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Farley of York, tabled and specially assigned for Friday, June 2nd, pending the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Good, that the Senate accept the Ought to Pass, As Amended, Report of the Committee.

Divided Report

Five members of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Relating to Election of School Board of City of Old Town." (S. P. 352) (L. D. 936)

Reported in Report "A" that the same Ought to Pass.

(Signed)

Senator:

GOOD of Cumberland

Representatives:

BAKER of Orrington

SHAW of Chelsea

CUSHING of Bucksport

RICHARDSON

of Stonington

Three members of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported in Report "B" that the same Ought to Pass As Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-150)

(Signed)

Senators:

SPROUL of Lincoln

STERN of Penobscot

Representative:

BELIVEAU of Rumford

Two members of the same Committee on the same subject

matter reported in Report "C" that the same Ought Not to Pass.

(Signed)

Representatives:

WHEELER of Portland

CONLEY of Portland

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Sewall.

Mr. SEWALL of Penobscot: Mr. President, I move that the Senate accept the Majority Report, Report "A," of the Committee.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Penobscot, Senator Sewall, moves that the Senate now accept Report "A," Ought to Pass.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Lincoln, Mrs. Sproul.

Mrs. SPROUL of Lincoln: Mr. President, I would oppose the motion of the Senator for the following reason: two years ago we had a bill before Legal Affairs which provided for the election of the School Board in the City of Old Town. To me that was a democratic process and something which we should do. This hasn't had a chance to see whether that worked under that form of system or not. I would have liked to have seen it tried a little longer. This particular bill provides for something altogether different. I would oppose the motion.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Sewall.

Mr. SEWALL of Penobscot: Mr. President, I reluctantly rise to debate with Senator Sproul on this matter. I am well aware, as is everyone, in Old Town at least, that this system was put into effect two years ago at which time called for the election of the School Board rather than the appointing of the School Board. People in City Government in Old Town are prepared to accept the elective method of having a School Board. This bill simply changes the format to the extent that it would call for elections to the School Board at large the elective method of having a ward basis. The previous bill, the bill that went through here three years ago, in the opinion of many, including most people in City Government in Old Town, and they were well represented

here at the hearing, felt that this was aggressive to the extent that it went back to a ward system, or rather elections in Old Town are on an at-large basis. We have no intention of either upsetting the will of the Legislature or the electorate in Old Town, but the wards in Old Town are unequal in population. Some wards have 500 people in them; other wards have as many as 1,500 people. It's a small city and it certainly is the opinion of many in the City of Old Town that this legislation would put the School Board situation in good shape. Thank you.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Farley of York, tabled and specially assigned for Friday, June 2nd, pending the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Sewall, that the Senate Accept Report "A" Ought to Pass.

Divided Report

The Majority of the Committee on Natural Resources on Bill "An Act Relating to Pollution Control in Maranacook Lake, Annabessacook Lake and Cobbosseecontee Lake in Kennebec County." (S. P. 410) (L. D. 1039)

Reported that the same Ought Not to Pass.

(signed)

Senators:

SEWALL of Penobscot
FERGUSON of Oxford
VILES of Somerset

Representatives:

PIKE of Lubec
SAHAGIAN of Belgrade
DICKINSON of Mars Hill
FULLER of York
CURRAN of Bangor

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported that the same Ought to Pass.

(signed)

Representatives:

BROWN of Augusta
EUSTIS of Dixfield

(On motion by Mr. Katz of Kennebec, tabled and specially assigned for Friday, June 2nd, pending Acceptance of Either Report.)

Final Reports

The following Committees submitted their final reports:

The Committee on Agriculture
The Committee on Legal Affairs
Which were Read and Accepted.
Sent down for concurrence.

Second Readers

The Committee on Bills in the Second Reading reported the following:

House - As Amended

Bill "An Act Relating to Counter-signing Fees for Insurance Agents and Brokers." (H. P. 875) (L. D. 1287)

Which was Read a Second Time and Passed to be Engrossed as Amended in concurrence.

Senate - As Amended

Bill "An Act Relating to Appeals from Juvenile Court Proceedings." (S. P. 319) (L. D. 842)

Bill "An Act Relating to Dividends and Stock Held by unknown Stockholders." (S. P. 503) (L. D. 1218)

Which were Read a Second Time and Passed to be Engrossed, As Amended.

Sent down for concurrence.

Enactors

The Committee on Engrossed Bills reported as truly and strictly engrossed, the following:

An Act Relating to Suspensions Ordered by the Hearing Commissioner. (H. P. 269) (L. D. 390)

An Act Relating to Membership on the Maine Milk Commission. (H. P. 339) (L. D. 487)

An Act Relating to Closed Season on Bear. (H. P. 355) (L. D. 502)

Which were Passed to be Enacted, and, having been signed by the President, were by the Secretary presented to the Governor for his approval.

An Act Providing Funds for Road at Maine Maritime Academy. (S. P. 208) (L. D. 547)

(On motion by Mr. Berry of Cumberland, placed on the Special Appropriations Table.)

An Act Relating to Qualifications of Applicants for Examination for Admission to Practice Law. (H. P. 514) (L. D. 727)

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Lund.

Mr. LUND of Kennebec: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: The merits of this act relating to qualifications of applicants for examination for admission to practice law have been well debated in this body and I do not propose to debate it further. At this time I would move for indefinite postponement of the bill and ask for a division.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Kennebec, Senator Lund, moves that Item 8-5 be indefinitely postponed and that when the vote be taken that it be taken by division.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Franklin, Senator Mills.

Mr. MILLS of Franklin: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I join Senator Lund in the expression that this has been so well handled and debated in this body that further debate on the merits are probably superfluous at this point. I just wish to express the hope that this bill which has had such a rocky road now receive its final passage and have a safe journey to the Governor's office shortly.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Snow.

Mr. SNOW of Cumberland: Mr. President, I would request permission of the Senate to pair my vote with the Senator from Penobscot, Senator MacLeod, who is absent. If Senator MacLeod were here, he would vote against passage of this and I would vote for it.

The PRESIDENT: Does the Chair hear objection? The Chair hears none and the Senator may pair his vote.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Sewall.

Mr. SEWALL of Penobscot: Mr. President, I respectfully request to pair my vote with Senator Ferguson who is out of town. Were he here he would vote for passage of the measure and I would vote against it.

The PRESIDENT: Does the Senate hear objection? The Senator may pair his vote.

Is the Senate ready for the question?

As many as are in favor of the indefinite postponement of the bill will stand and remain standing until counted. Those opposed?

A division was had. 11 Senators having voted in the affirmative, and 15 Senators having voted in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone did not prevail.

Which was Passed to be Enacted, and, having been signed by the President, was by the Secretary presented to the Governor for his approval.

An Act Clarifying Compensation for Occupational Disease Under Workmen's Compensation Act. (H. P. 650) (L. D. 903)

(On motion by Mr. Johnson of Somerset, tabled, unassigned, Pending Enactment.)

An Act Relating to Appropriation to Maine Institution for the Blind. (H. P. 667) (L. D. 922)

(On motion by Mr. Johnson of Somerset, tabled, unassigned, Pending Enactment.)

An Act Providing Funds for Relocating of Maine Central Railroad Tracks in Livermore Falls. (H. P. 822) (L. D. 1230)

(On motion by Mr. Berry of Cumberland, placed on the Special Appropriations Table.)

An Act Relating to Cost of Living Adjustments for Retired Employees of the City of Lewiston and Their Beneficiaries. (S. P. 565) (L. D. 1435)

An Act Relating to Pensions for Members of the Lewiston Police Department, Lewiston Fire Department and Their Beneficiaries. (S. P. 566) (L. D. 1436)

An Act Providing Hospital Insurance Benefits Under Social Security Act for State Employees. (H. P. 1065) (L. D. 1532)

(On motion by Mr. Johnson of Somerset, indefinitely postponed as covered by other legislation.)

An Act to Regulate the Alteration of Wetlands. (S. P. 612) (L. D. 1597)

An Act to Provide for the Issuance of Weapons Permits to Certain Non-resident Employees. (H. P. 1172) (L. D. 1670)

Which were Passed to be Enacted, and, having been signed by

the President, were by the Secretary presented to the Governor for his approval.

Emergency

An Act Relating to Non-lapsing Funds for Land in York County for Park Purposes. (H. P. 771) (L. D. 1118)

Which, being an emergency measure and having received the affirmative vote of 27 members of the Senate, was Passed to be Enacted, and, having been signed by the President, was by the Secretary presented to the Governor for his approval.

Orders of the Day

The President laid before the Senate the first tabled and today assigned matter (H. P. 1147) (L. D. 1638) Bill "An Act Relating to the Financing of the State Liquor Commission."

Tabled — May 24, 1967 by Senator Wyman of Washington.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Wyman of Washington, retabled and specially assigned for Friday, June 2nd, pending Passage to be Engrossed.

The President laid before the Senate the second tabled and today assigned matter (H. P. 515) (L. D. 728) Bill "An Act Relating to Wages Paid for Benefits and Eligibility Under Employment Security Law."

Tabled — May 25, 1967 by Senator Johnson of Somerset.

Pending — Consideration.

(In Senate — May 9, 1967 Passed to be Engrossed.)

(In House — May 17, 1967 Passed to be Engrossed as Amended by House Amendment "A", Filing H-310)

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Good.

Mr. GOOD of Cumberland: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: This item has considerable interest so if I can have your indulgence I would like to explain it so that you can answer any questions that may be asked of you because it has great interest on the part of industry and it has

particular interest on the part of the Maine Employment Security Commission.

Now, the bill itself 728, "An Act Relating to Wages Paid for Benefits and Eligibility Under Employment Security Law," is of little consequence since it is simply a bill to correct the wording in the existing law, but there has been proposed an amendment that has considerable interest and the amendment is House Filing 310, and apparently this bill is being used as a vehicle for the attachment of this amendment. So that you will not misunderstand my position, I am going to move when the time comes that the amendment be adopted. Prior to that, however, I am going to offer an amendment to the amendment, but that's not important.

Now, this amendment, and that is all we are talking about here, and I have telegrams and letters from industries in this state favoring the amendment, and it has to do with the method whereby you obtain unemployment benefits. Prior to the last session of the Legislature, your benefit year was the calendar year so if you were unemployed, you go down to 331 Water Street and you'd walk through the door and say "My name is John Doe and I'm unemployed. Do you have a check here for me?" And they would say "No, we don't have any check for you. We didn't know you were unemployed until you came through the door, but I think we can help you out." So you would say, "Well, what do I do?" Now this is prior to the change in the law, and they would say, "Well, your pay period is based upon the calendar year." And you would say, "Well, I didn't know that, but they used to send it in." "Do you have withholding statement with you, a W-2 Form?" And you would say "Yes, I always carry my W-2 Form with me for identification, but this is the first time I have ever used it in fifteen years." So they would say, "We could look at your W-2 Form so we could find out how much you earned last year because your base period is your calendar year." That's the old law. So you would say, "Here it

is, Is this all?" And they would say, "No, you have to make application." So you make an application and they said "There is something else that we need at this time besides your W-2 Form to know how much you earned — your reason for separation. Maybe you quit and you're not entitled to benefits." So, first of all we'll say that this is on May first. He makes out his application for unemployment at that time and they say they need to get the information from the employer, "Why did you quit?" So the Maine Employment Security Commission sends a request for a wage and separation information to his employer to find out why he got through, so they say, "You come back next week and sign up for a waiting period." So you come back on May 8.

So he says "My name is John Doe. Is my check ready?" They say "No, but we did hear from your employer and the reason for your separation entitles you to unemployment compensation, but you come back next week on the 15th and sign up for your check." So he goes back. He is still unemployed. His name is John Doe. "Do you have a check ready for me?" "No," but they say, "You sign up for your first check and you will get it early next week." Well, he does. Everything is fine. That is the way this used to work.

Now, at the last session of the Legislature, in improving the formula, changed the base period and the base period is no longer the last calendar year so the W-2 Form doesn't work any more and it says the base period, and I quote from Title 26, Section 1191, "On and after April first, 1966 each eligible individual who is totally unemployed in any week shall be paid with respect to such week benefits equal to one twenty-fifth of his wages, rounded to the nearest dollar, earned in the five quarters of his base period." Let me give you the definition of his base period. Now, the base period according to the law that was changed at the last session of the Legislature, is the first of four quarters of the previous five

quarters prior to his date of application. So now what happens? John Doe is unemployed so he goes down to 331 Water Street and he says "My name is John Doe and I am unemployed. Do you have a check for me?" They say "No, we didn't know you were unemployed until you came through the door, but if you have a W-2 Form here that was good when you were unemployed a year ago, but it is no longer any good now. We've got to know what you earned in the first four quarters of the previous five. Can you tell us that?" He says "No. I'm not a bookkeeper." "But we've got to know what you earned in the first four quarters of the previous five." Well, they say "You fill out an application." So he does. They say "Well, now we don't know what you earned so we have to ask your employer for two things. First of all, we have to know the reason why you quit and whether this entitles you to workmen's compensation or not, and we need to know what you earned in the first four of your previous five quarters, to find out your high quarter." So they send this form to the employer and the employer reports back what this particular individual earned in each of the four quarters of the previous five. So now he come back on the eighth and he says "I'm John Doe, I was here a week ago. Do you have a check for me?" And they say "No, we don't, but we have heard from your employer so we now know what you earned and we know the reason for your separation is all right. You sign up for the waiting period, and you come back in one more week and sign up for your check." So he comes back in a week and signs up for his check. "I'm back here on the fifteenth to sign up for a check. Do you have this check?" "No, you can get it the first of next week." So he does, he gets a check and everything is fine.

Now there is one thing that happens in all this under the new law. John Doe is unemployed and he goes down to 331 Water Street and he says "My name is John Doe. I'm unemployed, and do you have a check for me?" They say "No,

we don't have a check for you. We didn't know you were unemployed until you came through the door, but you fill out an application and we'll have to ask your employer two things. Why you are unemployed and how much you earned in the previous four quarters of the last five and you come back next week and sign up for the waiting period which will be the eighth." So he comes back on the eighth and they say "We haven't heard from your employer yet, but we all know that he has seven days, so you come back next week and sign up. He comes back next week. "Have you heard from my employer yet?" "No, we haven't heard, but you sign up for the check anyway and we will have you sign an affidavit as to what you earned in the first four of the last five quarters." You say "I don't know what I earned in each of the first four of the last five quarters." Well, they say "You make an estimated guess and we'll take your word for it. If it is wrong we will have to make some adjustment." So he does make out an affidavit, haven't heard from the employer yet, so they send the information up to the Maine Unemployment Security Commission and he gets a check. Later on they hear from the employer and they find out that perhaps his figures are not correct so they have to make an adjustment. However, he is receiving a check.

So, the Maine Employment says, "We've got to be efficient and we don't look too good sometimes, but most of the time we look pretty good so we are going to ask all the employers in the state, 8,800 of them, to make a report every quarter of every employee they have who earned in that quarter \$5,000 or less or a total of \$20,000 a year and we will have them send to us every quarter a list. That's a million and a half names a year and we will have those on file." So when John Doe goes down he says "I don't know how much I earned in the first four quarters of the previous five quarters" and they say, "It doesn't matter; we have it on file."

Well, they hired a computer down at the Maine Employment

Security Commission to take care of this and they put on some more help to handle this million and-a-half names, but they are only using about 27,000 of these names.

I have a letter here that pretty well sums it up for industry — or I had a letter — Yes, here's a letter I have here, and I have several, from the International Paper Company. They object to this present law and they want the amendment, and this says, "I am writing you as an authorized representative of the International Paper Company regarding the adoption of the proposed amendment to L. D. 728 which would eliminate the quarterly filing of payroll reports with the Employment Security Commission. I submit the following factual information in support of this request: One, the Androscoggin and Otis mills employ an average of 1,029 people which will increase to approximately 1,500 with the start of expansion in December of 1967. During the past twelve months, we have had ten full claims and seven partial claims, most of which were due to a very unusual power failure. From the above you can readily see that we are required to report on a great number of employees while we, as a relatively stable employer, our claims are few." And then he says, "Let's go back to the old request of reporting system and not bother us with all this paper work."

Now, why are we operating under this quarterly system now? How has the law changed after the last session of the Legislature improved the formula? Well, by Statute, Title 26, Section 1082, the Maine Employment Security Commission has the power to regulate this reporting by the employer. I realize if we go along with this amendment, we are overruling the Maine Employment Security Commission, although I don't know as they will greatly object. Commissioner Cote wrote me a letter. I went down and talked to him yesterday. He objects. I believe that he would be opposed to the amendment. I talked with Commissioner Sinclair. He gave me the

information I asked for, and Commissioner George, I talked with him in his office. I think he would go along with any suggestion of the Legislature, although he pointed out both sides.

So, if you adopt the amendment which I am in favor of, you go back to the request of reporting and you only have to report the names of those who are actually unemployed, being approximately 27,000 out of the 275,000 now required to file every quarter. Thank you.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Good of Cumberland, the Senate voted to suspend the rules and reconsider its action whereby it passed this bill to be engrossed. House Amendment "A" was read by the Secretary.

Then the same Senator presented Senate Amendment "A" to House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

Senate Amendment "A" to House Amendment "A", Filing S-211, was read by the Secretary as follows:

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 515, L. D. 728, "An Act Relating to Wages Paid for Benefits and Eligibility Under Employment Security Law."

Amend said Amendment in the 11th line by striking out the underlined figure "10" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure "7"; and by striking out in the 17th line the underlined word "incident" and inserting in place thereof the underlined word "accident"

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Good.

Mr. GOOD of Cumberland: Mr. President, Senate Amendment "A" to House Amendment "A" amends House Amendment "A" in two respects that the Maine Employment Security Commission was interested in having. Under the House Amendment "A", they give the employer ten days in which to file his report. The old law used to be seven days so this takes it back to the seven. The present amendment excuses the employer in case of an unavoidable incident. The old law used to be accident so this changes it back to accident.

Senate Amendment "A" to House Amendment "A" was Adopted. House Amendment "A" as amended by Senate Amendment "A" was Adopted, and the Bill, As Amended, Passed to be Engrossed in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

The President laid before the Senate the third tabled and today assigned matter (S. P. 514) (L. D. 1227) Senate Report—Ought Not to Pass from the Committee on Towns and Counties on Bill "An Act Relating to Penalty for Exceeding Appropriation for Economic and Recreational Development in Oxford County."

Tabled—May 25, 1967 by Senator Norris of Oxford.

Pending—Acceptance of Report.

On motion by Mr. Norris of Oxford, retabled and specially assigned for Friday, June 2nd, pending Acceptance of Report.

The President laid before the Senate the fourth tabled and today assigned matter (S. P. 541) (L. D. 1398) Bill "An Act Relating to Issuing of Parking System Revenue Bonds and Water and Sewer System Revenue Bonds by Municipalities."

Tabled—May 25, 1967 by Senator Johnson of Somerset.

Pending—Passage to be Engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Johnson of Somerset, retabled, unassigned, pending Passage to be Engrossed.

The President laid before the Senate the fifth tabled and today assigned matter (H. P. 829) (L. D. 1237) Bill "An Act Relating to Right to Vote on Approval of Final Urban Renewal Plans."

Tabled—May 26, 1967 by Senator Good of Cumberland.

Pending—Consideration.

(In House—May 19, 1967 Passed to be Engrossed.)

(In Senate—May 22, 1967 Report "B", Ought Not to Pass. Accepted in Non Concurrence.)

On motion by Mrs. Sproul of Lincoln, the Senate voted to Adhere to its former action.

The President laid before the Senate the sixth tabled and today assigned matter (S. P. 439) (L. D. 1091) Senate Reports — from the Committee on State Government on Bill, "An Act To Create the Office of Ombudsman." Majority Report, Ought Not to Pass; Minority Report, Ought to Pass.

Tabled — May 26, 1967 by Senator Hildreth of Cumberland.

Pending — Acceptance of Either Report.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Hildreth.

Mr. HILDRETH of Cumberland: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: There was once a time, and it wasn't so very long ago, when our government, both state and federal was divided into three branches, the legislative, the judicial and the executive. Today these three branches of government are overshadowed by a fourth, the administrative. As the complexity of government has increased, and the demands upon it have grown, the Legislature has been forced to delegate more and more of the actual works of the government to the administrative agencies. This is as it should be, but the fact is that government has grown fantastically and is doing incredibly more than its founders ever dreamt that it would. The point is that in their day to day dealings with the government, people don't deal with the Governor or with the Legislators, or if they can help it with the courts. They deal with the administrative agencies of our government.

I introduced this bill because I think too many people, whether rightly or wrongly, don't like or admire the government that they see. At best, they tolerate it and, if worse, they resent it. I think this is true, that it is wrong, and we can and should do something about it. The Ombudsman which would be provided by this bill could investigate administrative acts which were contrary to law or even if legal are unreasonable, unfair or oppressive, or based on mistaken facts or on improper grounds, or are unreasonably unexplained, or are performed in-

efficiently or in some other way are just plain wrong. The Ombudsman could investigate, and this along with the independence which the bill would give him, is the key to his effectiveness, not necessarily to point a finger or to rap knuckles, but to evaluate the administrative procedure that gave rise to the complaint and formulate recommendations regarding future administrative actions or procedures that will improve them.

At the present time nobody, but nobody, in the state government has the time and the interest and the stature and the ability to objectively perform this function. One question that is often asked about the Ombudsman is: with 151 representatives and 34 senators, who needs him? Don't the legislators now do everything that he would do? I think the answer is they don't, and they can't. The Legislature meets only six months out of every two years. During that time most of us are tremendously busy on legislative matters. We all get complaints and problems from our constituents which we try to handle for them. Some time if they are simple, we do a good, calm job, but how often do we merely go to the agencies that our constituent is complaining about and ask them to look into it? How often do we merely grab at a routine answer that is sufficient to keep our constituent from getting mad at us? How diligent are we if we think our constituent is a nut or voted against us in the last election? Even more important, how good a job do we do during the other eighteen months when we have gone back to Fort Kent or to Kittery to try and catch up on our business, particularly if we are not planning to run for office the next time?

Even if the legislator could adequately handle all of the complaints of his constituents, and I think this is open to very serious question, he cannot begin to compare with the Ombudsman in the role of a constructive administrative critic. The agency is merely going to breathe a sigh of relief when the legislators leave and go right back to doing the things they

have been doing in the same old way. Nothing is going to be learned or improved from the Legislator's efforts.

Another question people often have is: wouldn't this just be piling one more bureau on top of all the others? The State of Maine has less than a million people yet it has over ten thousand state employees, over 90 per cent of whom would be covered by this act. It seems to me that we have reached the point where we could well institute what industrialists call quality control. We have got the quantity, but shouldn't we try to maintain a governmental output at a better level of quality if we can do it without being disproportionate to the cost.

I will say again, I don't think anybody in State Government, the way it is set up now, the way duties are delegated to the office building over there with our present governmental and electioneering setup, that anybody has the time, the interest, the stature and the ability to insure that State Government works properly and efficiently for the people. Each and all of these qualities are necessary and only the Ombudsman has it. Now, I realize that the Ombudsman is considered new and bizarre and perhaps queer, perhaps colorful, and many people I am sure feel possibly very ineffective. Actually, historically, the Ombudsman has proved himself. Interest in this country in the Ombudsman is growing fantastically. Eighteen states have legislation pending for them at this time to introduce similar legislation. The State of Hawaii has already passed the Ombudsman, becoming the first state to do this.

I think this is a foreign import that is peculiarly adapted to our present fabric of government, and I think we should have the courage and the foresight to grab it. I move that we accept the Minority Ought to Pass report

Thereupon, the Senate voted to accept the Minority Ought to Pass report of the Committee and the Bill was Read Once and Tomorrow Assigned for Second Reading.

The President laid before the Senate the seventh tabled and today assigned matter (S. P. 432) (L. D. 1086) Bill "An Act Concerning Duty of Reasonable Care to Social Invitee."

Tabled—May 26, 1967 by Senator Harding of Aroostook.

Pending—Enactment.

On motion by Mr. Harding of Aroostook, the Bill was passed to be enacted and, having been signed by the President, was by the Secretary presented to the Governor for his approval.

The President laid before the Senate the eighth tabled and today assigned matter (S. P. 635) (L. D. 1635) Bill "An Act Relating to the Water and Air Environmental Improvement Commission."

Tabled—May 26, 1967 by Senator Sewall of Penobscot.

Pending—Enactment.

On motion by Mr. Sewall of Penobscot, retabled and specially assigned for Tuesday, June 6, pending Enactment.

The President laid before the Senate the ninth tabled and today assigned matter (H. P. 882) (L. D. 1294) Bill "An Act Providing Vocational Education Loan Funds."

Tabled—May 26, 1967 by Senator Katz of Kennebec.

Pending—Passage to be Engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Katz of Kennebec, retabled and specially assigned for Tuesday, June 6, pending Passage to be Engrossed.

The President laid before the Senate the tenth tabled and today assigned matter (H. P. 265) (L. D. 386) House Report—Ought to Pass in New Draft Under Same Title (H. P. 1176) (L. D. 1674) from the Committee on Health and Institutional Services on Bill "An Act Revising the Drug Narcotic and Pharmacy Laws."

Tabled—May 31, 1967 by Senator Greeley of Waldo.

Pending—Acceptance of Report.

On motion by Mr. Greeley of Waldo, the Senate voted to Accept the Ought to Pass in New Draft

Report of the Committee and the Bill was Read Once.

Mr. Greeley of Waldo presented Senate Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

Senate Amendment "A", Filing No. S-206, was read by the Secretary as follows:

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" TO H. P. 1176, L. D. 1674, Bill "An Act Revising the Drug, Narcotic and Pharmacy Laws."

Amend said Bill in section 5 by striking out in the last line (Same in L. D. 1674) the underlined figure and word "11 months" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure and word '2 years'

Further amend said Bill in section 6 by striking out in the 5th and 6th lines (5th line in L. D. 1674) "2210, 2212- A or 2212-B," and inserting in place thereof the following: 'and 2210'

Senate Amendment "A" was adopted, and the Bill, as Amended, tomorrow assigned for Second Reading.

The President laid before the Senate the eleventh tabled and today assigned matter (H. P. 356) (L. D. 503) House Reports — from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill, "An Act Revising the Laws Relating to Guides Under Fish and Game Laws." Majority Report, Ought Not to Pass; Minority Report, Ought to Pass.

Tabled — May 31, 1967 by Senator Hoffses of Knox.

Pending — Acceptance of Either Report.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Knox, Senator Hoffses.

Mr. HOFFSES of Knox: Mr. President, I move we accept the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report of the Committee and I would speak to my motion.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Knox, Senator Hoffses, moves that we now accept the Majority Report, Ought Not to Pass.

The Senator may proceed.

Mr. HOFFSES: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: The public hearing on this L. D. 503 was very well attended by sportsmen, registered guides, members

of the Fish and Game Department, game wardens, and many of the general public. The hearing was held and was very orderly. The proponents of this L.D. presented a most attractive package. They brought out many instances which are worthy of very careful consideration, namely: the safety factor, the possibility of lost persons, they mentioned the deer population, and I know that there are gentlemen in this Senate this morning who are willing and anxious and are very well qualified to speak on the deer population of the State. Another matter which was brought out was the property owners' rights, the person who owns property and pays taxes on it and who, after all, is entitled to some rights.

Many of these factors which were discussed, I believe, at some future time should be given very careful consideration. However, the objections to the bill at this time outweighed the benefits. This would be a radical change. We have enjoyed in this State very liberal hunting regulations, we have a very large group of people from out-of-state, non-residents, who come to this State to hunt our big game and also our upland game.

The loss of revenue, if we were to institute this registered guide bill would be very substantial to the Fish and Game Department, we having just reviewed the Department's budget. They certainly are in no position to continue with the service which they are now rendering if they were to suffer a loss of the revenue, which this could very well mean.

The campowners would be very greatly affected by the implementation of this document. A great many of the sporting camps in this State depend almost entirely on out-of-state residents, and to implement this would be a tremendous loss of revenue to them. It would also be a loss of revenue to the State in general.

Although there are some hunters that come into the State and bring practically all of their food, their ammunition and everything which they need, they will bring a camper or tent or something of that nature, they will camp out,

and the campowners, the people who cater to these people, receive no benefit whatsoever, but there is a very large majority of the people coming into the State who do leave a great deal of money in the State, and it does help our economy to quite a substantial extent.

Probably the most important factor is the number of guides in relation to the non-resident big game licenses which are issued. We have 1,843 registered guides, and one of them sits on my right. We issued last year 33,173 non-resident licenses. Now, it would be utterly impossible for this number of guides to guide this many non-resident hunters. It would mean that you would have to waive the regulations and we would be back where we are now at the present time.

Another factor is the people who were born in this State, had a 22 rifle to start out with and graduated to a high-powered rifle and who are extremely familiar with the country around where they were born and brought up, and probably are better qualified to guide than some of the guides which we have holding a guide's license, with all due deference to the good Senator on my right.

Another factor which I believe has also been left out on this document is the non-resident who owns very valuable pieces of property in the State. No consideration is given to them in this bill. Many of them are well qualified to travel in our woods, to possess, to bear arms and to hunt our prized wild life.

These are but a few of the objections and the reasons for the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report of the Committee, and I would hope that you would support the Ought Not to Pass Report.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Ross.

Mr. ROSS of Piscataquis: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: When I first saw this bill I thought I was going to get fulltime employment, however, if I voted for it, it would undoubtedly be a conflict of interest.

There is one point that I want to make sure that this Senate gets, or every member of the Senate. I think it has been very well brought out, especially on the floor of the other body, that there is a shortage of deer in the State of Maine. The deer population is down, except in some sections. I know it is down in Washington County, even the Warden Supervisor appeared before Senator Hoffses' Committee and testified that the deer herd in Washington County was lower than he had ever seen it in 20 years. Something has got to be done to curtail this slaughter of the deer without an increase in the herd. Now, I am not capable of telling you how to solve this problem. I think that this would be a step in the right direction except for one thing; it is too drastic at this time.

As Senator Hoffses told you, we don't have enough guides, and it would undoubtedly wreck the State economically for the timebeing. In the future it might be very well to consider a guide law.

One thing that rankles me no end is that the deer herd goes up in other states whereas it remains practically stagnant here in this State. For instance, in the State of Texas which, I will admit, is a large comparison, but in the State of Texas they killed 55,000 more deer last year than they did the year before. If we maintain the same level of kill we think we are doing very well. It seems strange to me that it can go up in other states and remain the same here where we advertise this as a great deer-hunting state. The State of Pennsylvania, the State of Michigan, Minnesota, they kill 100,000 deer, we brag about 30,000 or 30,000 odd here. I say that we are killing the goose that lays the golden egg, and I think that something has definitely got to be done. I am going along with Senator Hoffses on the Ought Not to Pass Report on this bill, but I would like to make one suggestion to the Senate - I don't necessarily mean Legislative Research Committee but somebody should make an interim study of the deer situation

in the State of Maine and come up with a solution to it.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington, Senator Wyman.

Mr. WYMAN of Washington: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I read very carefully the arguments for and against this bill as it was heard in the other House, and there was one argument that impressed me particularly in favor of the bill, and that was this matter of conservation.

It reminded me of a number of sessions ago, when I was in the Legislature, I came over here in the interest of a clam conservation measure, and all the same arguments were used against it, that there were plenty of clams, it would throw people out of work, and nearly all the same arguments that have been used against this. It was too early, that we had enough clams, and similar arguments. Well, I was not a very good lobbyist and the clam bill failed, and there has been no conservation measure on clams, and you know how our clam situation is now and how difficult it is now to go and purchase a bushel of clams.

It seems to me you have got the very same thing on this deer matter. Figures given for Washington County on a 20-year average are 3486 deer. That is from 1940 to 1959. In the last seven years the average has dropped from 3486 to 2259. And it seems to me that these arguments to put this off, we don't need it, or to refer it to research, it seems to me that we ought to do something now before the deer are thoroughly depleted and the herd is reduced any more. In the meantime we can study the matter and then, if this guide law is wrong, we can change it. But at this point, it seems to me that we should bring a halt to this excessive kill of deer and do something at this moment to keep what we have until we can find out just what is happening. In other words, I see no point in, as the old saying goes, waiting and locking the barn door after the horse is stolen. I, therefore, oppose the motion of the Senator from Knox, Senator Hoffses.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Hancock, Senator Young.

Mr. YOUNG of Hancock: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I, too, oppose the motion of Senator Hoffses to accept the Ought Not to Pass Report. I agree with Senator Wyman. Both of the other previous speakers have admitted that something has got to be done; that our deer herd is being depleted. I know in Hancock County, the area where I come from, that the deer herd is going down all the time. If we could get this bill passed it could be amended to take care of some of the objections that the Senator from Knox suggested about people born in the State. There could be an amendment that would affect those people and also people who own property, they could be exempted.

This bill says that no non-resident shall hunt without a guide. One guide would have four non-resident hunters to look after, and he would be responsible for proper licensing and obeying the laws. They would more or less act as additional game wardens, and they would have a lot to do with protecting the game. These so-called sports that we have coming down here now, they park their cars in roads and run across people's fields, they park their cars anywhere, and perhaps someone is working in the woods and they will plug up the woodsroad and go off and leave their car all day. This type of thing is going on all over. I think if we didn't have this kind of people we would be better off, and in the long run we would get a better calibre of sport; they would be willing to spend more money. The campowners who are worried now, afraid they would lose some revenue for a year or two, they would soon get that back and they would have a much better class of sports come to their camps.

Another thing was brought up, which I was quite interested in, that we only have about 1,800 guides at the present time. I would say that if this law was passed there would be plenty people apply for guide's licenses, capable people who could take care of all that

this law would do, and the State would pick up some additional revenue on the guides' license. I admit they will lose revenue on the non-residents' licenses for perhaps a couple of years, but after that I think that for two or three years there would be less hunting, and the deer would have a chance to increase and, in my opinion, in a short time we would have a better deer herd and these so-called sports would be better taken care of, there would be less chance for them to get lost, and they would be probably told about the laws, what they could do and what they shouldn't do. I think it would be a good start to get this bill on the books, even though we have to amend it, and I hope that the motion to accept the Ought Not to Pass Report is defeated.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Barnes.

Mr. BARNES of Aroostook: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I am opposed to this bill, and I would like to give you just a couple reasons why.

No 1, this bill provides for one guide for four hunters. In the first place, one man cannot guide four men, it is an impossibility. In the second place, they argue that this would conserve our deer herd. In my opinion, it would do just the opposite, because when sports come up from out-of-state they hire a guide, and that guide feels responsible to those hunters to get a deer. In my experience, I have seen some of these out-of-state hunters when they have guides, they lay around the camp and play cards, drink alcoholic beverages, even on Sunday, Senator Ross, and these guides who are experienced hunters and old-time poachers will go out and hunt. Now, he is more capable and better qualified to shoot deer than are those out-of-state hunters. So, what happens? He goes out and he hunts day and night and brings in a deer for each one of his sports. So, actually, what happens? You get a larger deer harvest, than you would without the guides.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator and licensed

guide from Piscataquis, Senator Ross.

Mr. ROSS of Piscataquis: Thank you for the plug, Mr. President. As I said before, I don't think this is the solution at the present time, and I would like to make a couple suggestions. One would be a buck law, where you kill only buck deer. That seems to be working pretty well in some other states where the herd is growing. Another one would be a shorter season.

I personally am not one who takes too much stock in biologists. I don't care if this is publicized or not or right on the record, but I talk to a lot of trappers, woodsmen and hunters, and especially the trappers that are in the woods most of their days. In fact, one trapper caught 157 beaver this winter so you know he is not an amateur. They have spent their lives in the woods, and they will tell you frankly that the deer herd is down. But if you talk to a biologist he will tell you that the deer herd is up. Now it is just a question of who you are going to believe. As I have told you before, definitely I think it is down, but I don't think that this is the proper solution to it.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Boisvert.

Mr. BOISVERT of Androscoggin: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I rise with reluctance because this is a matter actually which I have no knowledge of, as far as the conservation of the deer herd. But I rise to support Senator Hoffses for one reason. As I travel the countryside, and especially on a beautiful day like today, I am so happy to be living in the State of Maine. It makes me happy to find the beauty that we have here. But it makes me sad at times also when I think of my relatives, my friends, that left the State, not because they did not love the State, but because they found a way of living outside of this State. When we talk about tourists, people that are returning to the State of Maine, most of them, — we don't know the percentage — but I would say most of our tourists are our own people coming back to visit the land that they love, and a bill like

this would force them to hire a guide to roam through the woods of the State of Maine which they so love. I support Senator Hoffses.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from York, Senator Farley.

Mr. FARLEY of York: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I rise to support the Senator from Knox County, the Chairman of the Inland Fisheries Committee. He has covered the ground in a very nice way. My vote upon the question hinges upon the testimony that I heard. To me, those who represented Washington County that day were only trying to do this: to get rid of what they call the undesirables. That went on for quite a few minutes.

Now, I have a brother who goes to Washington County, and has been going for over ten years, and I know he doesn't touch liquor. I know he plays cards. He has a gun, and he probably sits on a stump, and he probably sees a rabbit go by because he never came home with anything that I ever knew of. But he goes into Washington County - trucking business is hard work - and he goes for a rest. And when they said they wanted to get rid of the undesirables the first thing that came to my mind was about my own brother. I was disturbed. Even one member who spoke, who comes from Washington County and belongs to an organization that I belong to, he said if I voted against it he didn't want to speak to me any more. I said "Frank, I am going to tell you something. I am going to vote against you for the simple reason of the statement that was made."

Now, if we are going to attract people to come into the State of Maine to go hunting or do this and that, I do think that is an awful reflection to cast upon those people coming in; they are undesirables. What they do down there, I don't know, but I do think that the Chairman of the Committee was fair, fair at the hearing, and I think he was very fair here this morning standing up and giving his view of it, and I am pleased to vote with him.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Harding.

Mr. HARDING of Aroostook: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I speak only on this as a State Senator. I will not try to add to what my colleague has mentioned about his knowledge of night hunting because I am sure it is far superior to mine.

Seriously, though, the people in my county are very much opposed to this bill, and I would be very fearful of any of us three going back to Aroostook County if it ever passed. And when the vote is taken, Mr. President, I would ask that it be taken by division.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington, Senator Wyman.

Mr. WYMAN of Washington: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: May I point out that I did not mention any undesirables. The one point that impressed me was the conservation angle, and I think it is a question of whether we want to kill the deer and finish them off now so that the good Senator's brother can have deer now, but in a few years may not have them, or whether we want to stabilize this and increase the deer herd so that there will be some in the years to come.

The PRESIDENT: The pending question is on the motion of the Senator from Knox, Senator Hoffses, that the Senate accept the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report of the Committee. All those in favor of accepting the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report of the Committee will stand and remain standing until counted. All those opposed?

A division was had. 23 Senators having voted in the affirmative, and six Senators having voted in the negative, the motion to accept the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report of the Committee prevailed.

The President laid before the Senate the twelfth tabled and today assigned matter (H. P. 1021) (L. D. 1509) Bill "An Act Creating the Maine Board of Auctioneers."

Tabled—May 31, 1967 by Senator Katz of Kennebec.

Pending—Passage to be Engrossed.

Mr. Katz of Kennebec presented Senate Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

Senate Amendment "A", Filing No. S-212, was read by the Secretary as follows:

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1021, L. D. 1509, Bill "An Act Creating the Maine Board of Auctioneers."

Amend said Bill in Section 1 by striking out all of the 2nd underlined sentence of that part designated "S276" and inserting in place thereof the following:

'The board shall be composed of 3 licensed auctioneers and shall be appointed by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the Council, for initial terms of one, 2 and 3 years respectively, the latter to be chairman of the board.'

Further amend said Bill in section 1 by striking out all of the 2nd underlined sentence of that part designated "S279" and inserting in place thereof the following:

'The board shall issue such licenses on the application within one year of the effective date of this Act to all auctioneers who have held a state license during any one of the 2 years preceding the effective date of this Act without examination upon payment of an initial license fee of \$15 and \$15 for each subsequent renewal.'

Further amend said Bill in section 1 by striking out all of subsection 3 of that part designated "§ 280" and inserting in place thereof the following:

'3. Fee. The applicant shall pay an initial license fee of \$50 and \$25 for each renewal, except that any person who has held a nonresident auctioneer's license in this State during any one of the 2 years preceding the effective date of this Act shall pay an initial fee of \$25 and \$25 for each renewal.'

Senate Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill, as Amended, Passed to be Engrossed in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

The President laid before the Senate the thirteenth tabled and today assigned matter (S. P. 609)

(L. D. 1603) Bill "An Act Authorizing Joint Rates Between Certain Transportation Carriers."

Tabled—May 31, 1967 by Senator Johnson of Somerset.

Pending —Passage to be Engrossed.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Lund.

Mr. LUND of Kennebec: Mr. President, I move the pending question.

The PRESIDENT: Is it now the pleasure of the Senate that this bill be passed to be engrossed, as amended?

The Chair recognizes the Senator from York, Senator Reny.

Mr. RENY of York: Mr. President, for the purpose of an amendment, I move that this bill be tabled until Monday, June 5.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from York Senator Reny, moves that this item be tabled and specially assigned for Monday, June 6, pending passage of the bill to be engrossed.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Barnes.

Mr. BARNES of Aroostook: Mr. President, I respectfully request a division when the vote is taken on the tabling motion.

Thereupon, a division was had. 12 Senators having voted in the affirmative, and 17 Senators having voted in the negative, the tabling motion did not prevail, and the Bill was Passed to be Engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

The President laid before the Senate the fourteenth tabled and today assigned matter (H. P. 769) (L. D. 116) House Report—Ought Not to Pass from the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Providing for a Credit Against Sales and Use Tax on Industrial Machinery and Equipment."

Tabled—May 31, 1967 by Senator Hildreth of Cumberland.

Pending—Acceptance of Report.

On motion by Mr. Hildreth of Cumberland, the Senate voted to accept the Ought Not to Pass Report of the Committee.

The President laid before the Senate the fifteenth tabled and

today assigned matter (H. P. 335) (L. D. 469) House Report—from the Committee on Towns and Counties on Bill "An Act Relating to Joint State and Municipal Purchasing." Majority Report, Ought to Pass; Minority Report, Ought Not to Pass.

Tabled—May 31, 1967 by Senator Berry of Cumberland.

Pending — Motion by Senator Sproul of Lincoln to Accept the Minority Ought Not to Pass Report.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Couturier.

Mr. COUTURIER of Androscoggin: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I must oppose the motion of Senator Sproul to accept the Ought Not to Pass Report, and I certainly hope that her motion is defeated.

This bill is a very simple one, and this Senate in the past has felt that it has quite a responsibility to the municipalities of this State. It is generally felt that the municipalities, cities and towns, are overburdened as it is and that they must get relief. Well, financial relief is not the only thing that we can give to these municipalities. Indeed, I feel that this bill, if it is passed, will do much to help the municipalities of the State of Maine.

What it will do basically is permit these municipalities to buy better equipment at better prices. The cities and towns of the State of Maine will be able to buy through the State Bureau of Purchases, they will have the advantage of having the volume prices, they will be able to get good specifications and good merchandise from the State which they cannot afford to get through their own offices now, and we will find that, thus, they will save money and get better equipment.

True, there may be a certain minor cost to the State for this service, but I think that the advantages to be gained by passing this bill far overshadow the cost that might be entailed.

Mr. President, unfortunately, my memory doesn't serve me too well this morning and I was wondering if you could refresh my memory

by giving to me and to the Senate the Committee Report.

The PRESIDENT: The Ought to Pass as Amended Committee Report was signed by the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Couturier, the Senator from Franklin, Senator Mills, Representative Crommett of Millinocket, Wight of Presque Isle, Meisner of Dover-Foxcroft, Robertson of Brewer, Snowe of Auburn and Nadeau of Sanford. The Ought Not to Pass Report is signed by the Senator from Lincoln, Senator Sproul.

The Chair recognizes the same Senator.

Mr. COUTURIER: Mr. President, I will say this - I don't want to belabor the point - I feel that as far as the municipalities of the State of Maine are concerned, this is probably one of the most important bills that we will have this session, and I certainly hope that the motion to accept the Ought Not to Pass Report will be defeated and that the bill will be passed.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Lincoln, Mrs. Sproul.

Mrs. SPROUL of Lincoln: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: You have heard a very able argument from one who knows very well how to speak. I, however, would like to point out my reasons for signing the Minority Ought Not to Pass Report.

In the first place, the only proponents of the measure were the sponsor and the Maine Municipal Association, and one who appeared, who said he was not an opponent but did speak at least in a neutral fashion more or less against it, and that was the gentleman from the Bureau of Purchases. He pointed out that he, as I said the other day, that he did not have the staff to handle this, and this has been taken care of by an amendment, that is true. But it does represent added cost to the State, and it represents to the State something else that they must do. I personally feel that we have enough problems here at the state level right now without taking on any others.

Another reason I signed this Ought Not to Pass is that per-

sonally I see no harm in buying at the local level. Certainly those who sell at the local level are approached for their taxes, we don't forget that when it is tax time.

Thirdly, the advantage in buying at the state level has been pointed out to you, but one of the things that they buy at the local level is culverts, and they are bought at a reduced price. They are bought at the local level and they are delivered at the local level. What is the State going to do if they find a truckload of culverts arriving? Are they going to go around to each town and deliver them? No provision is made for that. Neither is there any provision made for the mailing or the delivery of small items if they are purchased through the State.

True, it is permissive, but I oppose this measure. I just don't see the sense to it.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Couturier.

Mr. COURTIURIER of Androscoggin: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: There is quite a bit of merit to the argument that we should buy on the local level. I don't dispute that. I don't doubt that many municipalities, in fact, I would say all municipalities, will continue to buy many items on the local level even though they can purchase through the State if this bill should pass. However, there are many items which can be bought at a price which is so much cheaper on the State level than on the municipal level that it isn't funny. And I think that we have to realize that these prices do affect the tax rates in our different communities.

The Senator has brought out that there is no plan to implement this bill at the present time. However, it was brought out, and the bill states, if I may read the bill: "Municipal purchasing. To permit any political subdivision or school administrative district in the State of Maine to make purchases of materials, equipment and supplies, through the State Bureau of Purchases" — and this is a very important part — "subject to such procedures, rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the State

Purchasing Agent." I certainly expect the State Purchasing Agent to look out for the interests of the State, and I don't believe that his first responsibility is to the municipalities. However, on the other hand, if the State is offered a price on — let's say automobiles, then there is no reason why this very same price cannot be extended to the municipalities, towns and cities, that are creatures of our State. I think that we would find on automobiles, for instance, the different companies selling these automobiles are certainly willing to subsidize their dealers to a much greater extent when they are selling to the State than when they are selling to municipalities and selling to these municipalities only a few items. Whereby the State may purchase 120 cruisers for the State Police, the City of Lewiston would be purchasing only six during the current year, and the same could be said for most other communities. However, if the State can call for bids on police cruisers, and state "We want 100 cruisers," and this same price is to be applicable to any municipality that wants these same cruisers, and is willing to order them through the State, I see no problem there, and I believe that these municipalities will enjoy prices which will be substantially lower than what they are now paying.

Obviously, if the prices are about the same, the town officials and the city officials will want to encourage their local industries and local dealers, and they will not bother the State and will not go through the State for these purchases. But I think that on many major items, on items that are significant, on costly items, that they can get a much better deal through the State. And I feel it is our responsibility to make these facilities of the State available to the cities and towns of Maine.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Girard.

Mr. GIRARD of Androscoggin: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I am not speaking against my good friend, Senator Couturier, but I am against this

bill too. I am with Senator Sproul. I think that in adding this to this department we will be increasing a lot of professional help which will cost a lot of money. If all the municipalities and the cities go into this it will create more administration, which in turn the cities and the towns will have to pay back. There might be a few dollars saved, but at the same time I think that it is a good way of doing business in our municipalities when we have controllers, managers or purchasing agents to do our buying for the cities and municipalities and deal with some of our biggest taxpayers who are in business around our own cities. For a few dollars I don't think it would pay. We should encourage our people first who can give the best bid to the city or the town. So, I am in favor of Senator Sproul's Ought Not to Pass Report.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Franklin, Senator Mills.

Mr. MILLS of Franklin: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I did sign the report with the good Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Couturier, and do support his position.

I think I indicated the other day when I asked for someone else to table the matter after I had finished that he was not then present, and I indicated that my position was governed quite a bit by the experience that he had had in his administration of the City of Lewiston. I think that you can see from the argument he has presented here this morning why I was inclined to go along with him. It seems to me that if anyone were under local pressure to favor local merchants and that sort of thing, that Lewiston, being the large city that it is, that his position might well have been the other way. But being the student of Government that he is, and I might add that I have heard by way of the grapevine that he might very soon be a student of the law, which I very much hope he will since he has such distinguished ability to project a viewpoint and be so lucid in his argument - I think I am old enough, I am so much

older than he, that I can make such compliments probably - so, I think that the position of the Senator from Lewiston is so clear that it doesn't need any additions from me. I am sure that I am unable to add to the experience that he has had. The arguments seem to be very strong in his favor, and I hope that his bill will prevail.

The PRESIDENT: The pending question is on the motion of the Senator from Lincoln, Mrs. Sproul, that the Senate accept the Minority Ought Not to Pass Report of the Committee. As many as are in favor of accepting the Ought Not to Pass Report will stand and remain standing until counted. Those opposed?

A division was had. 13 Senators having voted in the affirmative, and 16 Senators having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Senate voted to accept the Majority Ought to Pass, as Amended, Report of the Committee, and the Bill was read once. House Amendment "A" was read and adopted, and the Bill tomorrow assigned for Second Reading.

The President laid before the Senate the sixteenth tabled and today assigned matter (H. P. 1162) (L. D. 1663) Bill "An Act Relating to Realty Subdivisions in Municipalities and Unorganized Territory."

Tabled—May 31, 1967 by Senator Hildreth of Cumberland.

Pending—Passage to be Engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Hildreth of Cumberland, retabled and specially assigned for Friday, June 2, pending Passage to be Engrossed.

The President laid before the Senate the seventeenth tabled and today assigned matter (S. P. 638) (L. D. 1642) Bill "An Act Changing the Foundation Program Per Pupil Allowances."

Tabled—May 31, 1967 by Senator Johnson of Somerset.

Pending—Enactment.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Somerset, Senator Johnson.

Mr. JOHNSON of Somerset: Mr. President, in view of the fact that this is now covered by other legislation, I would move that the bill and its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

Thereupon, the bill and its accompanying papers were indefinitely postponed.

Sent down for concurrence.

The President laid before the Senate the eighteenth tabled and today assigned matter (S. P. 599) (L. D. 1580) Resolve, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Grant Adult Rights to Persons Twenty Years of Age and to Reduce the Voting Age to Twenty Years.

Tabled — May 31, 1967 by Senator Berry of Cumberland.

Pending — Final Passage.

On motion by Mr. Albair of Aroostook, and under suspension of the rules, the Senate voted to reconsider its action whereby the Resolve was Passed to be Engrossed.

The same Senator presented Senate Amendment "B" and moved its adoption.

Senate Amendment "B", Filing No. S-214, was read by the Secretary as follows:

SENATE AMENDMENT "B" to S. P. 599, L. D. 1580, Resolve, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Grant Adult Rights to Persons Twenty Years of Age and to Reduce the Voting Age to Twenty Years.

Amend said Resolve in the Title by striking out the words "to Grant Adult Rights to Persons Twenty Years of Age and"

Further amend said Resolve by striking out in the 2nd line (same in L. D. 1580) the word "amendments" and inserting in place thereof the word 'amendment'

Further amend said Resolve by striking out all of the 2nd and 3rd paragraphs (same in L. D. 1580).

Further amend said Resolve by striking out all of the 2nd, 3rd and 4th paragraphs from the end and inserting in place thereof the following (same in L. D. 1580):

'Form of question and date when amendment shall be voted upon.'

Resolved: That the aldermen of cities, the selectmen of towns and the assessors of the several plantations of this State are empowered and directed to notify the inhabitants of their respective cities, towns and plantations to meet in the manner prescribed by law for calling and holding biennial meetings of said inhabitants for the election of Senators and Representatives at the next general election in the month of November or special state-wide election on the Tuesday following the first Monday of November following the passage of this resolve to give in their votes upon the amendment proposed in the foregoing resolution, and the question shall be:

"Shall the Constitution be amended as proposed by a resolution of the Legislature to Reduce the Voting Age to Twenty Years?"

The inhabitants of said cities, towns and plantations shall vote by ballot on said question, and shall indicate by a cross or check mark placed against the words "Yes" or "No" their opinion of the same. The ballots shall be received, sorted, counted and declared in open ward, town and plantation meetings and returns made to the office of the Secretary of State in the same manner as votes for Governor and Members of the Legislature, and the Governor and Council shall count the same, and if it shall appear that a majority of the inhabitants voting on the question are in favor of the amendment, the Governor shall forthwith make known the fact by his proclamation, and the amendment shall thereupon, as of the date of said proclamation, become a part of the Constitution.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Albair.

Mr. ALBAIR of Aroostook: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: The objections to the previous bill, L. D. 1580, whereby it granted the constitutional rights to adults reaching the age of 20 years has been removed. Now, this proposed amendment, if adopted, would grant voting rights only. I believe this is

sound progressive legislation and I hope that this amendment would be adopted.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Hancock, Senator Anderson.

Mr. ANDERSON of Hancock: Mr. President, I move indefinite postponement of L. D. 1580 and all accompanying papers, and when the vote is taken, Mr. President, I move that it be taken by division.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Hancock, Senator Anderson, moves that this item be indefinitely postponed. The same Senator has requested that the vote be taken by a division.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Hildreth.

Mr. HILDRETH of Cumberland: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I would have voted in opposition to L. D. 1580, but am in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Albair. I think this amendment makes a great deal of sense. I have given this a great deal of thought, as I am sure all of us have. It is a very basic issue. Being a constitutional amendment, it is one that the people will have an opportunity to vote on. It is a measure which I think the people are peculiarly effective in voting on as opposed, say, to the construction of a certain bridge. This is a matter that I think is of interest basically to people all over the State, and I think that it makes sense to give people the opportunity to vote on it.

Furthermore, I think that our young people today, many of them are still students at this age, and I think they honestly know more about government than most other people do, and probably more at that particular point in their lives than they will thereafter. I, therefore, hope that the amendment prevails.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Barnes.

Mr. BARNES of Aroostook: Mr. President, I would like to pose a question through the Chair to some member of the Bar in the Senate. Would it be constitutional to grant

voting privileges without granting all the adult privileges? I mean, I think there is some question in the minds of some people as to whether that would meet all the requirements of our constitution.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Aroostook, Senator Barnes, has posed a question through the Chair to some member of the Bar. Some member of the Bar may answer if he so desires.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Hildreth.

Mr. HILDRETH of Cumberland: In response to the question of Senator Barnes, I would say that it is a constitutional amendment because what, in fact, we are doing is amending the constitution. The question would be: is it in violation of the Federal Constitution, and I see no problem there. Certainly there is nothing in our State Constitution that would prevent us from making this amendment and sending it to the people. If the people vote to amend it then it is constitutional.

The PRESIDENT: Is the Senate ready for the question? The question again is on the motion of the Senator from Hancock, Senator Anderson, that the bill and accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. As many as are in favor of indefinite postponement will stand and remain standing until counted. Those opposed to indefinite postponement?

A division was had. Seven Senators having voted in the affirmative, and 22 Senators having voted in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone did not prevail.

Thereupon, Senate Amendment "B" was adopted, and the Bill, as Amended, was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

The President laid before the Senate the nineteenth tabled and today assigned matter (H. P. 89) (L. D. 186) House Report — Ought to Pass from the Committee on Indian Affairs on Bill, "An Act Relating to Compensation and Allowances for Members of the Indian Tribes at the Legislature."

Tabled —May 31, 1967 by Senator Johnson of Somerset.

Pending — Acceptance of Report.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Curtis.

Mr. CURTIS of Penobscot: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: I would like to speak concerning L.D. 186 and concerning the Indian affairs.

Last year the committee hearings on Indian affairs bills were presented in front of seven different committees. This year an Indian Affairs Committee was appointed for the hearing of the Indian bills, and it made it very, very satisfactory, I felt, and personally, the Committee headed by Senator Beckett, I feel, was very sincere and gave a lot of attention and time and made very close contact between the Indian tribes and the Legislature.

The Indian Affairs Committee heard many bills. They had the representatives from the Indian Plantations here, who presented the facts, and they had a very close relationship. The bill previously was recommending full legislative pay. The Committee gave that considerable thought. That was very early in the session. This bill has been tabled since May 2nd, when I tabled it, and since then we have learned that the Indians themselves, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, none of them feel it is necessary to have large pay, and they were very satisfied to keep the pay as it is at \$500.

However, one representative has made 41 trips here to the Legislature this winter and spring, being the contact of the tribe to the Indian Affairs Committee of the Legislature. Many times it has been very, very helpful and made it very understanding. Knowing that the relationship of Indians to the Legislature has existed since 1835, I think that we should do everything we can to keep the relationship close, to be helpful and understanding.

The Indian Affairs Committee has given considerable thought and attention to the health, the safety, sanitation, welfare, progress and

the needs of the Indians. As a member of that Committee, I have had considerable interest and, you might say enjoyment, working with them and understanding their problems.

I would at this time say that I think that the pay for only eleven trips down to the Legislature, when one has made 41 trips, is rather small. There was no consideration for overnight in case of storms, and several times there were storms to go back in and storms to start out in. I am offering at this time Senate Amendment "C" for consideration which I feel will correct that inequality limiting the number of trips and limiting the amount of allowance for living conditions, but not changing the salary any over the present situation.

Thereupon, the Senate voted to accept the Ought to Pass Report of the Committee and the Bill was read once.

Senate Amendment "C", Filing No. S-199, was read by the Secretary as follows:

SENATE AMENDMENT "C" to H. P. 89, L. D. 186, Bill, "An Act Relating to Compensation and Allowances for Members of the Indian Tribes at the Legislature."

Amend said Bill by striking out all of the last paragraph and inserting in place thereof the following:

"The member of the Penobscot Indian Tribe and the member of the Passamaquoddy Indian Tribe elected to represent his tribe at the biennial assembly of the Legislature shall receive a compensation of \$500 for such attendance and travel at each legislative session for 20 trips to and from his place of abode at the same rate as state employees receive, and allowance for meals and housing expenses as any other member of the Senate and House of Representatives for 20 days' attendance at each legislative session."

Senate Amendment "C" was adopted and the Bill, as Amended, tomorrow assigned for Second Reading.

The President laid before the Senate the seventh tabled and unassigned matter (H. P. 1114) (L.

D. 1583) Bill "An Act Requiring Constructed Public Buildings be Made Accessible to the Physically Handicapped."

Tabled—May 31, 1967 by Senator Johnson of Somerset.

Pending—Enactment.

On motion by Mr. Johnson of Somerset, the Bill was Passed to be Enacted, and, having been signed by the President, was by the Secretary presented to the Governor for his approval.

The President laid before the Senate the eighth tabled and unassigned matter (H. P. 1155) (L. D. 1652) Bill "An Act Providing State Scholarships for Higher Education."

Tabled—May 31, 1967 by Senator Johnson of Somerset.

Pending Enactment.

On motion by Mr. Berry of Cumberland placed on The Special Appropriations table.

Mr. Berry of Cumberland was granted unanimous consent to address the Senate:

Mr. BERRY of Cumberland: Mr. President and Members of the Senate: The Members of the 103rd Legislature suffered a sad personal

loss in the passing yesterday of Representative Charles Lowery of Brunswick. Many of us had the pleasure of serving with Charlie in the House where Charlie was a very valuable and active member since his election to the 99th Session of the Legislature. The fact that Representative Lowery had not been in the best of health for practically his entire legislative experience, and yet was in the vanguard of the fight on several legislative matters, particularly those dealing with pollution, indicate and prove that Charlie was a very, very brave man. He was extremely active. He was a member, and an ardent one, of the Democratic Party, an ally at times, and a political foe at times, with whom it was a pleasure either to join or joust. I know we suffer, all, a great sense of personal deprivation in the passing of Representative Lowery.

Now, Mr. President, I would move that out of respect to the memory of Charles Lowery the Senate stand adjourned until nine-thirty o'clock tomorrow morning.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Berry of Cumberland,

Adjourned until nine-thirty thirty o'clock tomorrow morning.